

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/06/2024

COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25

PAGE# 1 of 12

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer detained a person without reasonable suspicion.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was detained for no reason.

The named officer stated he responded to a call for service at a restaurant of an individual wielding a deadly weapon (metal bat) who made felony threats to multiple victims who worked at the restaurant and posed a danger to the public. The complainant was a trained Muay Thai and martial arts trainer.

The named officer stated he was the initial unit on scene and attempted to de-escalate the subject while maintaining time and distance until Hostage Negotiation Team (HNT) and Critical Incident Trained (CIT) units arrived on scene and took over.

When the officer arrived, he spoke to the restaurant manager, who told him the complainant came into the restaurant demanding his car keys. The manager did not know anything about the complainant's keys. The complainant was wielding a metal bat in his right hand, in violation of California Penal Code section 417(a)(1), and became hostile when he was advised that they did not have his keys. The complainant told the manager he would "bash his brains out" with the bat if he did not get his keys in violation of California Penal Code section 422(a).

The manager, afraid and fearful for his safety, believed the complainant would assault him with the bat and immediately called 911 as the complainant went downstairs to the bar. As the officer was speaking to the manager, the complainant walked out of the restaurant with the bat and began walking away, yelling, "You're not going to arrest me!". He began walking northbound through the parking lot as two other officers arrived on scene to assist. The complainant approached the northeast corner of the parking lot, where he placed the baseball bat, an item that appeared to be a samurai sword, and a backpack in the rear of his sport utility vehicle (SUV). He then attempted to get in his vehicle to drive away. He ordered the complainant multiple times to step back from his vehicle. The complainant was not cooperative and became verbally aggressive in violation of PC sec. 148(a)(1). He began to pace back and forth in the parking lot. Based on the officer's training and experience, this was a display of pre-attack tactics known as the "tiger walk". The complainant stated multiple times that he was not going to comply with the police

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/06/2024 COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25 PAGE# 2 of 12

and was not going to be taken into custody by police without a fight, and that officers would have to kill him. He further stated that if any officers approached him, he would stab them with his keys. All officers maintained time and distance and employed de-escalation techniques to talk down the complainant. The Hostage Negotiation Team (HNT) was called in, and when those negotiations were unsuccessful, the Tactical Unit (TAC) was called in to take over. After a long standoff, the officers were able to take the complainant into custody.

Department records, including the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD), Incident report, photographs of the complainant, and the Citizen Arrest form, corroborated the named officer's account.

Body-worn camera footage corroborated the named officer's account of the incident.

Department General Order (DGO) 5.03 allows officers to conduct an investigative detention when there is a reasonable suspicion that would leave a reasonable person to believe that a crime is, was, or is about to occur, and the person under suspicion is reasonably connected to the crime. Reasonable suspicion to detain is also established whenever there is any violation of the law.

The complainant told the restaurant manager he would "bash his brains out" with the bat if he did not get his keys, which is a violation of California Penal Code section 422(a). The complainant wielded a metal bat in his right hand, in violation of California Penal Code section 417(a)(1), and became hostile when he was advised that they did not have his keys. Based on this information, there was a reasonable suspicion for the officer to detain the complainant.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/06/2024

COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25

PAGE# 3 of 12

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #2-7: The officer used unnecessary or excessive force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that officers used unnecessary force. The complainant said he was struck with an Extended Range Impact Weapon (ERIW) three times and physically assaulted by officers. The complainant said officers put his face into the ground, and an officer put his knee on his back. He said he suffered a cut to his right knee as a result of being taken to the ground. The complainant did not sign a medical authorization form; thus, the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) was unable to obtain any medical records.

Officer #1 retired from the Department and is no longer subject to discipline. DPA reviewed the body-worn camera (BWC) video of named officer #1. The video showed the complainant continually walking back and forth around the small area of the parking lot. Each time the complainant walked near his black SUV or towards the perimeter, officers would give a verbal warning that less lethal rounds would be delivered. For over 2 hours, the complainant continued to ignore officers' commands to cooperate and constantly verbally insulted negotiators. Officer #1 deployed one 40 mm Oleoresin Capsicum (OC) impact round from his non-lethal ERIW, striking the complainant above the waist, after the arrest team moved forward to place the complainant under arrest. As officers made their approach, the complainant turned and began to stand up quickly. Officer #1 immediately fired a round from his ERIW to gain compliance. The video shows the complainant getting back on the ground and putting his hands out to the side, where he was eventually placed in handcuffs. The BWC video evidence corroborates Officer #1's written statement of his account of the incident.

Officer #2 stated he was a member of the Tactical Unit (TAC) and was dispatched to a critical incident. He was assigned the less lethal tool of an ERIW loaded with pepper ball Live-X rounds. He deployed the ERIW to prevent further resistance by the complainant. The complainant actively resisted. The complainant said he was a trained martial arts fighter and challenged multiple officers to fight him. He attempted numerous times to get into his car to flee. He refused to follow lawful commands to stay away from his vehicle. He used aggressive and sexually explicit language in an attempt to bait individual officers into a physical confrontation, which no officer engaged in. Officer #2 stated the pepper ball is a form of de-escalation used in an attempt to prevent the need for further escalation in the use of greater levels of force. Numerous verbal warnings were given to the complainant before the deployment of the

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/06/2024

COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25

PAGE# 4 of 12

Live X pepper ball rounds. Officer #2 stated he deployed approximately 10-20 rounds. Not all rounds were deployed at the complainant. Several rounds were deployed into the pavement in front of the woods to create a barrier to prevent escape. The use of the pepper ball was part of the tactical arrest plan in the event the complainant attempted to flee either in his vehicle or to the woods behind him, and/or physically resisted arrest. The complainant refused to comply with lawful commands, resisted arrest, and attempted to flee.

Officer #3 stated he responded to the scene to assist patrol units in arresting the complainant. He provided containment during the incident and deployed a Noise Flash Diversionary Device (NFDD) in close proximity to the complainant in an attempt to deter the complainant from accessing his vehicle, which officers believed contained weapons (metal bat and sword). Officer #3 placed himself on the exterior of a small barrier that separated the parking lot from the sidewalk, creating more distance between him and the complainant. Each time the complainant approached his vehicle, he gave the complainant verbal commands to stay away from the vehicle and to lie down on the ground. The complainant did not comply and became increasingly mad.

Officer #4 stated he was a member of the Tactical Unit and was dispatched to assist patrol units in arresting a felony threat suspect. The complainant was approximately six feet tall, weighed over 230 pounds, and was trained in mixed martial arts. Patrol units had already set containment at the parking lot and were unsuccessful in placing the complainant under arrest. He assisted with the complainant's arrest. The complainant had initially lain down on the ground but quickly stood up as officers had moved in from positions of cover. An impact projectile was deployed due to the complainant's active resistance and assaultive behavior. After the impact projectile was delivered to the complainant, he proceeded to lie back down on the ground. Due to his size, strength, active resistance, and assaultive behavior, Officer #4 placed the complainant's legs in a figure four control hold to gain control and place him under arrest. As he was attempting to control the complainant's legs, the complainant pushed his legs backward against the officer, almost causing him to lose control. The complainant was then placed under arrest in handcuffs.

Officer #5 stated his initial response was containment if the suspect decided to run into the bushes from the parking lot. After he was relieved, he became part of the arrest team. He assisted in taking the complainant into custody. He used Type III physical control techniques. The complainant was verbally aggressive and stated that he would not be arrested without a fight and would stab the police with his keys. He had threatened others with a metal bat prior. He did not comply with verbal de-escalation attempts. He did not comply with any de-escalation with non-lethal Extended Range Impact Weapon (ERIW) super sock rounds, attempted pepper ball deployments, and a Noise Flash Diversionary Device (NFDD). After being hit with a "pepper ball munitions" round, he started to be compliant and then stood

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/06/2024

COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25

PAGE# 5 of 12

up when officers approached to physically control him. An OC 40mm impact round was deployed, and the complainant then said he would comply.

Officer #6 stated he responded as back-up to a patrol unit and was holding the perimeter. He deployed a non-lethal round from an Extended Range Impact Weapon (ERIW). The complainant was not cooperative, verbally aggressive, and was making threats to officers on scene. The complainant was alleged to have threatened people inside a popular restaurant with a bat. Officer #6 observed the complainant place a bat and a samurai sword inside the trunk of his vehicle. The officer was also aware that the complainant had firearms registered to him that could have been inside his vehicle. The complainant refused to comply with any commands and to surrender peacefully. Officer #6 and other officers created a perimeter around the complainant and took cover behind their patrol vehicles. The complainant stated multiple times that if any officers approached him that he would stab them with his keys. Officer #6 stated multiple warnings were given to the complainant about approaching his vehicle, or he would deploy the ERIW. The complainant was aware of the boundaries and continued testing the limits of those boundaries that were given to him by police officers. The Hostage Negotiation Team (HNT) arrived on scene and had exhausted all de-escalation techniques to get the complainant to surrender. The complainant stated he was trained in mixed martial arts. Officer #6 observed the complainant approaching the backside of his vehicle, and knowing he still possessed his car keys, he feared for the safety of himself and everyone on scene because he had deadly weapons and possibly a firearm inside the vehicle that could be used against officers. Officer #6 was approximately 30 feet away when he deployed one round from his department-issued ERIW at the complainant to Zone 2 (waist down). The one round to Zone 2 appeared to be ineffective.

Witness Officer #1 stated the complainant displayed verbal, passive, and physical resistance. After nearly four hours of de-escalation efforts, time and distance, SFPD Tactical officers utilized force options to apprehend the complainant.

Witness Officer #2 stated he was one of the multiple supervisors on scene. He took over as the incident commander and coordinated with the Hostage Negotiation Team (HNT) and Tactical units until he was relieved by a Captain. The complainant displayed verbal, passive, and physical resistance. The complainant also made criminal threats to officers on the scene. Witness Officer #2 stated that Officer #6 notified him and another sergeant of his Use of Force. Witness Officer #2 determined the Use of Force to be within Department policy.

Witness Officer #3 was the Tactical Commander in charge of the Tactical officers and Specialist officers at the scene. His role was to give recommendations and options to the Incident Commander and ensure the options were carried out once the decision was made. He was in charge and oversaw the tactical plan

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/06/2024

COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25

PAGE# 6 of 12

to arrest the complainant. Witness Officer #3 stated the complainant's verbal responses and physical actions displayed a person who would fight with the officers attempting to arrest him. The complainant refused to obey all lawful commands and continued to display assaultive behavior by getting up onto his feet. He ordered Officer #2 to deploy additional pepper ball munitions to gain compliance and for officers to take the complainant into custody. The complainant told officers that he was not going to be taken into custody without a fight and that officers would have to kill him. The complainant also told the officers that he would use his keys to stab the officers if they approached him. The complainant is 6'0 tall, 235 lbs., and was believed to have mixed martial arts training. Witness Officer #3 stated his orders to the officers were, if it appeared to them that was going to the complainant was going to his vehicle, they were authorized to use force to prevent the complainant from accessing possible weapons from inside his vehicle, or from him using his vehicle as a weapon, or for him to flee. The complainant was walking towards his vehicle when force was initially used. Before his arrival, officers surrounded the complainant for approximately two hours. During this time, the Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) and Hostage Negotiations Team (HNT) members attempted to de-escalate the situation and convince the complainant to surrender peacefully. Before the use of force, numerous warnings were given to the complainant to stay away from his vehicle, and the possibility of force being used if he did not obey lawful commands.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage corroborates each of the named officers' accounts of the incident.

The Incident Report (IR) stated the first responding officer met with the manager of the restaurant, who told him the complainant came into the restaurant demanding his car keys, to which he had no knowledge of. The complainant was wielding a metal bat in his right hand, in violation of PC sec. 417(a)(1), and became hostile when he was advised that they did not have his keys. The complainant threatened the manager and told him he would "bash his brains out" with the bat if he did not get his keys in violation of PC sec. 422(a). The manager was afraid and fearful for his safety as he believed the complainant would assault him with the bat and immediately called 911 as the complainant went downstairs to the bar. As the officer was speaking to the manager, the complainant walked out of the restaurant with the bat and began walking away, yelling, "You're not going to arrest me." He began walking northbound through the parking lot as two more officers arrived to assist. The complainant approached the northeast corner of the parking lot, where he placed the baseball bat, an item that appeared to be a samurai sword, and a backpack in the trunk of his vehicle. He then attempted to get in his vehicle to drive away. The complainant was ordered multiple times to step back from his vehicle. He was not cooperative and became verbally aggressive in violation of California Penal Code section 148(a)(1). He began to pace back and forth in the parking lot. He stated multiple times that he was not going to comply with the police and was not going to

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/06/2024

COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25

PAGE# 7 of 12

be taken into custody by police without a fight, and that officers would have to kill him. He also stated that if any officers approached him, he would stab them with his keys.

All officers maintained time and distance and employed de-escalation techniques to talk down the complainant. The Hostage Negotiation Team (HNT) and SFPD Tactical Team (TAC) were requested to assist with the incident. All de-escalation techniques yielded no progress. The complainant repeatedly provoked and knowingly tested the established boundaries. As he reached the threshold of his vehicle trunk, an officer deployed the less-lethal round and struck the complainant in Zone Two. The Tactical Unit then deployed their plan of action and used several non-lethal weapons to gain compliance and took the complainant into custody. The complainant was transported to the hospital by San Francisco Fire Department Medics. After the complainant was medically cleared, he was transported and booked for multiple charges.

Evidence photos show the complainant sustained abrasions and bruising to the left upper thigh, both knees, lower legs, hands, lower left torso, and face. The injuries are consistent with being struck with non-lethal impact weapons and being taken to the ground to be handcuffed.

The Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) records show officers were dispatched to a call for service of threats/harassment. The CAD comments document that the complainant walked into the restaurant demanding his keys and had a bat and a Lacrosse stick with him. The complainant threatened to destroy the place with a bat and threatened employees and patrons. The complainant was taken into custody approximately four hours after officers arrived on scene.

A Property Receipt form documents that the complainant had a 29-inch baseball bat and a Samurai sword.

The use of force by each named officer was documented in the incident report, Use of Force logs and Supervisory Use of Force Evaluation Forms. The use of force by each named officer was determined to be within Department policy. It was noted that the complainant did not sustain serious injury as a result of the use of force by officers.

Department General Order (DGO), 5.01(I)(D) (Use of Force: PROPORTIONALITY) states:

“When determining the appropriate level of force, officers shall, when feasible, balance the severity of the offense committed and the level of resistance based on the totality of the circumstances known to or

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/06/2024

COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25

PAGE# 8 of 12

perceived by the officer at the time. It is particularly important that officers apply proportionality and critical decision-making when encountering a subject who is armed with a weapon other than a firearm.”

DGO 5.01(III)(A) (Use of Force: USE OF FORCE MUST BE FOR A LAWFUL PURPOSE) states:

“Officers may use reasonable force options in the performance of their duties, in the following circumstances:

1. To effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search.
2. To overcome resistance or to prevent escape.
3. To prevent the commission of a public offense.
4. In defense of others or in self-defense.
5. To gain compliance with a lawful order.
6. To prevent a person from injuring himself/herself. However, an officer is prohibited from using lethal force against a person who presents only a danger to himself/herself and does not pose an immediate threat of death or serious bodily injury to another person or officer.”

The evidence shows that the named officers used multiple force options to detain, gain compliance, and handcuff the complainant. The complainant was agitated and aggressive, had threatened employees at a restaurant and was armed with a metal baseball bat, a samurai sword, had refused lawful orders, and actively resisted officers. Officers had attempted de-escalation techniques for approximately three hours before the use of force. The complainant had initially lain down on the ground but quickly stood up as officers moved in from positions of cover. An impact projectile was deployed due to the complainant’s active resistance and assaultive behavior. After the impact projectile was delivered, he lay back down on the ground. Due to the complainant’s size, strength, active resistance, and assaultive behavior, officers placed the complainant’s legs in a figure four control hold to gain control and place him under arrest.

The named officers’ use of force was reasonable and necessary given the circumstances and complied with Department policy. The BWC evidence supports the named officers’ actions.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/06/2024 COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25 PAGE# 9 of 12

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #8-9: The officers towed a vehicle without justification.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said his truck was towed from the parking lot for no reason.

Officer #1 and Officer #2 both stated that the complainant's vehicle was not allowed to remain on private property, and it was towed at the request of the restaurant manager. Officer #1 requested approval for the tow from Officer #2. Officer #2 said he approved the towing of the vehicle. The restaurant manager signed the Tow Form.

Department records, including the BWC evidence, incident report, Tow Form, and Citizen Arrest form, corroborate the officers' statements.

DGO 9.06 (Vehicle Tows) authorizes the towing of vehicles when a person has been arrested, and the vehicle is not parked in a place that will be legal for at least 24 hours from the time of arrest.

In this instance, the restaurant manager requested the vehicle be towed because it could not remain in the restaurant's private parking lot. The complainant was also under arrest.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #10-18: The officers failed to provide medical treatment.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: U

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/06/2024

COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25

PAGE# 10 of 12

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated officers did not provide medical attention for his right knee. He said he asked for hydrogen peroxide so he could treat himself.

The named officers stated that the complainant was in the care of San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) medics upon his arrest. He was transported to a hospital for medical evaluation.

Body-worn camera footage did not capture the complainant asking to treat himself. The BWC footage showed that the SFFD Medics were on scene and provided medical attention to the complainant once he was taken into custody. Under the circumstances, it would be unreasonable for officers to have allowed the complainant to treat himself.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #19-27: The officers behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said officers made inappropriate comments. Officers were making jokes. One officer said, "At least you'll have a blanket.", and another officer said, "You're an idiot."

The named officers denied that they made the alleged comments. Officer #2 retired from the Department and is no longer subject to discipline. DPA reviewed the BWC video of Named Officer #2. The video did not capture Officer #2 making any such comments.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/06/2024 COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25 PAGE# 11 of 12

Body-worn camera footage did not capture any of the named officers making the alleged comments; however, some portions of the audio were redacted or muted for tactical reasons, and other parts of the audio were unclear due to background noise and multiple people speaking at the same time.

Department General Order 2.01 (General Rules of Conduct, Rule 14) states, “When acting in the performance of their duties, while on or off duty, members shall treat the public with courtesy and respect and not use harsh, profane or uncivil language”.

The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #28: The officer engaged in unwarranted action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The named officer ordered a tactical officer to deploy pepper ball rounds at the ground towards the complainant.

The named officer stated he was the tactical commander at the scene. He was in charge of the tactical officers and specialist officers at the scene. Part of his role was to give recommendations and options to the “incident commander” and ensure the recommendations were carried out once the decision was made. During this incident, he was in charge and oversaw the tactical plan to arrest the complainant. When he arrived on scene, he was informed that the complainant would be arrested for criminal threats and delaying a lawful arrest. The complainant was surrounded by officers and refused to obey lawful commands. The complainant continued to display assaultive behavior by getting up onto his feet.

The named officer stated he ordered the tactical officer to deploy additional pepper ball munitions to gain compliance and for officers to take the complainant into custody. The complainant verbally told officers

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/06/2024 COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25 PAGE# 12 of 12

that he was not going to be taken into custody without a fight and that officers would have to kill him. The complainant also told the officers that he would use his keys to stab the officers if they approached

him. The complainant is six feet tall, weighs 235pounds, and was believed to have mixed martial arts training. His orders to the officers were, if it appeared to them that the complainant was going to his vehicle, they were authorized to use force to prevent the complainant from accessing possible weapons from inside his vehicle, or from him using his vehicle as a weapon, or for him to flee. The complainant was walking towards his vehicle when force was initially used. Before the named officer's arrival, officers surrounded the complainant for approximately two hours.

During this time, Crisis Intervention Team and Hostage Negotiation Team members attempted to de-escalate the situation and convince the complainant to surrender peacefully. Before the use of force, numerous warnings were given to the complainant to stay away from his vehicle, and the possibility of force being used if he did not obey lawful commands. After the Tactical officer deployed the pepper ball, the complainant appeared to cooperate with the officers' commands.

BWC footage evidence corroborates the named officer's account of the incident.

As the tactical commander, the named officer was authorized to give orders to tactical officers under his command to use force options. The named officer's actions are in accordance with the Department's Use of Force policy.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 12/27/2024

COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/2025

PAGE# 1 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1-2: The officers failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant was involved in a verbal altercation that escalated into a physical altercation. He reported that the officers failed to arrest the suspect and reduced the incident to a mere “miscellaneous investigation,” failing to categorize it as “battery” or “assault” in the incident report. Additionally, the officers failed to obtain surveillance footage and did not interview witnesses.

DGO 2.01 Rule 5. Performing Duties-Members shall perform their duties promptly and according to Department policies and procedures. Members shall maintain a working knowledge of all information required for the proper performance of their duties.

DM 11 Report Writing Manual, Heading Section, A4 Type of Incident in pertinent parts:

TITLES. Enter the type of the incident, using the list of titles provided in the Incident and Charging Manual (SFPD).

The Incident and Charging Manual (SFPD) lists report titles for the most common violations of the Penal, Vehicle, Health and Safety, and Welfare and Institutions Codes. Violations that are not listed should be categorized under one of the primary “Miscellaneous” titles listed below. In these cases, identify the specific violation first, followed by the primary Miscellaneous title.

Primary “Miscellaneous” Titles:

Miscellaneous Investigation Violation of Municipal Code

Miscellaneous State Felony Viol. of Municipal Police Code

Miscellaneous State Misdemeanor Violation of Park Code

Violation of Federal Statute Viol. of State Labor Code

Violation of Fire Code

Named officer #1 stated the decision to title the report as a miscellaneous investigation rather than battery was based on the available facts at the time of the investigation and his responsibility to remain impartial and evidence-based in documenting the incident. He did not witness the incident, so after conducting

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 12/27/2024

COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/2025

PAGE# 2 of 3

interviews with the parties involved, he was unable to determine a clear primary aggressor, nor was there sufficient corroborating evidence to support battery charges against any individual. He said labeling the incident as battery without a definitive finding of culpability would have been speculative and could have had legal and procedural implications for those involved. The miscellaneous investigation title was chosen to reflect the need for further review from other units to investigate the incident with additional context or evidence if it became available. The officer stated that his priority was to document the facts accurately and remain neutral, especially in situations where mutual combat may have been a factor, and where premature categorization could bias subsequent investigation or adjudication.

The DPA obtained BART records showing that BART officers were the first to arrive at the incident. They found three individuals arguing, with the complainant holding a knife. Each involved party claimed that the other had the knife originally. BART's video footage did not capture the entire fight because part of it was out of the camera's view.

The body-worn camera footage revealed that named officer #2 spoke to restaurant employees where the argument began and asked for the surveillance footage. He was told he needed to go through the restaurant's human resources department to get it. The officer then spoke to a security guard, who said he only saw a verbal argument inside the store and did not witness a physical fight.

SFPD records and body-worn camera footage confirmed that officers conducted a thorough investigation, documented the incident in a report, and an appropriate report title was used. It is incumbent upon officers to be as accurate and precise as possible. The named officer documented all of the evidence he was able to collect in the moment.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 12/27/2024

COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/2025

PAGE# 3 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The complainant raises matters outside the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant raises matters outside the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Police Department
Internal Affairs Division
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/07/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/09/25

PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers failed to properly investigate.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complaint said that she contacted SFPD because she heard noises and saw a shadow of a person outside her home. The complainant said the officers who were dispatched to her location made no effort to obtain any video footage from her neighbor.

Both named officers stated that they responded to a Priority C trespassing call. They were familiar with the complainant and conducted a full investigation of the incident as reported. The officers said that the complainant described hearing noises outside of her apartment's bedroom window. She then saw the light in a shared garage illuminate, saw a shadow of a person, and also heard someone say "shush."

The named officers said that they conducted a walkthrough of not only the garage, but also the entire backyard area of the apartment building. They specifically looked for evidence of a crime, i.e., the fire escape being down, footprints, broken locks, broken windows, or open doors and found none. Named officer #1 recommended that the complainant review footage that belonged to her apartment building to ensure that the noise was coming from a trespasser and not her neighbor.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage captured what appeared to be the entirety of the officers' contact with the complainant. The footage shows the officers conducted an investigation and told the complainant they found no evidence of a crime. The complainant advised that the neighbor across the street had cameras, and the named officers said they would not gather that evidence as it was 5:30 am.

The evidence showed that the named officers took appropriate investigative steps.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/07/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/09/25

PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officers who were dispatched asked the complainant, “What do you want us to do about it?”

The named officers denied making the statement.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage that appeared to capture the entire contact the officers had with the complainant did not show either of the officers making the alleged statement.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur or that the named officers were not involved.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/16/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/13/25 PAGE 1 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer made an inappropriate comment.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said he called police to report that he had been battered. The named officer responded, and while in close proximity to the complainant, the officer said, "I hate this guy." The complainant said the comment was inappropriate.

The named officer acknowledged making the comment out of frustration, as the complainant failed to follow instructions intended to keep him separated from the suspected batterer. The named officer said the complainant, in a previous contact, had been similarly difficult, refusing to sign a traffic citation. The named officer said he made the comment to his partner and he did not use profanity or prohibited speech.

The named officer's partner stated he heard the named officer make the alleged statement but understood the comment was directed at him.

Body Worn Camera footage shows that the officer told the complainant to stop and explain what had happened and made the comment as the complainant walked past him. The complainant responded to the officer that he believed him to be racist.

The evidence proved that the officer made the comment to his partner after the complainant failed to follow an instruction intended to protect his safety. While the comment offended the complainant, the statement was of a personal opinion and not an insult, uncivil language or profanity directly aimed at the complainant that would have constituted misconduct.

The evidence proved that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct did not rise to the level of misconduct.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/16/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/13/25

PAGE 2 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer knowingly engaged in racially biased policing.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant believed the officer's rude comment was motivated by the complainant's race.

The named officer stated that he had made the comment out of frustration, because the complainant failed to follow instructions, which implicated his own safety. The named officer said he made the comment to his partner and that the comment did not have anything to do with the complainant's race. The named officer pointed to the fact that the complainant raised the accusation of bias immediately after the officer made the comment and he told the complainant his comment was made due to his failure to follow instructions, not his race. The named officer's partner stated he heard his partner make the statement alleged by the complainant but understood the named officer made the statement to him.

Body Worn Camera footage shows that the complainant responded to the officer's comment, saying he believed him to be racist, which the officer denied immediately, saying the comment was aimed only at the complainant's behavior, not his race.

The evidence proved that the officer made the comment to his partner out of frustration at the complainant's failure to follow an instruction. While the comment clearly offended the complainant, the statement was of a personal opinion and not an insult, uncivil language or profanity. The comment did not include any reference to or description of race, national origin or other protected class, as the officer detailed at the time. The comment was not directly aimed at

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/16/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/13/25

PAGE 3 of 3

the complainant in a way that would have constituted misconduct. The evidence proves that the alleged misconduct did not occur.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 02/06/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/25 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-4: The officers conducted an improper search or seizure.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that his neighbor sent the police to his apartment because the neighbor could hear a domestic disturbance through the walls. When officers arrived, the complainant answered the door naked. An officer forcefully detained him by grabbing his wrist, pulling him out of his doorway, and handcuffing him in the hallway. The complainant felt that the officer abused his power by detaining him in handcuffs. Several officers then searched the complainant's home without his permission.

The DPA's investigation showed that a neighbor called for police assistance, believing someone inside the complainant's apartment was throwing objects at a woman inside. Multiple officers were sent to investigate an "A-priority" domestic violence incident. Upon arrival, the officers could hear an argument happening inside the apartment. When the officers knocked on the door and announced themselves as police, the parties inside the apartment went silent. A short while later, the complainant opened the door naked. Not having enough information at that point to determine if the complainant was the suspect or victim, the officers detained him. The complainant insisted he was alone inside the apartment, even though the reporting party and officers had heard two people arguing. Fearing for the safety of the other party, who could have been the victim, the officers searched the apartment. Broken glass and needles were strewn on the floor, potentially indicating that dangerous objects had been thrown.

The officers initially searched the apartment without finding the other party. The officers reviewed surveillance footage, showing that no one had left the apartment since their arrival. The officers then searched the apartment more extensively and found the other party hiding inside. The officers completed their on-scene investigation, determining that the hidden party was the primary aggressor and that the complainant was the victim.

Officers may enter an apartment without consent or a warrant when an emergency exists, such as an imminent threat to life or property. In this incident, officers had credible evidence supporting their suspicion that a domestic violence incident had occurred. The neighbor reported hearing objects thrown and screaming. The officers heard a second person yelling inside, who became unresponsive. The officers had yet to identify the victim and the primary aggressor, and it was reasonable and proper for the officers to enter the apartment to ensure the safety of the other party. Once both parties were located, the officers

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 02/06/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/25 PAGE# 2 of 2

followed the Department's domestic violence policy, which required them to identify the primary aggressor.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer engaged in unwarranted action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that an officer improperly grabbed his wrist to handcuff him during the domestic violence investigation. Additionally, he was kept in the hallway without any clothing.

The named officer stated that he responded as a backup officer to a domestic violence incident where the caller indicated that items were being thrown at a female inside an apartment. The named officer said that although this location had multiple prior domestic violence incidents, he was not familiar with the complainant. When the complainant answered the door, the officer reasonably suspected that the complainant could be the primary aggressor. The officer handcuffed the complainant pending completion of the on-scene investigation. Another officer quickly obtained pants for the complainant and helped him get dressed in the hallway. The officer asked the complainant if anyone else was inside the apartment. The complainant denied that there was a second person in the apartment.

Officers are required to fully investigate domestic violence incidents and may detain both parties while they make determinations to identify the victim and the primary aggressor.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 02/24/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25 PAGE# 1 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-3: The officers failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant called dispatch to advocate for her client. Her client was protected from her son by a restraining order, but the son was sleeping inside her client's home anyway. The complainant said that the named officers failed to enforce the restraining order violation.

Named officer #1 said he was familiar with the complainant and advised that he was on scene to speak with the complainant's client to determine whether she was a victim of a crime. Named officer #1 confirmed that he talked to the complainant by phone, as she was not on scene. Named officer #1 stated that he advised the complainant that the restraining order had not been served and, therefore, could not be enforced. The complainant asked for the son to be removed for an involuntary mental health detention. The officer explained that the son did not meet the criteria for an involuntary mental health detention. The officer informed the complainant that he would serve the restraining order that day.

Named officer #2 said that he was not familiar with the complainant and did not know her before the investigation. Named officer #2 acknowledged that he spoke with the complainant and explained to her that the restraining order had not been entered in the Department Records as served. He then advised the complainant that he personally served the Restraining Order while on scene.

Named officer #3 stated that he was familiar with the complainant and confirmed speaking with her by telephone. He generally recalled speaking with the complainant about the overall incident as they tried to determine whether a served restraining order existed. Named officer #3 stated that they were unable to find any proof of service for the restraining order in question. They contacted the Identification Bureau and had the relevant documents sent to the local station. The unserved restraining order was then brought to the scene and served upon the client's son.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage corroborated the officers' statements. Footage showed that once the officers determined the Restraining Order had not been served, they had the document sent to the district station and then brought it to the scene to serve it.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 02/24/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25 PAGE# 2 of 3

Department Records indicated that although an order was previously signed, the Restraining Order was not served.

The named officers conducted a proper investigation regarding the alleged violation of the Restraining Order. The Restraining Order was not in effect when the officers arrived because it had not been served. Unserved Restraining Orders cannot be enforced until they are served upon the restrained person. The officers obtained a copy of the Restraining Order and served it on the son so that it could be enforced for future incidents.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that the named officer made inappropriate comments to her in a phone conversation.

The named officer said he spoke with the complainant regarding the Restraining Order and informed her that it had not been served, but he did not recall precisely what he said. He acknowledged that, several times, he explained to the complainant that they could not take people to the hospital against their will if

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 02/24/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25 PAGE# 3 of 3

they did not meet the 5150 criteria. He further said that he told the complainant it would be like kidnapping her client's son if they placed a hold on him, when he didn't fit the 5150 criteria.

BWC captured some of the comments that the complainant alleged.

Department General Order 2.01 mandates that officers shall treat the public with courtesy and respect and not use harsh, profane, or uncivil language.

Based on the evidence, the named officer was professional and acknowledged that he made some of the comments raised in the complaint; however, they did not rise to the level of misconduct.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 03/20/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-3: The officers failed to properly investigate.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant filed an online complaint stating that his father called the police, claiming he had hurt his mother, and his social worker said he had flipped over the table. He stated he did not commit any crimes; however, the officers did not check on his mother's injuries or the condition of the table. The complainant provided an incident date and report number, which indicate a different year for the incident. The complainant refused to participate in the investigation.

Named Officer #1 stated that the father told named officer #3 that his son, the complainant, became upset with his wife, the complainant's mother, while they were at the dining table. The argument started because earlier that morning, the mother had taken the son to the doctor for his mental health condition. Officer #2 said that the mother told him the son threatened to kill her with a cleaver. The mother said the son then went into the kitchen. She was scared and locked herself in her room with her 6-year-old daughter. Named Officer #1 said he does not recall seeing or talking to a social worker at the scene. He also stated he had not reviewed any security camera footage since the incident occurred inside the house.

Named Officer #3 mentioned he does not remember the details of the incident but stated that they assessed the mother's injuries as part of standard procedure.

Department records show that the father, the reporting party, told Dispatch that his son has a mental issue and refuses to take medication. The parents were frightened because their son was upset and threatened to kill them. The son ran into the kitchen to get a knife. The incident report states that the mother wanted the son to take his mental health medications, but he became upset and started kicking her under the table. He then threatened to kill her with a cleaver and went into the kitchen. The report also notes that the son denied harming his mother or any of the allegations made by the parents.

Body-worn camera footage shows Officer #3 taking a statement from the father upon arrival, as he was outside the house. When the mother came out, the officer asked if she was injured and needed medics, and she said no. The footage also captured the son being detained and handcuffed as he was walking out of the house.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 03/20/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25 PAGE# 2 of 2

The evidence collected indicates that officers on scene interviewed the involved parties, obtained their statements, and checked for injuries. The evidence establishes that the alleged conduct occurred; however, it was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #4-6: The officers made an arrest without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated in his online complaint that he was arrested without cause in this case and demanded to be released quickly.

The named officers denied that the complainant was arrested but confirmed that he was placed on a mental health detention since he was a danger to others for threatening to hurt his mother.

Department records indicate that the complainant was detained for a “5150” mental health hold and then transported to a nearby hospital. Other documents show that named officer #2 determined the complainant to be a danger to others because he made threats to hurt his family member.

Body-worn camera footage shows that the officers took the complainant to the hospital on a mental health detention instead of the police station.

The evidence proves that the complainant was not arrested in this incident but was placed on a mental health detention hold for making threats to his family. The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 04/01/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/09/25 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the male officer who arrived on the scene ignored her and did not provide her with services.

Dispatch records indicated that the San Francisco Sheriff's Deputies flagged down San Francisco Police Officers to assist them with detaining the complainant. The deputy explained to SFPD officers that she was investigating the complainant for assaulting a City contractor.

Body-worn camera (BWC) revealed that once the named officers arrived on scene, the deputy explained that she was investigating an assault and considering whether the complainant should be placed under and involuntary mental health detention. The officers stood by as the deputies completed their investigation. The deputies were the primary law enforcement on scene and responsible for the incident resolution and any necessary services.

Department records and body-worn camera footage contradicted the allegation as presented by the complainant.

The evidence proves that the alleged misconduct did not occur.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #: The complaint raises matters not rationally within DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/SFSO - IA

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters not rationally within DPA's jurisdiction.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
Internal Affairs Division
25 Van Ness, Room 350
San Francisco, CA 94102

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 04/01/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer displayed threatening, intimidating, or harassing behavior.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that San Francisco Police officers had been following him and breaking into his car for the past month and a half.

Department Records confirmed that no active cases are assigned to an investigator regarding the complainant. Records did show that two previous cases involved the complainant.

The named officer acknowledged that he was previously assigned to a San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) case that involved the complainant. He did not believe he had spoken directly to the complainant. The named officer stated that he conducted various investigative tasks, which included computer workup as well as DNA analysis of items of evidence. The named officer advised that he was not currently, nor had he previously, performed any surveillance of the complainant in the past. He stated that he had never searched or vandalized the complainant's vehicle.

The investigation revealed no evidence that the SFPD was following, surveilling, or conducting illegal searches of the complainant's car.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur or that the accused officer was not involved.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 04/22/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/07/2025 PAGE# 1 of 7

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-3: The officers failed to properly investigate.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant lodged a complaint against the named officers in response to a call for service he generated about his neighbor at a Shared Occupancy Residency (SRO). The complainant alleged his neighbor attempted to break into the bathroom stall when he was using it and that the neighbor verbally threatened him. The primary responding officers - named officers #1 and #2 - responded to the scene. The complainant alleged that named officers #1 and #2 failed to properly investigate the incident as they never took his formal statement and disregarded pertinent evidence which he believed would have led to an arrest of the neighbor. The complainant requested a higher-ranking member, also respond. Accordingly, named officer #3 responded to the scene. The complainant alleged that named officer #3 similarly disregarded pertinent evidence and failed to properly investigate the incident.

The evidence, including body-worn camera footage (BWC), officer interviews, and incident reports, reflected the following: named officers #1 and #2 recalled responding to the scene. After Dispatch aired the call for service, the officers did not quite understand what was being alleged by the complainant and called the complainant for verification and clarification. The complainant informed them that while he was inside the restroom, a neighbor had shaken the doorknob and screamed at him. The officers responded to the scene for further investigation. They observed the complainant in the lobby, briefly spoke with him, and responded to the neighbor's unit to investigate the incident. The neighbor explained what had occurred. The neighbor implicated the complainant as the initial aggressor in their encounter. He admitted to engaging in a verbal altercation with the complainant but denied attempting to open the bathroom door. Named officers #1 and #2 did not believe that the elements for a crime had been established and responded to the lobby to speak with the complainant to explain his options moving forward. When the complainant realized the officers had not arrested the neighbor, he became irate, preventing them from explaining why they did not arrest the neighbor and outlining his options moving forward. Named officer #1 checked for any independent evidence and spoke with the building manager who advised that he did not witness the incident and that any potential video footage was not readily available.

The complainant became increasingly upset at the officers and requested that a higher-ranking member respond. Named officers #1 and #2 summoned named officer #3. Named officer #3 responded, spoke with

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 04/22/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/07/2025 PAGE# 2 of 7

the responding officers, interviewed the complainant and the neighbor and agreed with the preliminary officers' finding that no crime had been committed. They provided the complainant with resources and a call for service number in the event something else occurred.

The evidence showed that the named officers investigated the incident properly considering the available evidence.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 04/22/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/07/2025 PAGE# 3 of 7

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #4-6: The officers failed to make an arrest.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant also alleged that the officers failed to arrest the neighbor for terrorist threats.

The above facts are incorporated by reference. California Penal Code Section 422 makes it unlawful to communicate a threat of death or great bodily injury to another person that places that person in a reasonable and sustained fear for their safety. The threat, however, must be “willful, serious, specific, clear,” and the person making such threat must have the apparent ability or means to carry it out.

Named officers #1 and #2 explained at length that the evidence did not meet the elements for a violation of Section 422. The named officers explained that both parties implicated each other, and that no independent evidence existed to show who initiated the encounter between the two and whether a crime had occurred. The named officers also emphasized that the complainant changed his account of what had occurred in what they believed was an attempt to have them change their mind and arrest the neighbor. They did not believe what the complainant had initially alleged amounted to a violation of Section 422.

Named officer #3 reviewed the available evidence and determined that a crime had not occurred.

The evidence, such as BWC, supported the officers’ decision not to arrest the neighbor. The BWC also corroborated that it was difficult to determine what precisely the complainant had alleged since he continued to add facts and change his account of what had occurred. Additionally, the officers were within their discretion not to arrest the complainant, particularly when no independent evidence existed and both parties implicated each other.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 04/22/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/07/2025 PAGE# 4 of 7

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #7: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that named officer #2 pointed her fingers aggressively at him and accused him of changing his story about what had occurred.

The above facts are incorporated by reference. Named officer #2 admitted to informing the complainant that he had changed his story several times. However, she did not recall or believe that she pointed her fingers aggressively towards him. Named officer #2 denied behaving inappropriately towards him in any manner and stated that she remained calm and removed herself from the situation when she realized that things between the officers and the complainant were escalating.

BWC of the incident showed named officer #2 advising the complainant that he continued to change his account of what had occurred. However, the footage does not capture named officer #2 behaving in an aggressive manner, pointing her fingers at the complainant aggressively, or otherwise acting inappropriately towards him. The footage corroborated the officer's assertion that when it became apparent that things were escalating and that the officers could not get through to the complainant, they removed themselves from the situation and waited until their superiors responded to the scene.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 04/22/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/07/2025 PAGE# 5 of 7

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #8: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that when he tried to emphasize that the officers should have arrested the neighbor, named officer #1 responded- while clenching her fists- “that is not how this works.”

Named officer #1 admitted to telling the complainant that “that is not how this works,” but denied clenching her fists aggressively or at all towards him. Named officer #1 explained that she was trying to explain to the complainant that just because he said he wanted the male arrested, an arrest had to be based on evidence, but the complainant would not allow her to explain this. Named officer #1 denied behaving inappropriately towards the complainant in any manner.

BWC showed that the named officer made the above-mentioned statement. However, the footage did not support the fact that the officer aggressively clenched her fists or otherwise acted inappropriately towards the complainant. As mentioned above, the officers removed themselves when they realized they could not successfully de-escalate the situation and waited for their superiors to respond.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 04/22/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/07/2025 PAGE# 6 of 7

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #9: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged after they all moved outside of the building, he approached the named officer to take a picture of her badge/star number with his phone. However, he alleged that the named officer aggressively swiped his phone away.

BWC showed that after the officers went outside to create distance until the higher-ranking member arrived, the complainant followed them and yelled at them for a period. The complainant asked the named officer for her star number which she verbally provided several times. Thereafter, the complainant approached holding his phone out to take a picture of her star/badge number. The named officer put her hand out to keep the distance and prevent him from coming any closer and pushed his phone away. The footage did not show whether her hand contacted the phone. The named officer instructed him that he could not walk up on her in that manner for her own safety. The complainant appeared to realize the gravity of what he had done and apologized to the officer.

The named officer explained that when the complainant walked up to her, she was already nearly leaning against her patrol vehicle and had no recourse to back away. She felt intimidated, particularly because of the complainant's irate behavior up to that point and motioned him and his phone away from her out of safety. The named officer could not say with certainty but did not believe she contacted the phone. Additionally, she attested that she did not motion him away to prevent him from obtaining her badge/star number as she had already provided it to him several times.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 04/22/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/07/2025 PAGE# 7 of 7

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #10: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that named officer #4 - another higher-ranking member on-scene - made inappropriate comments about rape. The complainant felt the comments and questions pertaining to rape were inappropriate as the complainant had never alleged rape.

BWC showed that the complainant had in fact brought up the topic of rape and stated he feared he would be raped by the neighbor. The footage did not capture named officer #4 making any inappropriate comments about rape but mentioned it to ensure he was following the narrative provided by the complainant as to what occurred.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/09/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/02/25 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to properly investigate.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the officer failed to collect available surveillance evidence necessary to pursue prosecution in relation to the incident. According to the complainant, both business and residential surveillance footage existed, but the officer never obtained it. The complainant contends that this failure hindered the progress of the case.

The officer clarified that they were not the assigned investigator for the incident. Instead, their role was limited to serving as a video retrieval officer within the General Work Unit, which involved receiving a copy of the case report for video purposes only. The officer stated that the initial report did not come from them, but it was sufficient for identifying potential locations where video surveillance could be sought. After responding to the scene, the officer reviewed the available surveillance camera footage. The camera's angle only captured a fenced walkway leading to the back door of the store and did not record the parking lot where the incident occurred. The officer further noted that no other cameras were found within the parking lot that could have captured the event. The officer stated that they had never had direct communication with the complainant and were neither the investigating officer nor the supervisor. Their involvement was solely focused on attempting to retrieve video evidence.

Department General Order (DGO) 2.01 outlines officers' responsibility to perform their duties with diligence, preserve evidence, and support investigations, while DGO 6.02 provides specific guidance on locating, retrieving, and preserving video surveillance before it is lost or overwritten. Together, these policies emphasize that all members, regardless of their assignment, must make reasonable and good-faith efforts to identify and secure potential video evidence.

DPA sent an ID Poll to the district station. An ID poll describes the incident and asks that the Captain and/or members of the station review the incident description and identify officer(s) that were involved. The ID poll returned a response indicating that a civilian investigator had been assigned to the incident.

The officer was not the assigned investigator and only served as a video retrieval officer. After receiving the case report, the officer reviewed the available surveillance footage. No other cameras were found that could have captured the event. The officer made a good-faith effort consistent with Department General Orders and had no contact with the complainant.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/09/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/02/25 PAGE# 2 of 2

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #: The complaint raises matters not rationally within DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/IAD

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters not rationally within DPA's jurisdiction.

San Francisco Police Department
Internal Affairs Division
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/13/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/02/25 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer drove improperly.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: An anonymous complainant reported online that a patrol vehicle was second in line at a stop sign while waiting to cross the street. After the vehicle in front moved away, the officer accelerated and ran through the stop sign without stopping or letting the complainant cross. The complainant said that driving in such a manner near a daycare and across from a school is negligent, and the officer appeared to act with a sense of entitlement, as if he is above the law. The complainant provided a picture showing the vehicle driving properly on the road, with a visible license plate number.

The named officer stated he does not recall driving through that intersection or being involved in the incident. He mentioned he is unaware of any daycare nearby and said that other schools are a few blocks away. The officer also called the complainant's statement unfounded and claimed it was a personal opinion expressed unilaterally.

The witness officer stated that he was unsure whether he was even in the vehicle. He said that he was unaware of any schools or daycares in that area and noted that the complainant is entitled to his opinion.

There were no Department records documenting the driving or the incident.

The collected evidence does not provide sufficient proof to determine that the named officer drove improperly. The evidence does not confirm or deny that the alleged conduct occurred.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/13/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/25 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers used unnecessary or excessive force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he attended a baseball game and was later removed from the stadium. He said he was complying and did not escape. However, when he got outside the stadium, an officer rushed and tackled him and said he was drunk in public. He was not tackled to the ground, but he said he felt the officer's whole body and arm around him and that his wrist hurt from the incident.

Computer-aided Dispatch (CAD) shows that there was an intoxicated person report at the stadium, and a subject was transported to the station after. Other department documents show that the complainant had a flustered face, watery eyes, drooping eyelids, slurred speech and had a strong alcoholic beverage odor. It says the complainant displayed unruly conduct and was asked to leave by Named Officer #1 because he was unable to care for himself. The complainant was released a few hours after he was being taken into custody.

The witness, a security guard, stated that the complainant was belligerent, cursed at people and was aggressive even towards his own group. He had slurred speech, reeked of alcohol and refused to leave the area even after being told by the officers. Officers on scene escorted him out of the stadium while he kept cussing, however, the complainant turned back after walking out for about 10 feet, pulled up his hands looking like he was starting to fight. The witness said that the stadium has a policy that once a fan gets ejected, they cannot return the same day. Otherwise, it would be considered trespassing. The witness said Named Officer #1 then took him outside, handcuffed him and arrested him.

The stadium security camera footage captured that named officer escorted the complainant down the stairs and through the gate. The complainant walked out of the stadium for a few seconds and started walking back to the stadium entrance, raising his hands and leaning his body forward. Named Officer #1 then pushed the gate open and pushed the complainant away from the entrance.

Body-worn camera footage captured that the complainant was walking back to the stadium entrance and the named officer started pushing the gate open, went outside and pushed the complainant three times

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/13/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/25 PAGE# 2 of 2

until he got to an area about 100 feet away from the stadium. The complainant did not lose his balance or fall onto the ground during the interaction. Named Officer #1 then grabbed the complainant's wrist and turned it towards his back and Named Officer #2 placed the complainant into handcuffs and transported him to the station. The complainant appeared angry and kept leaning his upper body towards the officer and exhibited slurred speech. Named Officer #1 told him that he was under arrest for public intoxication.

Department General Order 5.01 (Use of Force) and Section 5.01.05 (Levels of Resistance) state that if a subject is compliant, then the possible force option is handcuffing and control holds. If a subject is actively resisting or even assaultive, then officers are justified to use their personal body weapons to gain advantage over the subject.

In this case, the complainant showed aggressive and assaultive behavior while being drunk in public by walking back towards the officers, raising his hands up in the air and leaning his body forward, it was justified for the officers to use their personal body weapon to push the complainant away and eventually place him in handcuffs to prevent further resistive or assaultive behavior from the complainant.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/15/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/02/25

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer drove a City vehicle in a grossly negligent or reckless manner.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The anonymous complainant was driving when an SUV turned onto the street that they were moving on. The vehicle behind the complainant then activated its red lights and passed the complainant's car, raising concerns about pedestrian safety. The complainant recognized the SUV as one used by the mayor's security detail.

The named officer, who was assigned to the Mayor's Security Detail, confirmed he was driving the mayor's vehicle. The officer operated an unmarked black SUV and activated the red emergency lights during the incident. The mayor had departed on a bicycle, and the officer performed a three-point turn to follow him. The officer observed a vehicle approaching at a concerning speed and later passed a civilian car with red lights activated. The officer stated his actions were necessary to protect the mayor and did not endanger others.

Body-worn camera footage was unavailable as members assigned to work Dignitary Protection or the Mayor's Detail are exempt from wearing body-worn cameras.

San Francisco Police Department General Order 5.05, Emergency Response and Pursuit Driving, requires that officers operating emergency vehicles do so with due regard for the safety of all persons. It mandates balancing the necessity of immediate protective action against the risks posed to other motorists, pedestrians, and officers. The order further specifies that emergency lights may only be activated in circumstances that justify such use under law and policy.

While the complainant raised safety concerns, there is insufficient evidence to determine whether the officer violated departmental policy regarding the manner in which they drove a city vehicle. The officer credibly explained that he assessed traffic, observed no pedestrians, and acted with urgency to protect the mayor. Without supporting evidence, the DPA could not prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/15/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25

PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers failed to properly investigate.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant reported an assault outside a nightclub. Officers responded, took statements from the complainant and a witness, and captured the exchange on body-worn camera. Medics transported the complainant by ambulance. Police arrested the suspect for battery and public intoxication. Officials later advised the complainant that no charges would proceed due to conflicting accounts. Investigators did not collect surveillance footage, and the incident report omitted the witness's account (the witness later submitted a supplemental statement in person).

Named Officer #1 authored the incident report and confirmed that he included all pertinent information. He interviewed a friend of the complainant but determined she was intoxicated, had not witnessed the incident, and repeated details from the complainant; he excluded her statement. Named Officer #1 noted familiarity with surveillance cameras at the nightclub and based on prior experience, concluded they were inoperable and would not have captured the incident. He did not attempt to retrieve footage. He established probable cause for arrest based on the complainant's statement, observed injury, and the suspect's intoxication. Named Officer #2 remained with the suspect during the investigation and did not conduct interviews, identify witnesses, or seek surveillance. The officer did not author the report and did not document statements or investigative findings.

Department records were reviewed and showed that officers dispatched to an A-Priority call for assault and battery at a nightclub. Officers responded and located the suspect, who matched the complainant's description. The complainant identified the suspect as the person who struck her. Named Officer #1 observed redness and swelling to the complainant's left eye and documented the injury with photographs. Medics transported the complainant to the hospital. The suspect displayed signs of intoxication, including slurred speech and an unsteady gait. A supervising sergeant approved the arrest, and officers transported the suspect to the county jail for booking. Additionally, the witness provided a written statement at a district station, at a later time, certifying that she saw the suspect strike the complainant. The case file also included photographs taken by Named Officer #1 at the scene.

Department General Orders 1.03, Rule 9, in its relevant part, states that officers must submit reports that are accurate, factual, materially complete, and timely. DGO 2.01 Rule 16 states that members shall ensure a thorough and complete investigation is conducted. DGO 5.01 requires officers to make reasonable

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/15/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25 PAGE# 2 of 2

efforts to identify and interview witnesses, collect available evidence, and document investigative steps to ensure a complete case file.

Named Officer #1 exercised judgment and diligence in evaluating the reliability of witnesses and determined that the friend was intoxicated, had not directly observed the incident, and was repeating details provided by the complainant. The officer also relied on his prior experience that the cameras were either inoperable or limited to an area that would not have captured the incident. His rationale was based on professional knowledge of the district and prior investigative attempts, which fall within the discretion granted to officers under department policy.

Based on the totality of the evidence, the investigation was conducted in accordance with departmental standards. Therefore, the evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/16/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers detained a person without reasonable suspicion.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officers detained him without cause.

The named officers stated that the complainant was detained because they believed he was wanted on a warrant. The named officers had checked mugshots and believed the complainant matched the picture of the person they were looking for.

Police records and body-worn camera footage showed that the complainant was detained because the officers believed he was a wanted male. The named officer checked a mugshot and believed they had found the wanted person. The complainant provided identification, which the named officer checked on police systems. Through comparing information, the officers realized they had stopped the wrong person. Officers issued a release form and let the complainant go.

The evidence tends to indicate that the officers mistakenly identified the complainant, who had similar features to the wanted male. The officers had reasonable suspicion to believe the complainant was the wanted male. They briefly detained him to investigate and then released them.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/16/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25 PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officers were rough with him and refused to answer his questions.

The named officers stated that they stopped the complainant because they believed he was a wanted male. The named officers stated they were professional during their interaction with the complainant.

Body camera footage showed the named officer approaching the complainant and telling him he was being detained. The complainant reacted in disbelief and tried to move away from the officers. The complainant was resistant to being handcuffed. The footage showed the named officers used the minimum amount of force to handcuff the complainant. The footage also showed that the complainant repeatedly asked the officers to state the name of the person they believed the complainant was. The named officer did not provide the name but checked the complainant's ID before letting him go. The footage showed that the complainant bore some resemblance to the wanted person.

There was no indication that the officers were rough with the complainant. There is also no requirement for officers to provide the name of the person they are looking for. The officers conducted a professional stop and were polite to the complainant throughout.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25

PAGE# 1 of 13

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers used unnecessary or excessive force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was pulled over by named officer #1 and his partner and immediately instructed to roll down all four windows. He said he complied as much as he could but expressed concern about reaching around inside the vehicle in the dark. He informed the officers that his windows worked but expressed a hypothetical concern that if they had been manual or broken, he would not have been able to comply. The complainant stated he repeatedly requested to speak with a supervisor but received no response. He partially rolled down his windows and removed his keys as instructed. When ordered to hand over his keys, he refused, stating he had no intention of fleeing and would cooperate if allowed to exit the vehicle voluntarily. Instead, he alleged that the officers forcibly removed him from the car and slammed him face-first onto the pavement, resulting in a scratch near his eye.

Additionally, the complainant stated that named officer #2 escorted him to the sidewalk and instructed him to sit down. While in handcuffs, the complainant stated that named officer #2 performed a leg sweep, intentionally causing him to fall backward. As a result of the fall, the handcuff cut into his wrist.

Named Officer #1 stated that he observed the complainant's vehicle, which displayed registration tags that had expired 13 months earlier. As he and his partner approached the car, he noted that the interior was cluttered, making visibility inside difficult. According to named officer #1, his partner repeatedly instructed the complainant to roll down his windows, but the complainant refused. He explained that the lawful order was issued due to concerns for officer safety, citing the time of night, the high-crime area, the vehicle's rear-tinted windows, and the complainant's non-compliance. Named Officer #1 stated that the complainant was then asked to exit the car as a de-escalation tactic, but he again refused, lowering his window only partially. Named Officer #1 advised the complainant to turn off the vehicle and place the keys out of reach to prevent the possibility of flight. Although the complainant initially placed the keys on the dashboard (within reach), he retrieved them before named officer #1's partner could secure them. Due to the complainant's continued non-compliance, named officer #1 stated that he and his partner took hold of the complainant's wrists and removed him from the vehicle. He denied using excessive force and did not characterize the removal as a takedown. He stated the complainant was guided to the ground and did not complain of any pain or injury. Named Officer #1 then called for backup, and assisting officers escorted the complainant to the sidewalk.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25

PAGE# 2 of 13

Named Officer #1's partner is no longer with the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) and, therefore, could not be interviewed.

Named Officer #2 stated that other officers initiated a traffic stop involving the complainant, who did not comply with repeated commands to exit his vehicle. After the complainant was removed and placed in handcuffs, named officer #2 reported escorting him to the sidewalk. Named Officer #2 stated that he issued the complainant a lawful order to sit down approximately seven times, but the complainant refused to comply. He reported attempting a leg sweep to seat the complainant, but the complainant tensed and actively resisted. According to named officer #2, another officer provided support on the opposite side while he used his hands to move the complainant's leg to guide him into a seated position. He stated he did not hear the complainant complain of any pain or injury and was not otherwise made aware of any. Named Officer #2 indicated that his actions followed Department General Order 5.01 and denied using excessive force.

Department records indicate that officers initiated a traffic stop on the complainant due to his vehicle registration being expired for 13 months. Officers issued multiple commands for the complainant to roll down the windows, as visibility into the vehicle was obstructed by excessive clutter and window tinting. Following a period of non-compliance and due to the complainant's odd behavior, officers ordered the complainant to remove his keys from the ignition and hand them over, but he refused. He was then ordered out of the vehicle but again failed to comply. Officers subsequently physically removed the complainant from the car and guided him to the ground. He was then escorted to the sidewalk. His vehicle was towed, and the complainant was issued a citation for expired registration and resisting arrest. There were no reported injuries or complaints of pain resulting from the officers' actions during the detention. The complainant did express discomfort related to the handcuffs and being seated on the sidewalk.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage showed named officer #1 and his partner repeatedly instructing the complainant to roll down his windows due to limited visibility inside the vehicle. The complainant responded that there was no reason to comply. Officers then directed him multiple times to turn off the car and exit, explaining they only wanted to speak with him. The complainant requested a supervisor but was informed he needed to exit the vehicle first. Officers then told him that if he rolled down the windows, he could remain in the car. They continued issuing commands, citing concerns for officer safety due to the tinted windows. Named Officer #1 and his partner remained patient and suggested he roll the windows down partially. The complainant eventually complied.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25

PAGE# 3 of 13

Upon approaching the vehicle, the officers instructed the complainant several times to hand over his keys. He initially placed them on the dashboard but retrieved them when named officer #1's partner attempted to grab them. The complainant was again ordered to exit the vehicle and refused. Named Officer #1 and

his partner tried to detain the complainant by grabbing his wrists, but he resisted by tensing his arms and pulling them inward. Despite repeated commands to exit, the complainant remained noncompliant. The officers took hold of his wrists, forcibly removed him from the vehicle, and brought him to the ground. The extrication did not appear excessive, and the complainant was not slammed. He continued to resist handcuffing, requiring assistance from additional officers. At no point did the complainant report pain or injury. BWC footage also showed named officer #1 reporting to a supervising sergeant that when the complainant was removed from the vehicle, it was done very gently, and not in a takedown manner.

After being handcuffed, the complainant was escorted to the sidewalk by named officer #2, who instructed him multiple times to sit. The complainant refused, prompting named officer #2 to bend the complainant's leg to guide him into a seated position. The complainant did not express any pain or injury to named officer #2.

California Vehicle Code section 4000(a)(1) states in relevant part that vehicles shall not be on a public highway unless it is properly registered.

Department General Order 5.03.03(D) (Investigative Detentions) states in the relevant part that officers may detain an individual whenever there is any violation of law.

Department General Order 5.01 states in the relevant part that "Officers may use objectively reasonable force options in the performance of their duties . . . to effect a lawful detention." In addition, it states, "Officers shall strive to use the minimum amount of force necessary to accomplish their lawful purpose."

The complainant was lawfully detained for operating a vehicle with expired registration tags, a violation of the California Vehicle Code. Despite receiving multiple lawful commands, the complainant failed to comply with lawful orders, prompting the named officers to use the minimum amount of force necessary to gain compliance. The officers' actions were consistent with Department policy and were appropriate under the circumstances.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/22/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25 PAGE# 4 of 13

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer used unnecessary or excessive force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officer used excessive force when he was forcefully removed from his vehicle, causing a scratch near his eye.

The named officer is no longer with the San Francisco Police Department and is not subject to discipline.

No findings are made if the officer cannot reasonably be identified or the officer has left the Department and is therefore no longer subject to discipline.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that after informing the named officer of his intention to file a complaint, the named officer responded by saying he was the subject of a similar case and had prevailed.

The named officer stated he did not act in an unprofessional manner or speak inappropriately. He recalled educating the complainant regarding the actions of the police.

Department records indicate that officers initiated a traffic stop on the complainant due to his vehicle registration being expired for 13 months. Officers issued multiple commands for the complainant to roll down the windows, as visibility into the vehicle was obstructed by excessive clutter and window tinting. Following a period of non-compliance and due to the complainant's odd behavior, officers ordered the complainant to remove his keys from the ignition and hand them over, but he refused. He was then ordered out of the vehicle but again failed to comply. Officers subsequently physically removed the

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25

PAGE# 5 of 13

complainant from the car and guided him to the ground. He was then escorted to the sidewalk. His vehicle was towed, and the complainant was issued a citation for expired registration and resisting arrest. There were no reported injuries or complaints of pain resulting from the officers' actions during the detention. The complainant did express discomfort related to the handcuffs and being seated on the sidewalk.

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officer counseling the complainant on the importance of complying with lawful orders. The officer also mentioned a recent, similar incident in which a complaint was filed against him, and he was exonerated.

Department General Order 2.01 states in relevant part that officers shall treat members of the public with courtesy and respect.

The named officer did not violate Department policy by informing the complainant of the obligation to comply with lawful orders. He referenced a prior, similar incident in which his conduct was reviewed and found appropriate. At no point did the named officer behave in an unprofessional manner.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer failed to provide his or her name or star number.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: IC/S

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officer refused to provide him with his name after making multiple requests.

The named officer stated he did not act with malicious intent when he failed to provide his name to the complainant. He said different reasons why he did not do so; however, he ultimately admitted that he violated Department General Order 2.01 and should have provided his name and star number upon request.

Body-worn camera footage captured the complainant repeatedly asking the named officer for his name; however, the officer did not respond and failed to provide it.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/22/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25 PAGE# 6 of 13

Department General Order 2.01 states in relevant part that officers shall provide their name and star number upon request.

The named officer admitted that he violated Department General Order 2.01 by failing to provide the complainant with his name upon request.

A preponderance of the evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred and that the conduct violated Department policy or procedure.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6: The officer issued a citation without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer issued him a citation for resisting arrest without cause.

The named officer is no longer with the San Francisco Police Department and is not subject to discipline.

No findings are made if the officer cannot reasonably be identified or the officer has left the Department and is therefore no longer subject to discipline.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #7: The officer towed a vehicle without justification.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25

PAGE# 7 of 13

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that his vehicle was towed without legal justification.

The named officer stated that the complainant's vehicle registration had expired for 13 months at the time of the tow. He noted that the vehicle was lawfully towed pursuant to California Vehicle Code section 22651(o), which authorizes the removal of vehicles with registration expired for more than six months.

Department records show that the complainant's vehicle's registration had expired for 13 months.

Body-worn camera footage showed the complainant admitting that his vehicle's registration had expired.

California Vehicle Code section 4000(a)(1) states in relevant part that vehicles shall not be on a public highway unless it is properly registered.

California Vehicle Code section 22651(o) authorizes officers to tow a vehicle if its registration is more than six months past due.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #8: The officer failed to comply with the Department's Stop Data Collection requirement.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The Department of Police Accountability discovered through its investigation that the named officer failed to record Stop Data as required.

The named officer is no longer with the San Francisco Police Department and is not subject to discipline.

No findings are made if the officer cannot reasonably be identified or the officer has left the Department and is therefore no longer subject to discipline.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25

PAGE# 8 of 13

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #9: The officer failed to provide medical treatment.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: IC/S

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was injured after an officer performed a leg sweep, causing him to fall to the ground while handcuffed. He stated that he had asked the named officer to call an ambulance, but she failed to do so.

The named officer stated that the complainant informed her that the handcuffs were uncomfortable. While she was speaking with him, a senior sergeant in charge of the scene arrived. As she needed to leave, she advised the complainant to continue the conversation with the sergeant. She further stated that she did not violate Department General Order 5.01, as the complainant's complaint of pain was not reportable, and she instructed the complainant to speak with the supervising sergeant.

Witness officers involved in the use of force stated that they were never made aware that the complainant complained of any pain or injury.

Department records indicate that officers initiated a traffic stop on the complainant due to his vehicle registration being expired for 13 months. Officers issued multiple commands for the complainant to roll down the windows, as visibility into the vehicle was obstructed by excessive clutter and window tinting. Following a period of non-compliance and due to the complainant's odd behavior, officers ordered the complainant to remove his keys from the ignition and hand them over, but he refused. He was then ordered out of the vehicle but again failed to comply. Officers subsequently physically removed the complainant from the car and guided him to the ground. He was then escorted to the sidewalk. His vehicle was towed, and the complainant was issued a citation for expired registration and resisting arrest. There were no reported injuries or complaints of pain resulting from the officers' actions during the detention. The complainant did express discomfort related to the handcuffs and being seated on the sidewalk.

Body-worn camera footage showed the complainant seated on the sidewalk, flanked by officers. The named officer asked if he was injured, to which he responded affirmatively, stating the injury was "where the cuffs are." The named officer sought clarification, asking if the discomfort was solely from the handcuffs. The complainant replied, "Because they slammed on me, slammed me to the floor." The named officer again asked, "From the cuffs?" and the complainant responded, "Yes, from the cuffs." She then asked if he needed an ambulance, and he replied, "Maybe." When she asked again, "So it's just from

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25

PAGE# 9 of 13

the cuffs?” the complainant clarified, “No, but this is from you guys, from getting dropped on the floor.” As the named officer walked away, she pointed to a supervising sergeant who had just arrived and told the complainant, “This guy’s in charge.” However, she did not inform the supervising sergeant of the complainant’s injury complaint, nor did she instruct the complainant to relay that information. At no point did the complainant mention any pain or injury to the supervising sergeant. After leaving the complainant, the named officer approached the primary officers involved in removing him from the vehicle and informed them that the complainant reported pain from the handcuffs. Later, when another sergeant inquired whether force had been used, the named officer responded that the complainant’s wrist hurt from the cuffs and reiterated that she had told the complainant the supervising sergeant was now in charge. The footage does not show the named officer reporting a reportable use of force, nor is it documented in the incident report; instead, she only communicated to other officers that the complainant’s pain or injury was related to the handcuffs.

A photograph of the complainant’s wrist showed a slight laceration, consistent with where handcuffs were placed.

Department General Order 5.01 states in relevant part, “Any subject who has been injured, complains of an injury in the presence of officers, or complains of pain that persists beyond the use of the physical control hold shall be medically assessed by emergency medical personnel.”

Evidence shows that the complainant informed the named officer multiple times that he was injured from being slammed on the ground while in handcuffs. The complainant reported to her that he was injured. Under Department General Order 5.01, this level of force is classified as reportable, which requires the complainant to receive a medical assessment; however, this did not occur in this case.

A preponderance of the evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred and that the conduct violated Department policy or procedure.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #10: The officer failed to report use of force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: IC/S

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25

PAGE# 10 of 13

FINDINGS OF FACT: During its investigation, the Department of Police Accountability discovered that the named officer, a supervising sergeant, was informed by the complainant that he was injured due to an officer using force by slamming him into the ground while handcuffed.

The named officer stated that the complainant informed her that the handcuffs were uncomfortable. While she was speaking with him, a senior sergeant in charge of the scene arrived. As she needed to leave, she advised the complainant to continue the conversation with the sergeant. She further stated that she did not violate Department General Order 5.01, as the complainant's complaint of pain was not reportable, and she instructed the complainant to speak with the supervising sergeant.

Witness officers involved in the use of force stated that they were never made aware that the complainant complained of any pain or injury.

Department records indicate that officers initiated a traffic stop on the complainant due to his vehicle registration being expired for 13 months. Officers issued multiple commands for the complainant to roll down the windows, as visibility into the vehicle was obstructed by excessive clutter and window tinting. Following a period of non-compliance and due to the complainant's odd behavior, officers ordered the complainant to remove his keys from the ignition and hand them over, but he refused. He was then ordered out of the vehicle but again failed to comply. Officers subsequently physically removed the complainant from the car and guided him to the ground. He was then escorted to the sidewalk. His vehicle was towed, and the complainant was issued a citation for expired registration and resisting arrest. There were no reported injuries or complaints of pain resulting from the officers' actions during the detention. The complainant did express discomfort related to the handcuffs and being seated on the sidewalk.

Body-worn camera footage showed the complainant seated on the sidewalk, flanked by officers. The named officer asked if he was injured, to which he responded affirmatively, stating the injury was "where the cuffs are." The named officer sought clarification, asking if the discomfort was solely from the handcuffs. The complainant replied, "Because they slammed on me, slammed me to the floor." The named officer again asked, "From the cuffs?" and the complainant responded, "Yes, from the cuffs." She then asked if he needed an ambulance, and he replied, "Maybe." When she asked again, "So it's just from the cuffs?" the complainant clarified, "No, but this is from you guys, from getting dropped on the floor." As the named officer walked away, she pointed to a supervising sergeant who had just arrived and told the complainant, "This guy's in charge." However, she did not inform the supervising sergeant of the complainant's injury complaint, nor did she instruct the complainant to relay that information. At no point did the complainant mention any pain or injury to the supervising sergeant. After leaving the complainant, the named officer approached the primary officers involved in removing him from the vehicle and informed them that the complainant reported pain from the handcuffs. Later, when another sergeant

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/22/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25 PAGE# 11 of 13

inquired whether force had been used, the named officer responded that the complainant's wrist hurt from the cuffs and reiterated that she had told the complainant the supervising sergeant was now in charge. The footage does not show the named officer reporting a reportable use of force, nor is it documented in the incident report; instead, she only communicated to other officers that the complainant's pain or injury was related to the handcuffs.

A photograph of the complainant's wrist showed a slight laceration, consistent with where handcuffs were placed.

Department General Order 5.01.07 states in relevant part that the use of force is reportable if there is "[f]orce that (1) resulted in a physical injury; or (2) the subject reports physical pain or injury."

Evidence shows that the complainant informed the Named Officer multiple times that he sustained an injury from being taken to the ground while handcuffed. Under Department General Order 5.01, this level of force is classified as reportable; however, this did not occur in this case.

A preponderance of the evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred and that the conduct violated Department policy or procedure.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #11: The officer failed to report use of force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: IE

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25

PAGE# 12 of 13

FINDINGS OF FACT: During its investigation, the Department of Police Accountability discovered that the named officer, a supervising sergeant, may have been informed by the complainant that he was injured.

The named officer stated that the complainant did not report any injuries but mentioned that the handcuffs felt tight on his wrists. She confirmed that she had checked the handcuffs to ensure they were double-locked with the proper degree of tightness, and informed the complainant that handcuffs are not designed for comfort. After removing the handcuffs, she observed no visible injuries and offered the complainant a band-aid to address his concerns.

Witness officers involved in the use of force stated that they were never made aware that the complainant complained of any pain or injury.

Department records indicate that officers initiated a traffic stop on the complainant due to his vehicle registration being expired for 13 months. Officers issued multiple commands for the complainant to roll down the windows, as visibility into the vehicle was obstructed by excessive clutter and window tinting. Following a period of non-compliance and due to the complainant's odd behavior, officers ordered the complainant to remove his keys from the ignition and hand them over, but he refused. He was then ordered out of the vehicle but again failed to comply. Officers subsequently physically removed the complainant from the car and guided him to the ground. He was then escorted to the sidewalk. His vehicle was towed, and the complainant was issued a citation for expired registration and resisting arrest. There were no reported injuries or complaints of pain resulting from the officers' actions during the detention. The complainant did express discomfort related to the handcuffs and being seated on the sidewalk.

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officer ask another sergeant if there was use of force (reportable). The other sergeant reported that the complainant stated his wrist hurt from the handcuffs. At the conclusion of the incident, as the named officer was removing the complainant's handcuffs, the complainant pointed to his wrist and informed her that it hurt, to which she responded that they (handcuffs) were not intended to be comfortable. The complainant's response was mostly inaudible, except for a brief comment regarding sitting down. He then showed the named officer his wrist, and she asked him if he wanted a band-aid, which she provided.

A photograph of the complainant's wrist showed a slight laceration, consistent with where handcuffs were placed.

Department General Order 5.01.07 states in relevant part that the use of force is reportable if there is "[f]orce that (1) resulted in a physical injury; or (2) the subject reports physical pain or injury."

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25

PAGE# 13 of 13

Based on the evidence, it is unclear whether the named officer observed any injury to the complainant's wrist that prompted her to offer him a band-aid. Additionally, it remains uncertain whether the named officer recognized that the complainant was experiencing pain persisting beyond the physical control associated with handcuffing, which would have required her to report the use of force.

The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/27/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/02/25

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant submitted an anonymous online report stating that a large fight broke out in a nightclub and that the police did not intervene. The complainant provided a Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) number for the incident but declined to be interviewed.

The DPA used the CAD number and other information from the complainant to locate the incident and confirmed with the San Francisco Police Department's Legal Team that no incident report documented the event. The CAD indicated that the reporting party (RP) was punched inside the club, kicked out by security, and called the police. Later, the police unit reported to Dispatch that they had met with RP, who did not wish to press charges against the suspect. No further police action was requested.

Body-worn camera footage showed that Officer #1 spoke with a woman claiming someone had punched her in the club. The officer explained that it would be considered misdemeanor battery, and he could issue a citation; however, she would need to appear in court because the incident did not occur in his presence. It required a citizen's arrest. The officer also asked if she needed medical attention; she declined. Later, she stated that she wanted to press charges but did not wish to go to court. The officer then said that meant she could not press charges. The woman laughed, high-fived the officer, and thanked him for coming out.

The evidence shows that, although an assault may have occurred in the club, since it was not in the officer's presence, the reporting party would need to sign a citizen's arrest to press charges. However, she refused to go to court and did not sign a citizen's arrest, so the officer could not proceed with an arrest. The evidence confirms the alleged conduct occurred, but it was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/09/25

PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The named officer served as the lead investigator in a case involving the complainant and her partner. The complainant, a respected community member, alleged that the officer made disparaging remarks about her partner, which she perceived as harassment. She believes the officer's behavior was an attempt to convince her that she was a victim of human trafficking perpetrated by her partner and to pressure her into testifying in court. The complainant denies being a victim of any crime and questions the appropriateness of the officer's conduct.

The officer denied the complainant's allegation. He stated that, based on his investigation, he believed the complainant was a victim of crimes committed by her partner. He explained this belief was the reason both the complainant and her partner were detained together. During their initial interaction, the complainant denied being a victim and declined to cooperate with the investigation. The officer provided her with his contact information in case she later chose to cooperate or needed assistance. According to the officer, the complainant subsequently contacted him twice regarding an impounded vehicle that was seized as evidence for being used in the commission of a crime. As a professional courtesy, he facilitated the release of the vehicle by waiving all associated fees to help her retrieve the vehicle. The officer reported that, following those interactions, he has not initiated any further contact with the complainant and denied ever asking her to testify in court.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) conducted a review of relevant records, including incident reports, computer-aided dispatch (CAD) logs, and other computer-based research. This review corroborated the existence of evidence indicating illegal activity. Some of that activity occurred within the seized vehicle. Thus, the tow and seizure of the complainant's vehicle was lawful.

Department policy requires that all members adhere to the principles of Procedural Justice. These principles include giving members of the community a voice (opportunity to speak), ensuring fair and impartial treatment, respect, and providing a trustworthy process. (Department General Order 2.01.03.8 -- Public Courtesy). Members must also perform their duties promptly and according to Department policies and procedures. Members must also perform their duties promptly and in accordance with all written orders, policies, procedures, and lawful directives. (Department General Order 2.01.03.5 -- Performing Duties). The Department further emphasizes that while enforcement is a critical tool, some individuals

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/09/25

PAGE# 2 of 2

encountered during investigations may be acting against their will. The Department's primary goal in such circumstances is to identify potential victims of human trafficking and connect them with the appropriate support services. Officers are required by law to use due diligence in identifying these individuals, which includes asking questions such, "Are you a victim of human trafficking?" (Department Notice 24-108 -- Identification of Human Trafficking Victims)

The DPA's inquiry determined that the officer identified the complainant as a potential victim based on evidence gathered during his investigation. While the complainant perceived the interaction as harassment, the officer's actions were found to be consistent with Departmental policy and procedures related to the identification and support of potential trafficking victims. As part of his effort to support the complainant, the officer also extended professional courtesy by waiving fees to assist her in retrieving an impounded vehicle. Therefore, the conduct alleged by the complainant did occur; however, it was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: This complaint raises matters outside of the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/SFDA

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

The Office of the San Francisco District Attorney
Attn: Hall of Justice - Administration
850 Bryant Street, Room #322
San Francisco, CA 94103

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/29/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/30/25

PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that she has a restraining order against her sister. The complainant went to her mother's house, and the sister was present. The complainant left and on a separate occasion went back to her mother's house for a pre-arranged meeting. Her mother did not open the door, so the complainant called the police to check on her mother's welfare. The complainant stated that the named officer told her she would arrest her for approaching her mother's house.

The named officer stated that she informed the complainant that if there was a restraining order and she was the restrained party then the complainant would be arrested for violating the order. The named officer also stated she had not seen the restraining order and did not know what it said.

Department documents showed that officers were called by the complainant for a welfare check on her mother who had not answered her door.

Body camera footage was available for this incident, but recording began after the named officer's initial phone call with the complainant, so any mention of arrest is not captured. The footage does show the named officer speaking abruptly to the complainant and accusing her of playing games. The footage also showed that the named officer is confused about the content of the restraining order.

The allegation is about a conversation that is not recorded and has no independent witnesses. Due to this it is not possible to determine what was actually said.

The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/29/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/30/25

PAGE# 2 of 2

FINDING: IO-1/DEM

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was partially forwarded to:

DEM Division of Emergency Communication
1011 Turk Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/02/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/24/25

PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1-3: The officers behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that during an interaction with police, the named officers spoke inappropriately. Specifically, the complainant said that Named Officers #1 and #2 commented on the fact that the complainant was filming the incident, which the officers said could be seen as antagonization. Also, the officer noted that the complainant should try to keep calm next time. The complainant also mentioned that Named Officer #3 was discussing a 20-year-old and how that person was a full-grown man. The complaint said all these comments were inappropriate.

Body-worn camera footage showed that none of the officers made the comments described by the complainant. The footage showed that the officers were professional throughout their interaction with the complainant.

The comments described by the complainant are not inappropriate and therefore are not subject to potential discipline. However, the video footage showed that the officers never made these comments.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/02/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/24/25

PAGE# 2 of 2

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that the named officer did not put a seat belt on the complainant when he was transported in a patrol vehicle.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the Named Officer did put a seat belt on the complainant.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/02/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/21/25 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer displayed threatening, intimidating, or harassing behavior.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer looked at him. The complainant took this as an attempt to intimidate him.

The named officer stated that he has known the complainant for more than 25 years in his capacity as a San Francisco Police Officer.

The named officer acknowledged that he did observe and briefly interact with the complainant. He said that he tried to approach the complainant constructively and thought it was an opportunity to see if things had changed. The named officer said the complainant was immediately hostile and defensive throughout the conversation.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) did not find any evidence that the named officer made any comments or displayed threatening, intimidating, or harassing behavior as presented by the complainant. Overall, this was a casual encounter that did not rise to the level of misconduct.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/02/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: At a large community event, the complainant was involved in an altercation with a person he knew had a violent history. The complainant told a nearby officer that the individual was previously deported. The officer told the complainant that he could not remove the violent individual because San Francisco is a Sanctuary City.

Department records and body-worn camera footage showed that the complainant was detained for public intoxication. Officers handcuffed the complainant after he engaged in an altercation with another individual. The complainant appeared heavily intoxicated and reported to officers that the other party was a “deportee.” The named officer informed the complainant that San Francisco is a Sanctuary City and, therefore, he is unable to take action. BWC showed the named officer acted professionally when he communicated with the complainant.

The evidence showed that the officer acted appropriately and informed the complainant of City policy.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/02/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25

PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officer did not take action against the individual with whom he had an altercation. He said the individual was a “deportee.”

Department records showed that the complainant was detained for public intoxication.

Body-worn camera (BWC) showed officers handcuffing the complainant after he engaged in an altercation with another individual. The complainant appeared heavily intoxicated and reported to officers that the other party was a “deportee.” The named officer informed the complainant that San Francisco is a Sanctuary City and, therefore, he is unable to take action. BWC showed the named officer acted professionally when he communicated with the complainant.

San Francisco Administrative Code states that San Francisco is a Sanctuary City where city employees, including San Francisco Police Officers, are generally prohibited from using resources to assist immigration authorities.

In February 2025, the Board of Supervisors passed Resolution No. 33-25, reaffirming San Francisco’s commitment to the Sanctuary Ordinance. It emphasizes the city's refusal to assist in federal immigration enforcement and highlights the ordinance’s role in promoting public trust and safety.

The named officer acted in accordance with City policy by not taking action against the other party based on their immigration status.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/11/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25

PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer used unnecessary or excessive force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officer pushed him away from a doorway without warning.

SFPD documents containing an account of the incident at the time it occurred stated that the complainant was told to move and was then pushed back away from the doorway.

Video footage provided by the complainant shows the complainant trying to move past an officer to access a secure area guarded by police officers. The officer tells the complainant he is not allowed to enter. The complainant steps closer to the doorway, which is slightly ajar. The officer then calls out into the secure room for assistance. The named officer responded from within the secure room by stepping into the doorway to prevent the complainant from pushing past the officer in the doorway. The named officer tells the complainant to move and then uses a hand to push the complainant away from the door.

DGO 5.01 Use of Force Policy states that officers can use force to gain compliance with a lawful order. The named officer was protecting an area. The complainant was told he could not enter and was told to move. The complainant failed to comply, and the named officer used a light push to move the complainant away from the doorway. The force was proportional to the complainant's resistance of a lawful order.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/11/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25

PAGE# 2 of 2

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer spoke inappropriately to him by denying him access to see a government office and that the officer told him he would be getting a restraining order.

SFPD documents showed the named officer removed the complainant from outside a secure government office after he was told he could not enter.

Video footage provided by the complainant shows an officer telling the complainant he cannot enter the government office. The named officer then tells the complainant to move from the doorway. The named officer explains that the complainant is not allowed in due to his past behavior and that a restraining order would be coming his way.

Nothing said by the named officer rose to the level of misconduct.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/12/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/22/2025

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant had on-going issues with a neighbor in a shared occupancy residency (SRO). On the date in question, he stated that the neighbor threatened his life because the complainant's friend was occupying a plug for his wheelchair. The complainant and his friend thereafter called the police from the lobby phone. The complainant alleged that roughly three hours later, the police conducted a call-back to the lobby phone which went unanswered. The complainant felt the officers should have gone into the lobby and spoken with him.

DPA obtained several calls for services regarding the incident. The Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) reports from the incident showed that the complainant had called the police alleging that his neighbor had threatened to kill him. However, the CAD report also noted that the incident was not present or on-going but occurred roughly 25 minutes prior to the call for service. Dispatch had therefore downgraded the priority response of the call. The CADs showed that over the course of a two-day period, several officers had unsuccessfully attempted to respond to the incident and speak with the complainant. For instance, named officer #1- the initial responding officer- explained that dispatch had informed him that the complainant would be waiting outside for an officer. However, when he arrived on-scene he did not observe anyone waiting outside for him. He had dispatched a call-back to the only number provided- the front lobby- but was unable to get through to the complainant. The named officer did not recall whether he entered the lobby on said date but believed he made necessary attempts to try and contact the complainant.

The named officer emphasized that had the complainant been waiting outside or otherwise answered the phone, he would have conducted a full investigation into the matter.

DPA understands that the complainant was frustrated that the named officer did not come into the lobby, however, in these circumstances the named officer made reasonable attempts to contact the complainant by responding and attempting a call-back. Additionally, the other CAD reports similarly show that officers had repeatedly attempted to contact the complainant with negative results. The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/20/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/02/25

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer displayed threatening, intimidating, or harassing behavior.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant has received citations from the officer on several occasions due to her vehicle being parked in a red zone at her apartment building. The complainant stated she had permission to do so, yet the officer continued to harass her with parking tickets.

The named officer stated that he knew the complainant and had previously cited her vehicle for violations at a residential location. He explained that he prioritized enforcement of violations that threatened public safety, especially vehicles parked in red zones, because they blocked fire, EMS, and police access to the plaza at the location. The named officer could not recall the number of citations he had issued to the complainant since her previous DPA complaint. Still, he clarified that he had cited her vehicle for red zone violations that obstructed emergency services. He denied that the prior complaint had influenced his enforcement and stated that he issued citations strictly for public safety reasons. He added that any alleged “security permission to park” could not override public safety rules, so he issued citations when violations occurred. The named officer denied targeting the complainant and explained that he had likely issued more than 100 citations that year to various vehicles parked in the same red zone location.

Department General Orders 5.06 and 9.01 require officers to enforce laws impartially and to prioritize public safety. California Vehicle Code §22500 prohibits drivers from stopping or parking in designated red zones, which must remain clear for emergency vehicles. Additionally, California Vehicle Code §22500.1 further prohibits parking near fire hydrants and other safety-sensitive areas, making clear that no individual permission or agreement can override these restrictions.

Although repeated citations may make the complainant feel targeted, the officer complied with statutory requirements and departmental guidelines regardless of whether the complainant perceived repeated citations as targeted due to the vehicle being parked in a designated red zone.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/23/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/25

PAGE# 1 of 7

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers failed to properly investigate.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the named officers failed to conduct a query on CLETS (California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System) on the individual she claimed had assaulted her ("subject"). She stated that had they done so, they would have discovered that the subject had a violent criminal history in another state.

Named Officer #1 stated that when he spoke with both parties, he was conducting a preliminary investigation, and neither individual was detained or under arrest. As a result, he did not run a computer query on either party. He explained that, according to his training, he only conducts such queries when there is a legal detention or arrest.

Named Officer #2 stated that he did not conduct a computer query because, after hearing both parties' accounts, he determined there was no reasonable suspicion to detain either individual. Each party provided a differing version of events. According to named officer #2, it appeared the suspect closed the door to her business on the complainant only after the complainant attempted to keep it open forcefully. He further stated that officers typically run individuals through the computer system only when there is a legal basis for detention or arrest, which he concluded was not present in this case.

Department records indicate that officers responded to a call for service regarding an assault. Officers interviewed both parties, who had differing accounts. The complainant informed officers that the neighboring business owner ("subject") confronted her after asking one of her clients to speak more quietly in the common hallway. The complainant reported that the subject then knocked on her door, asking why she was talking with her client. The complainant reported that she began recording the interaction, after which the subject shut her door in the complainant's face. The complainant reported she suffered pain in her right arm and face and sustained damage to her glasses. The complainant refused medical attention. The report continued with the subject's statement, where she reported hearing the complainant speaking to her client's mother in the hallway. She confronted the complainant and told her to leave her client alone. The subject stated that the complainant began recording her and attempted to enter her business. However, the subject instructed the complainant to stop recording because a child was inside. The subject said she closed her door, but the complainant kept pushing on it, preventing it from closing. The subject repeatedly told the complainant to leave while trying to close her own door. The

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/23/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/25

PAGE# 2 of 7

subject told the officers that she was unaware that the door had hit the complainant. The report noted that officers asked the complainant for the recording; however, she stated she did not record. Officers could not determine who the primary aggressor was in the incident due to conflicting statements.

Body-worn camera footage showed officers responding to the complainant's workspace. The complainant informed officers that she had politely asked an individual speaking loudly in the hallway to lower her voice. She reported that a few minutes later, she exited her office to use the restroom. The complainant reported the subject "came out and confronted me and just would not leave me alone," and added, "When I went to the bathroom, she came out hollering, trying to confront me and start talking." The complainant reported that after leaving the restroom, she activated the phone's video recorder and approached the subject's office to discuss the earlier hallway interaction. The complainant stated that the subject became agitated, slammed the door, and in doing so, broke her glasses and injured her arm. The complainant later told officers that although she believed she had recorded the incident, the phone had not captured it. Officers asked her if she needed paramedics, and she stated, "I doubt it." The complainant also informed officers that she reported the incident to the landlord, but expressed concern about the landlord confronting the subject, stating, "She is kind of an urban sort of Black person, and she will attack me."

The footage then showed officers speaking with the subject, who appeared to be African American. The subject reported that the complainant had told her client, who was on a phone call in the hallway, to be quiet. She said that she then asked the complainant what kind of work she did and explained that the building can be noisy at times. The subject believed the interaction was over and returned to her workspace. However, the subject reported that the complainant later approached the door to her workspace while recording on her phone, and that a child was present in the room. She asked the complainant to stop recording and suggested they speak later. When the complainant refused, the subject attempted to close the door. The subject reported that the complainant pushed against the door to prevent it from closing, so she forcefully shut it to end the interaction.

The footage continued with officers returning to the complainant, who denied preventing the door from closing. Officers informed her that the subject did not want to be recorded due to the presence of a child and claimed that she stopped her door from being closed, prompting her to slam it. The complainant commented to the officers, "Why do these people always turn violent?" and added, "That kind of Black person hates my kind of Black person." Officers advised her that a report would be written and that she could pursue a restraining order if desired.

Department General Orders do not mandate specific circumstances under which an officer must run a subject's name through CLETS, except in domestic violence cases, which this is not. Instead, CLETS usage is governed by the California Department of Justice's CLETS Policies, Practices, and Procedures,

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/23/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/25

PAGE# 3 of 7

which state that access must be strictly for the administration of criminal justice. This includes, but is not limited to, the detection, apprehension, prosecution, adjudication, and detention of individuals.

The named officers did not violate Department policy by choosing not to run the subject's name through CLETS. According to their statements, they would have conducted a CLETS inquiry if either party had been detained. However, the evidence does not indicate that either individual was detained, as there were no commands or actions that restricted their freedom to leave. Even if the subject had been detained, the named officers still would not have violated Department policy, as there is no specific requirement mandating a CLETS query under such circumstances.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer failed to make an arrest.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: ND

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the named officer failed to arrest the subject who had assaulted her. She asserted that, had the subject been taken into custody, a subsequent assault committed days later by the subject's boyfriend against the elderly landlord could have been prevented. The complainant reasoned that, as the subject was the leaseholder, her arrest would have precluded the boyfriend from entering the building, thereby averting the later incident.

The named officer stated he did not have probable cause to arrest the subject due to conflicting stories and the lack of video or independent witnesses to the incident. Regarding the assault against the elderly landlord days after this incident, he stated that he could not know what would happen in the future, and just because someone had a violent history, it does not mean they are still a violent person. He stated that having a violent history is not grounds to make an arrest.

Department General Order 5.03.03 states in the relevant part, "Probable cause to arrest is a set of specific facts that would lead a reasonable person to objectively believe and strongly suspect that a crime was committed by the person to be arrested. Under the Fourth Amendment, arrests must be supported by probable cause."

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/23/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/25

PAGE# 4 of 7

The named officer did not violate Department policy or the law by declining to arrest the subject, as the available evidence and contradictory statements did not establish sufficient probable cause to support a lawful arrest.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer prepared an incomplete or inaccurate incident report.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the incident report contained multiple inaccuracies. She noted that the report failed to mention that the subject “chased” her to the bathroom. She also disputed the report’s claim that she “refused” medical attention, asserting instead that she informed the officer she would seek medical care independently. Additionally, the complainant felt the report portrayed her negatively and implied dishonesty by stating there was no video evidence. Finally, she noted that the report inaccurately stated the subject came to her door when, in fact, she went to the subject’s door.

The named officer denied that the incident report was inaccurate. He stated that at no point during his interaction with the complainant did she mention being “chased” by the subject. Regarding who approached whose door, he explained that the incident report is a summary of the investigation and that complete statements are documented in his body-worn camera footage. Concerning medical assistance, he recalled asking the complainant if she needed it, to which she responded, “I doubt it.” He added that he did not recall whether she stated she would seek medical attention on her own.

The incident report authored by the named officer does not appear to be inaccurate or defamatory toward the complainant. Body-worn camera footage does not show the complainant stating that she was “chased” by the subject at any point during the interaction. Regarding medical assistance, it is standard practice for officers to document that an individual “refused medical attention” when on-scene emergency medical services are declined. Concerning the absence of video evidence, the report accurately states that the complainant did not record the incident; it does not suggest that she was untruthful. Lastly, the

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/23/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/25

PAGE# 5 of 7

discrepancy regarding which party approached whose door is minor, not material to the investigation, and can be clarified by reviewing the body-worn camera footage.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer misrepresented the truth.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officer filed a false police report in violation of California Penal Code section 118.1 based on the inaccuracies stated above.

The named officer denied filing a false report and stated his report contained no inaccuracies.

Penal Code section 118.1 states in relevant part that “any peace officer knowingly and intentionally makes, or causes to be made, any material statement in a peace officer report . . . regarding the commission or investigation of any crime, knowing the statement to be false, is guilty of filing a false report . . .”

The named officer did not violate Penal Code section 118.1, as the incident report he authored does not appear to be inaccurate or contain any false material statement.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur or that the accused officer was not involved.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/23/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/25

PAGE# 6 of 7

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6: The officer knowingly engaged in biased policing or discrimination.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant, who identified herself as a part-Asian Black female who appeared 100 percent Black and a law-abiding Black American, stated that the named officer, whom she identified as a Hispanic American male, showed preference over the subject, whom she identified as a “criminally oriented Black American.” She stated the named officer “lacks the sensitivity to discern the difference between law-abiding black Americans and criminally oriented Black Americans.”

The named officer denied engaging in biased policing. He stated that he responded to the scene to assist and that, as a Hispanic officer, he does not approach calls with assumptions about who may be a law-abiding or criminally oriented citizen. He explained that his role is to respond, conduct interviews, investigate, and enforce the law when necessary. He further stated, “Race does not play a role in my decision-making. The fact that the [complainant] believes otherwise is beyond me.” He asserted that he was professional and courteous throughout his interaction with the complainant. The named officer also noted, “I have worked in and with the African American community for over 18 years, alongside leaders from African American, Samoan, Hispanic, and Asian communities. I have never been accused of bias toward any group. I treat everyone with the utmost respect and professionalism.”

Department General Order 5.17 (Bias-Free Policing Policy) states in the relevant part, "A guiding principle of the San Francisco Police Department is its commitment to treating all people with dignity, fairness, and respect. It is crucial for members to carry out their duties in a manner free from bias and eliminate any perception of policing that appears biased . . . A fundamental right guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States is equal protection under the law. Along with this right is the fundamental right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures by government agents, as guaranteed by the Fourth Amendment. Department members are charged with protecting these rights for all people, regardless of race, color, ethnicity, national origin, age, religion, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, mental or physical disability, or socio-economic status. Police action that is biased is illegal and violates these rights."

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/23/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/25

PAGE# 7 of 7

The evidence does not support a finding that the Named Officer exhibited bias in favor of the subject, whom the complainant referred to as “criminally oriented Black American.” Instead, the only indication of bias in this incident originates from the complainant, who made racially biased remarks.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur or that the accused officer was not involved.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #7: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA’s jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: Referral/ISD

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside the DPA’s jurisdiction. This complaint was partially forwarded to:

San Francisco Police Department
Investigative Services Division
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/23/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/07/25

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant reported that his bicycle was stolen and was later recovered by the named officer. He agreed to allow the bicycle to be taken into evidence for DNA testing. The named officer informed him that the bicycle would be returned within three days. Approximately one week later, having received no updates, the complainant began attempting to contact the named officer. He stated that over the following three weeks, he made multiple phone calls and sent several emails but did not receive any response.

The named officer stated that the complainant consented to having his bicycle taken for DNA testing in an effort to identify the suspect. The named officer advised the complainant that his bicycle could be retrieved the following day; however, the complainant informed him that he would be out of town and unable to pick it up. The named officer then explained that the bicycle would be booked into evidence and stored until the complainant was available to retrieve it. He further stated that he did not receive any phone calls from the complainant on his Department-issued cell phone, which they had previously used for communication. He acknowledged that the complainant sent text messages and emails twelve and fourteen days after the incident but noted that he did not see those messages because they were received on his last day before a two-week absence. The named officer stated that it was always his intention to have the bicycle returned to the complainant as soon as possible, and he attempted to do so the day after it was taken for testing. Upon returning to duty, he arranged for the complainant to coordinate the return of the bicycle. He expressed regret that scheduling conflicts between himself and the complainant delayed the process.

While it is unfortunate that the complainant did not receive timely communication from the named officer, scheduling conflicts on both sides contributed to the delay in returning the bicycle. The allegation does not rise to the level of misconduct.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/24/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/14/25

PAGE# 1 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers conducted an improper search or seizure.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant was involved in a physical fight at his residence with a romantic partner. He woke up the next morning when the police arrived at his residence. He later learned that his ex-partner had called the police and reported him for assault. He told the officers they could not come inside, but after stepping away from the door to get dressed, an officer entered the residence, stating he did not want the complainant to grab any weapons. The complainant was arrested and also stated that one of the officers went into the residence without his consent and gathered his wallet, keys, and other belongings to bring with him, took a bottle from the ground in the residence, and locked the residence before leaving.

Records showed that the officers were sent to the complainant's apartment to serve him with an emergency protective order and to arrest him on domestic violence related charges. Records showed that the complainant was accused of using a weapon during the domestic violence incident.

The named officers said that one officer entered the residence initially because they were concerned the complainant could be trying to obtain a weapon when he quickly stepped away from the door, out of sight, into another room. They acknowledged that the complainant did not want them to enter initially, but entered to prevent the complainant from grabbing a weapon.

The officers stated that they had permission to enter the complainant's apartment the second time. The officers stated that the complainant wanted them to grab his property, including his wallet and keys, to bring with him for booking. The complainant directed the officers where to look for his belongings. The officers also secured the residence by locking the door before they left.

Body-worn camera footage showed the complainant answering the door half-dressed. One officer asked the complainant if he had clothes to put on and asked if they could come inside. The complainant declined but then quickly turned to enter a room out of view from the front door. One officer briefly stepped into the apartment to watch the complainant grab his clothing and to ensure that he did not grab a weapon. The officer immediately stepped out of the apartment once the complainant came back into the doorway view with his clothing. The complainant dressed and stepped out of his apartment. The officers served him with the protective order and arrested him. The officers asked the complainant if he wanted them to

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/24/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/14/25

PAGE# 2 of 3

retrieve any of his belongings. The complainant directed the officers to where they could find his keys, wallet, cell phone, and shoes.

The evidence showed it was reasonable for the officers to enter the complainant's apartment. The first entry was for officer safety, to ensure that the complainant did not get a weapon from his bedroom. It was reasonable for the officers to suspect the complainant would retrieve a weapon from inside his bedroom because he was suspected of a violent crime and because he suddenly disappeared around a blind corner. Additionally, the complainant gave permission to the later entry and assisted the officers with locating items in his residence that he wanted, providing lawful entry. The seizure of the bottle was evidence of the crime for which the complainant was arrested and was in plain view.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers made an arrest without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said he was arrested for assaulting a person with whom he was in a dating relationship with, and the arrest was without cause, as he was actually the victim in the incident.

The named officers said they arrested the complainant for assaulting his boyfriend the prior night. He was arrested for assault with a deadly weapon, brandishing a deadly weapon, and domestic violence. The probable cause was established the evening prior, when the complainant's partner provided a statement to other officers about the assault. One officer confirmed the arrest order with a supervisor, who determined that the elements met the criteria for the arrest to be made.

Body-worn camera footage (BWC) showed that officers interviewed the party the complainant was in a dating relationship with, who alleged the complainant punched him in the face, scratched him, and brandished and swung a bottle at him. An officer took photographs of the other party, including a scratch on his face that he claimed he received because of being assaulted by the complainant. BWC footage

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/24/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/14/25

PAGE# 3 of 3

showed that the named officers handcuffed the complainant after arriving at his residence and advised him that there was a report from the prior evening where he was named as the main suspect. BWC footage also showed that the officer located and seized a bottle on the ground in the complainant's residence.

An incident report was authored, which detailed statements regarding the fight from the person the complainant had been dating, as well as the complainant. The reporting officer documented that the complainant's partner had numerous scratch marks on his cheek and chest, and a complaint of pain to his left pectoral area.

Photos taken by an officer of the party the complainant had been dating showed scratches on his face and chest.

The evidence showed that the named officers had probable cause based on the facts and circumstances in the case to arrest the complainant.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/26/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/16/25 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 1: The officer failed to write an incident report.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that she visited the police station twice regarding a hate crime before she was able to successfully file a report. She reported that an elderly passenger used profanity and told her to “go back to your country.” The officer at the station told her it was not considered a crime because no physical harm occurred. The complainant could not provide any officer’s names or badge numbers.

The incident report she eventually filed documented two separate attempts to report the issue. The first time, she was told they couldn't take the report because the station was busy. During the second visit, an officer said they still couldn't take a report. There was no additional information about the previous incidents.

Since the complainant could not identify the specific officers involved, DPA sent an ID Poll to the District Station. An ID poll describes the incident and asks the Commanding Officer to review the incident details and identify the officers involved. The ID poll returned negative results because there was insufficient information to identify the officers for further investigation.

There were no witnesses present at the time of the incident.

No finding outcomes are made when an officer cannot be reasonably identified.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/25/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/09/25 PAGE# 1 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers failed to provide his or her name or star number.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said he had an interaction with the named officers, and they failed to provide their badge numbers. The officers later detained the complainant because someone had identified him as vandalizing the officers' patrol vehicle.

The named officers said they were assisting the Department of Public Works with an assignment, and the complainant directed offensive comments towards them while they were working. They later saw spit and food splatter on their patrol vehicle, and nearby witness identified the complainant as the person who did it. The complainant was detained pending further investigation. The named officers denied that the complainant asked for their badge numbers.

Body-worn camera footage did not show the complainant asking the named officers for their names or badge numbers; however, the footage did not capture the officers' initial interaction with the complainant that took place before their investigation.

Department General Order 2.01, General Rules of Conduct, states in part that when requested, officers shall promptly and politely provide their name, star number and assignment.

The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/25/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/09/25 PAGE# 2 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers detained a person without reasonable suspicion.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officers detained him for vandalizing their police vehicle. He said someone spat and thrown food on it the police car but did not disclose whether he had done it. He said that he didn't feel that the act amounted to vandalism.

The officers stated that they observed food splatter and saliva on their patrol vehicle. They said they had reasonable suspicion to detain the complainant for investigation because a person sitting nearby pointed out the complainant and identified him as the person who did it.

Body-worn camera footage showed that there was debris and what appeared to be a spit on the glass of the officers' patrol vehicle. The footage showed that the officers detained the complainant and that a witness told one of the officers that the complainant spat and threw food on the patrol vehicle. The witness refused to provide his name for the report.

California Penal Code Section 594(a) states in part that every person who maliciously commits any of the following acts with respect to any real or personal property not his or her own, in cases other than those specified by state law, is guilty of vandalism: (1) defaces with graffiti or other inscribed material, (2) damages, (3) destroys.

The evidence showed that the named officers had reasonable suspicion to detain the complainant pending further investigation

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer issued a citation without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/25/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/09/25 PAGE# 3 of 4

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer cited him for vandalizing their police vehicle. He said someone spat and thrown food on the car but did not say if he had done it. He said that he didn't feel that the act amounted to vandalism.

The named officer stated that they observed food splatter and saliva on their patrol vehicle, and a person sitting nearby pointed out the complainant and identified him as the person who did it. The officers detained the complainant pending further investigation. Officer #2 stated that she issued the complainant a citation for vandalism but later dismissed it as the witness said they felt threatened by the complainant, wanted to remain anonymous, and because they were unable to obtain security footage at that time. The named officer stated that they later obtained security footage from the area.

An incident report was authored, which corroborated the named officers' statements. A supplemental report was also authored, which documented that security footage of the incident was obtained, showing the complainant aggressively throwing an unknown object at the front windshield of their patrol vehicle.

California Penal Code Section 594(a) states in part that every person who maliciously commits any of the following acts with respect to any real or personal property not his or her own, in cases other than those specified by state law, is guilty of vandalism: (1) defaces with graffiti or other inscribed material, (2) damages, (3) destroys.

The evidence showed that the named officer had probable cause to cite the complainant, but the witness ended up not feeling comfortable being involved, so the named officer voided the citation.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: PC

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/25/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/09/25 PAGE# 4 of 4

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that the named officer inappropriately called the complainant's speech and expression abnormal.

The named officer stated that he told the complainant that it was abnormal to curse loudly at people to get their attention. The complainant said he took it as a compliment.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the named officer commented that it was fine for the complainant to run his mouth, and that it was a little abnormal. The complainant said the comment was a compliment. The named officer also told the complainant that cursing and being very loud to get attention is not normal.

While the evidence showed that the named officer commented about the complainant's behavior being abnormal, the comments did not rise to the level of officer misconduct.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/03/25

COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/2025

PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant had an altercation with her brother at her mother's house. The complainant stated that her brother made threats to assault her and damaged the tires of her vehicle. In fear for her life, she called for police assistance. The named officer and her partner responded to investigate the incident. The complainant alleged that the named officer behaved and spoke inappropriately. She said that the officer kept interrupting her mother during their conversation, rolled her eyes, and exhibited attitude and unprofessionalism. The complainant stated that it seemed the officer was rushing her mother to express her thoughts. She stated that the officer refused to believe she was scared of her brother, giggled and laughed while talking to her brother like they knew each other, and allowed him to leave while the incident was being investigated. The complainant said her car would not start, so the officer's partner helped her charge the battery with a jumper pack. The complainant stated that the named officer instructed the officer to stop what he was doing and let her handle it.

The named officer stated that she recalled talking to the complainant's mother, who told her about the history of her children's feud. A lot of back and forth occurred during the conversation. She said that she made sure that everyone was safe and that no car was on fire. As to her contact with the complainant, she recalled her saying that her brother had injected something into the tires of her car, and that she was scared of him. For safety reasons, she instructed them to move down the street and away from her vehicle in case it exploded, based on the information she received from Dispatch. She then spoke with the complainant's brother, who said that he did nothing to the complainant's car. At some point, the brother told her that he had to leave for work. The officer stated that the complainant had a jumper pack she was unfamiliar with. As her partner assisted in starting the complainant's car with the jumper pack, she provided instructions on how to use it, ensuring the complainant would know how to operate it if a similar issue occurred with her car again. She explained to her that learning to use the portable charger would be valuable, and that jumpstarting a vehicle is an essential skill every car owner should know.

The officer's partner stated that he did not witness the named officer behaving and speaking inappropriately while talking to the complainant's mother. He stated that he did not understand what their conversation was about because they were talking in Chinese. He said he did not witness the named officer giggle and laugh, or allow the complainant's brother to leave the scene. He stated that the named officer's comments to the complainant on how to use the battery jumper pack were instructional because

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/03/25

COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/2025

PAGE# 2 of 2

the complainant said she did not know how to use it. He stated that the comments implied that everyone should be knowledgeable about using and operating automotive tools and devices in emergency situations.

The Computer-Aided Dispatch record of the incident shows officers responding to an A-priority call for vandalism. The complainant reported that someone had threatened to set her car on fire and punctured her tires.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) obtained the body-worn camera (BWC) videos of the incident. The videos show that the named officer was straightforward in dealing with the complainant and her mother. She attempted to mediate a longstanding family dispute and at times perhaps gave unsolicited advice. Her actions did not rise to the level of misconduct. None of the videos show her rolling her eyes, laughing, or giggling. As to the complainant's brother leaving for work, he was never detained and was free to leave. Regarding the officer's instructions on operating the jumper pack, the intention was not to embarrass the complainant but to familiarize her with its use in case she encounters a similar incident with her car.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/03/25 COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/2025 PAGE# 3 of 2

OFFICER SUSIE DER #4265

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer failed to properly investigate.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged the named officer failed to properly investigate. She stated that the officer briefly spoke with her brother, permitted him to leave during the investigation, and failed to assess the damage to her vehicle due to inadequate inspection.

The named officer and her partner stated that they checked the vehicle and found no damage to any of its tires.

The officers' BWC videos appeared consistent with their statements. Notably, the partner's BWC footage shows that he walked around the vehicle together with the complainant and found no visible damage. All of the tires appeared normal, not flat. The complainant admitted that she did not notice any damage to the tires when she walked around the car. Lastly, the brother's departure for work was lawful since he was never detained and was free to leave at any time. At that time, the officers had no evidence that the brother tampered with the complainant's tires.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/07/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/14/25

PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to properly care for, process, or book property.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant sold clothing and other items at a flea market and police officers seized items and money from her sales and later issued her a citation. She later got her money and most of the items back from the police department. However, she alleged some items from one merchant were never returned, which should have been. She said the named officer, who was her point of contact for the case, provided her with contact information for the merchant to try to get the items back as they had been released to them, but when she contacted the merchant, they refused to return them. Additionally, the complainant said that the items she received back from the police smelled musty and were no longer useful to her.

Department records showed that the complainant's items were seized and that she was issued a citation for receiving stolen property. The records showed that she was issued a property receipt for the money and items seized.

The named officer explained that he organized a fencing operation at the location of the flea market where the complainant was selling items. A retail crime manager reported that special trackers in the clothing showed that stolen merchandise was for sale at the complainant's booth. Officers seized the items and booked them as evidence. The seized merchandise was brought to the retailer, who identified which items had been stolen. The items not identified as stolen were later returned to the complainant.

The named officer stated that, after the complainant's arrest, she provided receipts for some of the items that were not returned to her. However, by the time the complainant produced the receipts, the retail store had closed operations. The named officer put the complainant in touch with the retailer's main company to work something out regarding the missing items. The named officer said that the complainant's items were properly stored in evidence boxes prior to being released back to the complainant.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage showed officers seizing items from the complainant at the flea market and putting the items in bags for transport. BWC footage showed that the complainant stating she had receipts for the seized items; however, the complainant declined to provide the receipts at the time of her arrest. An officer advised the complainant and her family member that since she chose to keep the receipts, she could provide them as evidence later, which BWC footage also showed her do. BWC

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/07/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/14/25

PAGE# 2 of 2

footage showed some of the property being stored in boxes. The footage showed the named officer bringing items to a retail store so they could be scanned and requesting and receiving a receipt for items that were shown as stolen.

While the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) recognizes that there was an issue with a retailer providing inaccurate information initially to the named officer regarding stolen items, the officer acted properly, given the information he had at that time of the investigation. Additionally, no evidence located shows the complainant's property was stored improperly.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/21/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/14/25 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he tried to file a police report and an officer refused to take his report from him. The complainant did not provide any further details and did not respond to further contact.

An ID poll was sent to the local station but did not return any results for the officer involved.

SFPD documents showed that the complainant called to say an officer had refused to take his report, but he did not wait for officers to come and speak with him.

Without further details from the complainant, it is not possible to identify the officer he is making the allegation against.

No findings are made if the officer cannot reasonably be identified or the officer has left the Department and is therefore no longer subject to discipline.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/16/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/02/25 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/DEM

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

DEM Division of Emergency Communications
1011 Turk Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/21/25

PAGE# 1 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers conducted an improper search or seizure.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said he was admitted to a hospital and left to go home against medical advice. He said his wife was worried about his decision to leave the hospital and later requested a welfare check for him when he was home. Medical personnel and police responded to his residence and were let inside by his wife. He alleged that the officers improperly entered his home without his consent.

The officers responded to the call to assist medical personnel with an aggressive patient. The medics informed the officers that they did not feel safe treating the complainant without police. The officers said that the complainant's wife provided consent for the officers and the medics to enter the residence. She came outside the home, told the complainant to get checked out, and allowed them inside.

Dispatch records showed that the complainant's spouse called for medical assistance because the complainant appeared confused. The records also showed that police were requested for the call because of an agitated patient.

Body-worn camera footage corroborated the officers' accounts. Emergency medical personnel told the named officers that the complainant was being aggressive and would not let them get near him to provide medical assistance. The complainant's wife came outside the residence with her dog and yelled out for the complainant to please get checked out and let the officers and medics inside the residence.

The evidence showed the complainant's spouse let the officers inside, legally allowing them to enter.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers detained a person without reasonable suspicion.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/21/25

PAGE# 2 of 3

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the named officers improperly detained him and had him transported to a hospital against his will.

The named officers said that the complainant was aggressive, agitated, and appeared to be mentally altered throughout their counter. He threatened them and medical personnel and grabbed onto a medic's arm without her consent while she was trying to assess him. The officers determined the complainant was a danger to others based on his behavior and comments, and they detained him for a mental health hold.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage showed that the complainant was not cooperative with medical personnel when they tried to assess him. The complainant grabbed onto a medic and also made threats. The complainant made nonsensical commentary, threw and kicked items in his residence, and the officers grabbed and placed the complainant into handcuffs. BWC footage also showed that the complainant's spouse told the officers that the complainant was not acting as he normally does and that his behavior was very unusual.

Department records showed that the complainant was placed on a mental health detention hold for being a danger to others.

Under California law, police officers have the authority to determine if an individual presents a danger to himself or others or is gravely ill. The evidence showed that the named officers had reasonable suspicion to detain the complainant for a mental health hold based on his actions, commentary, and the totality of the circumstances.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5-6: The officers used unnecessary or excessive force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the named officers used unnecessary force when handling him and grabbing him during the incident.

The named officers said they used control holds when placing the complainant into handcuffs. The complainant was detained under a mental health detention and deemed to be a danger to others. The

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/21/25

PAGE# 3 of 3

complainant actively resisted by tensing his elbows during the process. The officers said they complied with Department General Order 5.01 Use of Force and used the least amount of force while maintaining control of the complainant to effect the lawful detention

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage showed the complainant grab onto a medic's wrist when she attempted to assess him. The officers warned the complainant that they were going to place him in handcuffs multiple times if he did not cooperate. The officers placed the complainant's arms behind his back and handcuffed him. The complainant displayed resistance by tensing up his arms during the process.

Department General Order 5.01, Use of Force Policy and Proper Control of a Person, states in part that control holds are designed to gain compliance of, and/or control over, uncooperative or resistant subjects.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/24/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/21/25

PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 1: The officer failed to write an incident report.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he went to a police station to file an incident report regarding a financial crime, but the station personnel failed to prepare a report. The complainant stated that as he described the scenario to the officer at the counter, the officer shrugged his shoulders and dismissed the complaint. The complainant did not know the officer's name or star number but provided a brief physical description.

Because the complainant could not identify the specific officer involved in the interaction, DPA sent an identification poll ("ID Poll") to the district station including details that the complainant provided. An ID Poll describes the incident and asks that the captain and/or members of the station review the incident description and identify officer(s) that were involved. The ID Poll failed to identify an officer.

No finding outcomes are made when an officer cannot be reasonably identified.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 2: The officer failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/24/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/21/25

PAGE# 2 of 2

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that after his experience at the police station he called a specific police unit and left a voicemail message requesting a call back so that they could take a report. He stated that no one returned his call.

An ID Poll was sent to the police unit the complainant called. As noted above, an ID Poll describes the incident and asks that the captain and/or members of the station review the incident description and identify officer(s) that were involved. The ID Poll failed to identify an officer.

The ID Poll response indicated that officers polled did not recall the complainant's name or message. However, they consulted a unit call back log which reflected that the complainant was called back nineteen days later, and a voicemail was left, which advised the complainant to bring in supporting documents. It was unknown who called the complainant back.

No finding outcomes are made when an officer cannot be reasonably identified.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/29/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/2025

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer improperly touched a juvenile in a sexual manner.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: NF/W

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer solicited sexual acts.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: NF/W

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/30/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/25

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer drove a City vehicle in a grossly negligent or reckless manner.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant was crossing in a crosswalk with the right of way when a patrol vehicle failed to yield. The complainant raised their arms to signal the driver, who briefly stopped but then continued driving.

Computer queries were conducted to locate the incident. The search yielded negative results.

Because the complainant could not identify the specific officer involved in the interaction, DPA sent an ID Poll to two district stations as the incident could have occurred between two station areas.

An ID poll describes the incident and asks that the captain and/or members of the station review the incident description and identify the involved officer. The ID polls came back with negative results.

No findings are made if the officer cannot reasonably be identified or the officer has left the Department and is therefore no longer subject to discipline.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/31/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers failed to make an arrest.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officers failed to arrest an individual suspected of setting fire to his home a few weeks prior. He said he did not witness the suspect set fire to his house but suspected that he did so.

Named Officer #1 stated that he phoned the complainant, who provided a description of an individual suspected of arson and requested that the suspect be arrested. Named Officer #1 further stated that he and named officer #2 conducted a search of the surrounding area but were unable to locate the individual.

Named Officer #2 stated that he and named officer #1 responded to meet with the complainant regarding an arson investigation. While en route, they discussed the nature of the call and agreed that named officer #1 would contact the complainant by phone to gather additional information. Named Officer #2 stated that they obtained a description of the suspect and conducted a diligent search of the area but were unable to locate the individual.

Department records indicate that the named officers responded to a call for service regarding a suspicious person who allegedly attempted to set fire to the complainant's home. Dispatch provided a description of the suspect and the direction of travel.

The Department of Police Accountability attempted to obtain body-worn camera footage; however, the San Francisco Police Department was unable to locate any footage.

The named officers were unable to locate the suspect and, as a result, no arrest was made. Furthermore, even if the suspect had been located, the officers would not have had probable cause to make an arrest, as the incident occurred two weeks prior and the complainant did not witness the suspect setting fire to the residence.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/31/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25 PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3-4: The officers failed to activate their body-worn cameras as required.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: IC/S

FINDINGS OF FACT: The Department of Police Accountability discovered during its investigation that the named officers did not activate their body-worn cameras as required by Department policy.

The named officers stated they activated their body-worn cameras.

Department records indicate that the named officers responded to a call for service regarding a suspicious person who allegedly attempted to set fire to the complainant's home. Dispatch provided a description of the suspect and the direction of travel.

The Department of Police Accountability attempted to obtain body-worn camera footage; however, the San Francisco Police Department was unable to locate any footage.

Correspondence and audit records from the Body-Worn Camera Unit (BCU) indicate that they were unable to locate any body-worn camera footage or records of activation for this incident.

Department General Order 10.11.03.C. states in part, "All on-scene members equipped with BWC shall activate their BWC equipment to record the following circumstances . . . 12. In any situation when the recording would be valuable for evidentiary purposes . . . Failure to activate a BWC as outlined in this order shall subject a member to an administrative investigation and, if warranted, appropriate discipline."

Department Notice 23-045 states in part, "When responding to calls for service with a potential for law enforcement activity or any of the mandatory recording circumstances to occur, members shall begin recording by pressing the Event button while enroute and prior to arriving on scene . . ."

There is insufficient evidence to find that the named officers activated their body-worn cameras. A preponderance of the evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred and that the conduct violated Department policy or procedure.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/31/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/07/25 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that her friend, a bicyclist, was struck by a vehicle. She noted that the named officer responded to the scene and behaved in an unprofessional manner, making inappropriate comments. According to the complainant, the officer appeared to side with the driver who hit the cyclist, suggested the cyclist was at fault, accused him of traveling at an excessive speed, questioned whether he was wearing a helmet, and admitted unfamiliarity with traffic laws.

The named officer stated that he was assigned to patrol duties on the date of the incident and responded to a call involving a collision between a bicycle and a vehicle. He reported conducting a traffic collision investigation, which included interviewing all involved parties and witnesses, as well as reviewing surveillance footage of the incident. He stated that he did not give preference toward the driver, as he interviewed all parties and reviewed video evidence to determine the collision factors. He explained that his comment to the bicyclist regarding excessive speed was appropriate, as the bicycle's speed was a primary contributing factor to the collision. Based on video footage, statements from the parties, and witness statements, he concluded that the bicyclist was unable to slow down in time to avoid the collision due to his speed.

The named officer determined that the bicyclist violated California Vehicle Code §22350 by overtaking vehicles and entering the intersection unsafely. Regarding his question about helmet use, the named officer stated it was standard procedure to ask all parties about safety equipment. He noted that the bicyclist was not wearing a helmet upon his arrival and similarly asked the driver whether he was wearing a seatbelt. In response to the complainant's concern about his statement on not knowing all the laws in the California Vehicle Code, the named officer clarified that it is not feasible to memorize every code. He explained that he reviews relevant statutes as needed during the course of investigations. He also stated that he informed the parties he could not determine fault at the time of the incident, as he had not yet reviewed all available evidence, including surveillance footage.

Department records indicate that a bicyclist collided with a vehicle that made a left turn in front of him from the opposite direction. Both parties were found to be at fault, with the bicyclist approaching the intersection at an unreasonable speed and the driver failing to yield. The report also noted that dashcam and surveillance footage were reviewed as part of the investigation.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/31/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/07/25 PAGE# 2 of 2

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officer speaking with a bicyclist who reported being involved in a collision with a vehicle. The bicyclist stated that the car turned in front of him, causing him to collide with its side. This account was corroborated by his daughter, who was present at the scene. The footage showed the bicyclist and his daughter engaging in a discussion with the named officer regarding the applicable traffic laws. During the exchange, the named officer acknowledged that he was not well-versed in the California Vehicle Code and explained that his role was to collect statements, which would be forwarded to the Traffic Division for a determination of fault. He also asked the bicyclist whether he was wearing a helmet, explaining that he was required to ask. The footage also showed the named officer asking the driver if he was wearing a seatbelt.

The footage also showed the officer speaking with an independent witness, who stated that the bicyclist was traveling at an excessive speed and had been obstructed by another vehicle. The witness informed the officer that surveillance footage from his store may have captured the incident. The driver of the car reported to the named officer that he did not see the bicyclist and believed the bicyclist was traveling too fast. The footage showed the named officer speaking with all parties in a calm and professional manner.

California Vehicle Code §22350 states, “No person shall drive a vehicle upon a highway at a speed greater than is reasonable or prudent having due regard for weather, visibility, the traffic on, and the surface and width of the highway, and in no event at a speed which endangers the safety of persons or property.”

Department General Order 2.01 states in relevant part that officers must treat members of the public with courtesy and respect.

Body-worn camera footage supports the finding that the named officer conducted himself professionally and appropriately throughout the incident. While he does not specialize in traffic enforcement due to his patrol assignment, he acknowledged that he is not deeply familiar with every provision of the California Vehicle Code, which contains thousands of individual statutes. It is not realistic to expect officers to memorize the entire code.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/04/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/21/25 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-4: The officers behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he called the police for help, and four officers arrived on scene. He noted that the named officers were verbally abusive and intimidating toward him.

Department records showed that the named officers responded to a Priority A call regarding an Assault.

The body-worn camera (BWC) showed that the named officers on scene were very polite and accommodating to the complainant throughout the investigative detention. The officers listened and remained calm, although the complainant used profanity toward them throughout the encounter.

BWC and records indicated that the complainant requested a supervisor to respond to the scene so that he could speak to them in person about the call-for-service, as he was upset that he was being cited regarding the alleged assault. Footage showed that Named Officer #1 responded and professionally answered all questions that the complainant presented.

Department General Order 2.01(14) dictates that officers shall treat members of the public with courtesy and not use harsh or uncivil language.

There was no evidence that the named officers were verbally abusive and intimidating toward the complainant.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/12/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/2025 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant reported that he watched a video of an Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) raid. In the video, individuals were demanding that SFPD officers help identify the ICE agents, who were masked and in plainclothes. The individuals were unsure whether these agents were legitimate government workers, but the police officers did nothing to assist.

The complainant did not provide the video he was referring to in his complaint. Additionally, after a search of Department records, the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) was unable to locate any evidence of the event described in the complaint.

DPA was unable to independently identify the officer based solely on information provided by the complainant. Therefore, there was insufficient information to investigate the complaint.

A no finding outcome occurs when the Department of Police Accountability cannot complete an investigation because the officer cannot reasonably be identified.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/12/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/2025 PAGE# 2 of 2

UNKNOWN OFFICER

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant reported that he contacted a police district station, seeking answers about why the police permitted ICE agents to carry out a raid in the financial district. However, during the conversation, the male officer who answered the phone abruptly hung up on him.

After a search of Department records, the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) was unable to locate any evidence of the event described in the complaint.

DPA was unable to independently identify the officer based solely on information provided by the complainant. DPA sent an identification poll to the specialized unit asking for assistance identifying the officer based on a description of the incident. No officers were identified through the poll. Therefore, there was insufficient information to investigate the complaint.

A no finding outcome occurs when the Department of Police Accountability cannot complete an investigation because the officer cannot reasonably be identified.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/20/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: M

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement of the complainant and the named officer, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 10/7/25.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he accidentally hit a vehicle with a trash can. The car's driver got out, but the complainant left because he did not want a conflict. The driver followed the complainant up the road and called the police. Officers separated the two and then asked the complainant

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/20/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25 PAGE# 2 of 2

to provide the driver with his details. The complainant refused as he did not trust the driver. The complainant stated that the officers then threatened the complainant, saying they would turn this into a vandalism case.

The Computer Aided Dispatch report showed that the named officer responded to a call for service that was first identified as a “meet with citizen” but was quickly changed to a “fight no weapon.” It was noted that this was a civil dispute involving a trash can hitting a passenger vehicle door, and that the incident was handled within approximately 10 minutes.

Body-worn camera footage (“BWC”) showed a brief interaction between the named officer and the complainant. Initially, the named officer can be heard encouraging the complainant to provide his name and phone number to the driver in case the driver wanted to sue the complainant in civil court. The complainant resists providing this information. The named officer’s partner can be seen talking to the driver and then announcing that there is property damage on the driver’s video. At this point, the named officer notes that the other option is vandalism to the car. The complainant and the driver then proceed to exchange contact information. The complainant can be seen taking down the officers’ names and star numbers.

There is no indication that the named officer threatened the complainant during this interaction, and his comments do not rise to the level of misconduct.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/23/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/25 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 1: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that she was at the airport dropping off her daughter. Then an officer approached them and threatened to issue them a \$100 ticket. She said it was traumatic to drop her child off at the airport. The complainant has not yet received a citation.

Since the complainant could not identify the specific officers involved in the interaction, DPA sent an ID Poll to the Airport Bureau. An ID poll describes the incident and asks the Commanding Officer to review the incident description and identify the officers involved. The ID poll returned negative results. There was insufficient information to identify the officer for the DPA to conduct further investigation.

Department records did not show any security footage that captured the incident.

No finding outcomes occur when an officer cannot reasonably be identified.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 2: The officer issued a citation without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that an officer at the airport threatened to give her a traffic citation; however, she has not received it yet.

Since the complainant could not identify the specific officers involved in the interaction, DPA sent an ID Poll to the Airport Bureau. An ID poll describes the incident and asks the Commanding Officer to review the incident description and identify the officers involved. The ID poll returned negative results. There was insufficient information to identify the officer for the DPA to conduct further investigation.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/23/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/25 PAGE# 2 of 2

Department records did not show any citations issued or any security footage that captured the incident.

No finding outcomes occur when an officer cannot reasonably be identified.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/01/25

COMPLETION DATE: 10/16/2025

PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant heard a police officer yelling through a bullhorn at unhoused people. She went outside and saw two officers in a police vehicle. The complainant asked one of the officers to explain what was happening. It was the complainant's understanding that the officers were trying to get the people occupying the sidewalk to move along. She recalled two unhoused individuals set up on the sidewalk with a sheet covering their area. The complainant asked the officer what law the individuals had violated. The officer gave her the applicable law or rule that she could no longer recall. She remembered the officer laughing and saying that he could arrest the individuals if she kept asking questions.

Named officer #1 stated he and named officer #2 responded to the scene of the incident based on a request for service made through the "311" application regarding persons sitting on the sidewalk. Upon arrival, the officers observed an encampment with individuals sitting on the sidewalk and others sleeping inside a structure. They advised the persons that they were violating Penal Code section 647e, which prohibits individuals from erecting a tent, tarp, structure, or shelter on a public place. Named officer #1 stated the persons were also in violation of Section 168(b) of the Municipal Police Code, the "Sit/Lie Ordinance," which prohibits individuals from sitting or lying on the sidewalk between 7:00 a.m. and 11:00 p.m. Named officer #1 stated that they used their car's PA system to communicate, but at no point did they yell loudly at the individuals. Instead, they addressed them professionally and respectfully. Named officer #1 stated that he recalled the complainant approaching their vehicle and asking what they were doing. They informed her that the individuals had violated the laws as mentioned above. The complainant replied that she had never heard of 647e PC and then left. He denied laughing at the complainant or stating that they would arrest the unhoused individuals if she continued asking questions.

Named officer #2 stated that they advised the unhoused individuals to stand and refrain from blocking the sidewalk and offered them shelter services, but they declined assistance. He stated that the officers used their vehicle's speaker to address the individuals due to the large number and the size of the area. He denied yelling at individuals or laughing at the complainant.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/01/25

COMPLETION DATE: 10/16/2025

PAGE# 2 of 2

Municipal Police Code Section 168 makes it unlawful to sit or lie on a public sidewalk in commercial districts or corridors between 7:00 a.m. and 11:00 p.m.

Penal Code section 647(c) allows officers to clear people from blocking the free movement of persons on any street, sidewalk, or public place.

It appears that the officers had the right to instruct the individuals to move along and refrain from blocking the sidewalk. However, no witnesses were identified, and there was no record of the contact. Therefore, DPA cannot determine by a preponderance of the evidence whether the officers' statements and tone violated Department policy or procedure.

There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/05/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/25

PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer issued a citation without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant, a ride-share driver, reported that she was issued a traffic citation, without cause, for running a red light. She stated that officers claimed she had run the light when they approached her. However, she asserted this was inaccurate, as she had been stationary while waiting for passengers. She believed the officers were frustrated because her vehicle had created a narrow passageway, and they were unwilling to maneuver around her.

The named officer said he observed the complainant running a solid red light. He said he initiated a traffic stop by activating his forward-facing lights and siren. Despite this, the complainant continued driving at a high speed and did not stop until approximately two blocks later, when she abruptly made a right turn. Upon making contact, the named officer asked the complainant whether she had seen his lights and siren. She informed him, "I did, but I have to pick up my passengers." The named officer cited her for violating California Vehicle Code section 21453(a).

The witness officer stated he observed the complainant running a red light. He said he and his partner activated their forward-facing lights and siren, but the complainant did not stop her vehicle until approximately two blocks later.

Department records indicate that the named officer conducted a traffic stop and issued the complainant a citation for violating California Vehicle Code section 21453(a).

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officer and the witness officer initiating a traffic stop while their vehicle was still in motion for approximately two blocks. Upon approaching the complainant, the named officer asked whether she had noticed the lights and sirens behind her. The complainant replied, "But I do Uber." The named officer replied that her occupation was not relevant and proceeded to request her driver's license and registration. He informed her that the stop was due to her turning right at a red light without stopping. A citation was subsequently issued. California Vehicle Code section 21453 states in relevant part, "A driver facing a steady circular red signal shall stop at a marked limit line" and "after stopping . . . may turn right . . ."

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/05/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/25

PAGE# 2 of 2

Body-worn camera footage confirmed that the complainant was not stationary and waiting for passengers when officers approached her, contrary to her allegation. The named officer did not violate Department policy by issuing a citation for running a red light, as the witness officer also observed the violation independently.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/03/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25

PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer used unnecessary or excessive force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant was near a place of worship when someone reported him to the police. He said people from the place of worship always call the police on him. The complainant briefly spoke with the named officer, and later, when he was walking behind the named officer, the named officer turned around and pushed him in the chest for no reason, causing him to go to the ground.

The named officer was familiar with the complainant, who he said has a history of mental health issues, erratic behavior, and antagonizing worshippers at this location. He told the complainant to stop when he approached and not to antagonize the other party whom he had contacted. The complainant stepped closer, within arm's reach of the reporting party, posing a threat. He grabbed and pushed the complainant away to overcome his resistance, gain compliance with a lawful order, prevent a public offense from occurring, for the safety of the complainant and the other party, and to defuse a tense situation and potential further conflict.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage showed that the complainant approached the officer and the reporting party after the officer had spoken with the complainant. The named officer told the complainant he needed to stop. The complainant side-stepped closer during the encounter and continued speaking. The complainant gestured with his hand while talking, and the named officer grabbed the complainant's arm and pushed the complainant's back, moving him away. The footage did not show the officer turning around abruptly and pushing the complainant in the way the complainant alleged.

Department General Order 5.01, Use of Force Policy and Proper Control of a Person, states in part that officers may use objectively reasonable force options in the performance of their duties to overcome resistance, in defense of others, and to gain compliance with a lawful order.

The evidence showed the officer used low-level force to move the complainant away after the complainant ignored the officer's instruction to stop but instead moved closer.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/03/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/28/25

PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer failed to handle an assigned radio call.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that after the officer left the scene, someone from the place of worship stole his religious text, he reported it and no officers responded.

The complainant's alleged call for service was not located. There was insufficient information to investigate the complaint.

A no finding outcome occurs when the Department of Police Accountability cannot complete an investigation because the officer cannot reasonably be identified.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/09/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/30/25

PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to comply with Department General Order 5.01.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that various agencies, which included the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), abused their power and used aggressive behavior toward her fiancé while they took him into custody. The complainant further stated that there were approximately 28 officers in total, who created a lot of confusion, were hostile, and intimidating throughout the incident.

Department General Order 5.01 Use of Force, Section III-A states, "Officers may use reasonable force options in the performance of their duties, in the following circumstances: 1. To effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search.

Department Records documented that an arrest was made. Body-worn camera (BWC") displayed that the complainant's fiancé was arrested regarding a warrant.

BWC did not support the statement provided by the complainant. Footage revealed that there were not 28 officers involved; however, there was a presence of various agencies, including the San Francisco Police Department. The named officer can be seen as he assisted other agencies in a standby capacity. He asked the subject whether he wanted his personal items to be given to the complainant, to which the subject responded yes. The named officer assisted with a pat search and provided a folder of documents that included the subject's property and his cell phone to the complainant.

Based on the BWC and evidence obtained and reviewed, the officer did not abuse his power, display any aggressive or intimidating behavior throughout the encounter.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur or that the accused officer was not involved.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/09/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/30/25

PAGE# 2 of 2

FINDING: IO-1/SFSO

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
25 Van Ness Avenue Suite 350
San Francisco, CA 94102

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF

FINDING: IO-1/US Marshals

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

US Marshals Service
450 Golden Gate Avenue, 20th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/17/25

COMPLETION DATE: 10/02/25

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/IAD

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Police Department
Internal Affairs Division
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/17/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/02/25

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complainant raises matters not rationally within Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-2

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant raises matters not rationally within Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/17/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: IO/1

FINDING: Referral

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was referred in full to:

Mission Police Station
630 Valencia Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/17/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: IO/1

FINDING: Referral

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was referred in full to:

Northern Police Station
1125 Fillmore Street
San Francisco, CA 94115

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/17/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: IO/1

FINDING: Referral

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was referred in full to:

Mission Police Station
630 Valencia Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/19/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/15/25

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/CPD

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

Colma Police Department
1199 El Camino Real
Colma, CA 94104

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/19/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/09/25 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that they were crossing the street when an officer yelled at them to get out of the road using profanity. The complainant told the officer what they were doing, and the officer replied rudely, using profanity. The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) attempted to obtain further information from the complainant regarding the incident without success.

The DPA was unable to locate any record of the event through a search of department records.

DPA sent an identification poll to the relevant police division regarding the incident. No officer was identified through the poll. Therefore, there was insufficient information to investigate the complaint.

A no finding outcome occurs when the Department of Police Accountability cannot complete an investigation because the officer cannot reasonably be identified.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/25/25 COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/MTA MUNI

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
MUNI Security, Investigations & Enforcement
1 South Van Ness Ave., 8th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/26/2025 DATE OF COMPLETION: 10/16/25 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF/W

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/26/25 COMPLETION DATE: 10/02/25 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters outside the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/SFSU

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco State University Police Department
Division of Campus Safety
1600 Holloway Ave
San Francisco, CA 941532

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/24/25 COMPLETION DATE: 10/16/25 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complainant raises matters not rationally within Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-2

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant raises matters not rationally within Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/24/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/09/25

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complainant raises matters not rationally within Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-2

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant raises matters not rationally within Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/26/2025 DATE OF COMPLETION: 10/07/25 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to properly investigate.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF/W

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/30/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/16/2025

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF/W

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/01/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/30/25

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers used unnecessary or excessive force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officers grabbed her around the throat and forced her onto a hospital bed, causing bruising to her neck.

The complainant failed to provide evidence of the bruising on request and did not respond to further contact.

The named officers stated that they transported the complainant along with medics due to her making inappropriate comments to the medics. The named officers stated that they entered the hospital, handed the complainant over to medical professionals and then left. The named officers deny using any force on the complainant.

SFPD documents showed that the complainant was transported to the hospital. There is no mention of any use of force.

Body camera footage showed the officers assisting in transporting the complainant to the hospital. The complainant can be seen and heard being inappropriate with the medics. The body cameras are turned off before the named officer entered the hospital which is in line with Department policy.

The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/01/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/09/25 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/IAD

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Police Department
Internal Affairs Division
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/03/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/08/25 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/DEM

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

Division of Emergency Communications
Department of Emergency Management
1011 Turk Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/06/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/25

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 1: The officer behaved inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that she called the police regarding an incident. She alleged that one of the responding officers had an attitude and was aggressive, having a chip on his shoulder.

Department records showed that the named officer and his partner were dispatched to the complainant's apartment regarding a petty theft. The officers prepared an incident report, documenting the theft of the complainant's inhaler.

The named officer's body-worn camera (BWC) did not support the complainant's allegation against the named officer. The BWC showed the complainant being frustrated with the named officer when he was trying to get her to stay on topic.

The evidence proves that the alleged misconduct did not occur.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/07/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/16/25

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters not rationally within DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-2

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters not rationally within DPA's jurisdiction.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/09/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/16/25 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: IO-1

FINDING: Referral/IAD

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was referred in full to:

SFPD Internal Affairs Division
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/11/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/21/2025 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/DEM

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

Division of Emergency Communications
Department of Emergency Management
1011 Turk Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/16/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/21/25 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/DEM

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

Division of Emergency Communications
Department of Emergency Management
1011 Turk Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/16/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/21/25 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/IAD

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Police Department
Internal Affairs Division
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/22/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/25 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters not rationally within DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-2

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters not rationally within DPA's jurisdiction.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/22/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/25 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/IAD

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Police Department
Internal Affairs Division
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/29/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 10/23/2025

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer improperly touched an adult in a sexual manner.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: NF/W

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer solicited sexual acts.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: NF/W

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint.