

Annual Report of the Independent Review Committee for the University of Chicago Police Department

December 2020

Appointed by the University of Chicago, the Independent Review Committee (IRC) for the Police Department (UCPD) examines complaints of abusive language, dereliction of duty, excessive force, or violation of rights brought against UCPD by members of the University of Chicago (University) community and the public UCPD serves.

Accordingly, the IRC includes members from the community as well as University faculty, staff, and students. This Committee reviews UCPD's internal investigations and then reports its findings and recommendations to the Provost, President, Vice President & General Counsel and the community at large via an annual report posted on UCPD's website. Additional information about the IRC and its mission are available at https://safety-security.uchicago.edu/police/contact_the_ucpd/complaint_process/.

This Annual Report details the IRC's work and analyses regarding complaints against the UCPD for the 2019–2020 academic year.

I. The Complaint Review Process

UCPD adheres to University policies and extensive departmental rules and regulations, called General Orders, stipulating professional police conduct. Decades ago, the University established the IRC to provide serious and thoughtful review of citizen complaints to improve UCPD processes and overall policing. The procedure for filing and investigating such complaints is as follows:

1. A member of the University community or other community member who is dissatisfied with UCPD may call the dispatcher at 773.702.8181 and ask to speak with the Watch Commander or the supervisor on duty, or may make a formal complaint by completing a Compliments & Complaints Form, available at https://safety-security.uchicago.edu/police/contact_the_ucpd/complaint_form/. Students at the University may seek assistance from a representative of the Office of Campus and Student Life by calling 773.702.7770. Community members needing assistance may contact the Office of Civic Engagement at 773.834.8057.
2. Each complaint is assigned to the Executive Director for Campus Safety for investigation. Once the complainant signs an affidavit concerning the factual basis of the complaint, the complainant and other relevant concerned parties will have the opportunity to be interviewed by the Executive Director in connection with the investigation.
3. After the investigation is completed, the investigation and findings are reviewed by supervisors through the chain of command within UCPD. During the 2019–20 academic year, the Associate Vice President for Safety & Security reviewed every investigation and made the final decision with respect to the investigative findings and any discipline imposed.
4. The complainant receives a written response from the Associate Vice President to explain the findings and any disciplinary action taken as a result of a sustained complaint. The possible findings are:
 - *Unfounded*: The allegations are not factually accurate, or the alleged conduct did not occur.
 - *Exonerated*: The alleged conduct did occur, but it was justified under the circumstances.
 - *Sustained*: The alleged conduct did occur, and it was not justified under the circumstances.
 - *Not Sustained*: The written record of the investigation does not support a determination of whether the alleged conduct occurred. A classification of Not Sustained is used where a case involves conflicting stories that are not clearly resolvable on the basis of evidence presented.
 - *Administratively Closed*: No investigation was completed due to the fact that the complainant: (i) did not sign an affidavit for the investigation to proceed, a requirement of the State of Illinois for a complaint investigation (except in an instance of alleged serious or criminal violation) or (ii) otherwise failed to cooperate with the investigation.
5. For complaints relating directly or indirectly to issues of excessive force, violation of rights, abusive language, or dereliction of duty, the investigative report is submitted to the IRC for review. The

purpose of the IRC and a description can be found at the University's website at <https://csl.uchicago.edu/node/130380>.

6. As noted above, the IRC annually reports its findings and recommendations to the Provost, President, and Vice President & General Counsel as well as to the public. This report, summarizing all incidents reviewed and recommending changes to policies and procedures, is available to the public via the University's website at https://safety-security.uchicago.edu/police/contact_the_ucpd/complaint_process/.

II. Complaint Summaries and IRC Case Reviews

Sixteen complaints were filed against UCPD officers by members of the University community and the public during the 2019–20 academic year. The IRC reviewed twelve that fell within its above-described purview. (See Figure 1.) This report summarizes each case. UCPD's determination follows each summary, after which the IRC's evaluation of UCPD's determination and investigatory procedures appears. The IRC then provides its analysis or recommendation.

CR 2019-04

Case Summary: Traffic accident. Accused officer 1 was dispatched to the scene; officer 2 arrived later. The first allegation is that officer 1 inaccurately told complainant that he could not take photos of the scene for insurance. Accused officer 1 said he was required to give a "failure to reduce speed" citation as a "catch-all" citation in addition to a citation for blocking the intersection. Complainant may have seen these as conflicting citations. The second allegation is that officer 1 did not allow the complainant to explain his side of the story. The third allegation is that officer 1 did not ask if the complainant or his daughter (the passenger in complainant's car) needed medical assistance. The complainant began participating in the investigation process, including being interviewed. The complainant withdrew his complaint via email without saying why. All allegations were administratively closed.

Allegations: 1) Officer 1 provided inaccurate information; 2) Officer 1 did not allow complainant to explain his side of the story; 3) Officer 1 did not inquire if complainant or his passenger needed medical attention

- **IRC Response to Allegation:**

- *UCPD deemed all allegations administratively closed, and the IRC agrees.*
- *The Committee wondered why the complaint was withdrawn. It would be helpful to know why complaints are withdrawn; perhaps that information could be gathered through a form that complainants can use.*
- *The Committee noted that the investigation process took a long time.*
- *Officer 1 might benefit from additional trauma-informed practices training.*
- *It is good that the close-out letters to complainants now state that information from a complaint without a sworn affidavit may be used for training even if a case is administratively closed.*

CR 2019-05

Case Summary: UCPD received a report that the complainant, a University staff member, had taken a University vehicle from campus against department policy. The accused UCPD officers stopped the complainant near his home and reclaimed the University vehicle. The complainant claimed that the accused UCPD officers used excessive force during the stop, including drawing their weapons and aiming at his head. The allegation was deemed unfounded.

- **Allegation:** Complainant alleged that accused UCPD Officers used excessive force (drawing guns, pointing them at his head) in stopping him to take possession of a vehicle belonging to the University.

- **IRC Response to Allegation:**

- *The IRC agrees with UCPD's finding of unfounded. The IRC viewed the available video and did not find any evidence to support the allegation.*
- *Video available to IRC did not include the initial stop by the first two officers on the scene; those officers turned on their body cameras after their initial contact with the complainant. The UCPD investigator recommended bodycam training for the two accused officers.*
- *The IRC questioned whether UCPD is allowed to engage in business so far from campus. Jurisdiction may follow University property, but the stop was outside the UCPD's geographical bounds. It needs to be made clearer what the UCPD powers are outside of the boundary.*
- *The accused officers patted the complainant down because they had received prior information that the complainant might be armed. It would be helpful for the committee to see the bulletin that officers referred to containing that allegation. It would also be helpful to know the policy articulation of when a pat-down is warranted.*

CR 2019-06

Case Summary: Complainant asserted that his car broke down while he was transporting three passengers from a youth program to a restaurant for dinner. He parked in a tow zone with hazard lights flashing. The accused UCPD officer approached the passenger side of the car and asked the complainant (driver) to step out. The accused officer said he approached the car because the passengers' use of cell phones and robberies in the area made him suspicious. The case was administratively closed due to the lack of a signed affidavit.

- **Allegation:** The complainant alleged that the accused UCPD officer racially profiled him.
- **IRC Response to Allegation:**
 - *UCPD found the allegation administratively closed, and the IRC agrees.*
 - *Better connections with youth in the neighborhood could help reduce UCPD's suspicion and avoid allegations of racial profiling.*
 - *The accused officer (who no longer works at UCPD) did not approach the situation with a service mentality, but instead "grilled" the driver and passengers. The IRC suggested that the accused officer could have instead started the interaction with, "How can I help you?" to de-escalate a tense situation, and asked if UCPD has a protocol for engaging with community members who have car trouble.*
 - *The IRC asked for information about UCPD's progress in reducing racial profiling allegations, including details of relevant training.*

CR 2019-08

Case Summary: UCPD officers responded to a call from a Doc Films volunteer working a film screening at Ida Noyes Hall about a report by one filmgoer that another filmgoer was masturbating in the theater. The volunteer asked UCPD to remove the accused patron (the complainant in this case) from the building. UCPD officers asked the complainant to leave. Complainant showed officers his Doc Films pass, told them that he was a regular patron of the film screenings (corroborated by Doc Films volunteers), denied the allegation, and said that he thought his accuser was unhappy that he was using his phone during the movie. He asked who called in the complaint and asked to talk with the person, but officers declined to give him that information. After a short wait outside the building with two officers, a third UCPD officer presented the complainant with a criminal trespass warning (signed by the sergeant, who was offsite), and advised the complainant that he was banned from campus indefinitely and would be subject to arrest should he return. The officer also presented the

complainant with written information on how to appeal the ban.

- **Allegation:** The complainant alleged that the accused UCPD sergeant issued complainant a campus-wide criminal trespass warning without justification or cause.
- **IRC Response to Allegation:**
 - *UCPD found the allegation exonerated. The IRC agreed, but noted that additional evidence would have been helpful in making a more thorough determination. The purview of the IRC is only to review the UCPD's actions regarding a criminal trespass warning. A robust and separate, independent appeals process exists after the fact of a campus ban to determine whether the ban itself is ultimately justified.*
 - *In this case, the police officer was reasonable to issue the warning based on testimony that the alleged activity was "a violation of University policy" or "reasonably be deemed to be threatening, disruptive, violent, or criminal." The officer heard the complaint's conflicting testimony and had to make a judgment, which was reasonable under the circumstances. There were immediate safety concerns to the patron at stake. The accused officers' conduct (demeanor, courtesy) was also unimpeachable.*
 - *That said, questions and concerns arose about how the campus trespass policy is put into practice. Bans seem to be issued immediately, with an appeals process that may be onerous. UCPD policy mentions that UCPD may issue a campus ban "after a determination has been made," but it is not clear to IRC who in this case made the determination, the Doc Films volunteers or the UCPD, or who is authorized to make such a determination. For example, the officers' actions here seemed to be based solely on information from Doc Films staff members/volunteers; officers did not appear to interview the complaining patron or other patrons who offered to give testimony as witnesses. The accused sergeant who issued the ban asked no probing questions (from evidence in the documents shared with the IRC) and was not on the scene. An officer talking with Doc Films volunteers asked if they would like to ban the alleged offender but offered no other options.*
 - *Members agreed, however, that the University has a right to remove people from campus, which is private property. Once again, they also noted that a robust and separate, independent appeals process exists after the fact of a campus ban to determine whether the ban itself is ultimately justified. That process affords the complainant further opportunity to contest the basis of the ban itself.*

CR 2019-09

Case Summary: A UCPD officer pulled over a vehicle and approached from the passenger side. The complainant, a UChicago student, used profanity and expressed disbelief that the accused officer had jurisdiction. The situation escalated verbally. The accused officer placed the complainant under arrest forcefully, pushing the complainant to the ground. The complainant attested that his wrist, which was healing from a previous injury, was further injured in the process.

- **Allegation:** The complainant alleged that the accused officer 1) used excessive force while placing complainant in custody; 2) was unprofessional in not explaining or defining his authority as a law enforcement officer.
- **IRC Response to Allegation:**
 - *UCPD found the first allegation exonerated and the second unfounded. The IRC agrees.*

- *The accused officer appropriately used a wrist lock to take the actively resisting (arms flailing) complainant into custody, and relinquished the wrist lock when he gained compliance from the complainant. The officer had other means at his disposal to achieve compliance, such as pepper spray and a stun gun, but used a less restrictive method. The committee believes the force was reasonable “based on the totality of the circumstances to perform a lawful task, effect an arrest, overcome resistance, control a subject, or protect themselves or others from injury.” The complainant was belligerent, insulting, and non-cooperative. He engaged in behaviors that were reckless in the context of being detained by an officer of the law, such as reaching into his pockets to retrieve a snack after the officer asked him to put his hands on the car (The accused officer noted that he thought the complainant might have been reaching for a weapon.) and starting to give the accused officer his license and then quickly taking it back. He repeatedly insulted the accused officer and threatened the officer’s job. He could have listened when the accused officer attempted to explain his authority, and could have complied when asked to hand over his license.*
- *The committee also believes, however, that both parties could have engaged differently to avoid escalation. The accused officer threatened to send the complainant to jail very near the beginning of the interaction. He could have been more patient with the complainant in explaining his authority. In addition to stating his authority verbally, the accused officer might have offered his business card or the “Who We Are” informational post card to the complainant initially, and given the complainant time to review before proceeding. The complainant testified to the UCPD investigator that if he had seen “with full policing powers” in writing, as it appears on the post card, he would have been compliant with the accused officer’s requests.*
- *The accused officer did have jurisdiction in the situation. He stated such to the complainant, who simply did not believe him (without foundation).*
- *UCPD might consider additional ways to inform students about their role and powers. (The postcard is helpful, but it is not distributed widely.)*

CR 2019-10

Case Summary: A UCPD officer responded to a complaint from a local postal worker about a dog off leash. When the accused officer arrived on the scene, the dog ran toward him. The complainant alleged that the accused officer threatened to shoot her dog; she characterized the officer’s words as “unwarranted, irresponsible, intimidating, and excessive.”

- **Allegation:** The complainant alleged that the accused UCPD officer threatened to shoot complainant’s dog.
- **IRC Response to Allegation:**
 - *UCPD found the allegation unfounded, and the IRC agrees. The IRC viewed the available video and did not find any evidence to support the allegation. The accused officer said, “I don’t want to shoot your dog.”*
 - *The accused officer could have used different language (his hypothetical scenario of the dog attacking a baby may have escalated the situation), but his words were not the threat that the complainant alleged.*

CR 2019-11

Case Summary: No committee members could access the video. All discussion was based on the written records. Officer 1 pulled over the complainant because he was driving with headlights off. The interaction was

going smoothly. Officer 2 arrived; the complainant claimed he was rude and unprofessional. Officer 2 arrested the complainant on suspicion of driving while intoxicated and took the complainant to a facility for substance testing. The record indicates that the complainant may have ingested marijuana, but not cocaine; it was unclear if alcohol was involved. The complainant had interactions with Officer 2 at the arrest scene and also while being held awaiting test results. The case was closed because there was no signed affidavit from the complainant.

- **Allegation:** The complainant alleged that the accused UCPD officer was rude and unprofessional.
- **IRC Response to Allegation:**
 - *UCPD found the allegations administratively closed, and the IRC agrees.*
 - *The IRC noted a trend with officer 2 of rude and unprofessional behavior. The officer no longer works at UCPD.*

CR 2019-12

Case Summary: A vehicle/pedestrian accident happened near 57th Street and Ellis Avenue. An ambulance, fire truck, and two UCPD squad cars were at the scene, causing a traffic blockage. Two officers were directing traffic. The accused officer allegedly became frustrated when the complainant, a driver attempting to maneuver through the intersection, did not follow his directions. The driver had previously received different directions from the other officer. The accused officer allegedly called the driver a “f---ing idiot” as the accused officer went to move one of the UCPD squad cars. The accused officer also allegedly mumbled to himself, “J--- C---, these f---ing people.” The accused officer then allegedly told the driver, “I’ll remember your tags.” The accused officer later allegedly got into a verbal altercation with a CTA bus driver, telling her, “I’ll report your number.” The complaint was sustained, and the officer was given a one-day suspension and required to take remedial training.

- **Allegation:** The complainant alleged that the accused UCPD officer was rude and unprofessional.
- **IRC Response to Allegation:**
 - *UCPD found the allegation sustained, and the IRC agrees.*
 - *The scene was chaotic, and the accused officer’s frustration was understandable. However, he should have been able to handle the situation more professionally.*
 - *The accused officer mentioned at one point that his “patience is wearing thin,” showing awareness of his distressed state, yet he refused three offers of assistance from colleagues at the scene. A stress management class might be helpful.*
 - *Statements by the accused officer to the complainant and the CTA bus driver could be perceived as threatening and an abuse of power. The accused officer’s referring to a woman officer as “doll” was also unprofessional and inappropriate.*
 - *Better traffic management to route vehicles away from the intersection could have helped, as could traffic protocols and additional training that could help officers coordinate better (not issue contradictory instructions to drivers).*

CR 2020-02

Case Summary: The complainant, a paraplegic (paralyzed from waist down) patient at the University of Chicago Medical Center wanted to file a complaint against a nurse’s assistant who he says twisted his hand. The accused officer who came to take the complaint did not believe an assault took place. An accused sergeant was

called in and agreed with the accused officer that no assault took place. The nurse's assistant had grabbed his hand to keep from being hurt as the complainant swung his arms wildly, according to the nurse's assistant and a nurse who witnessed the event. Staff said the complainant had exhibited aggressive behaviors and they had sought a psychiatric evaluation of the complainant. The complainant's disability kept him from signing an affidavit while he was in the medical center. He promised to follow up with UCPD upon his discharge but did not. UCPD tried following up but could not reach the complainant post-discharge. The case was administratively closed.

- **Allegation:** The complainant alleged that the accused UCPD officers refused to file a criminal report after the complainant reported being victim of a battery.
- **IRC Response to Allegation:**
 - *UCPD found the allegation administratively closed, and the IRC agrees.*
 - *IRC could not determine if the facts of the case were true, as there was no report or investigation.*
 - *Although officers may have discretion in whether or not to file a report, if a person is insistent on making a report, members of the IRC felt that UCPD officers should oblige.*

CR 2020-03

Case Summary: The complainant, a former UChicago student, called the UCPD station asking what their hours are. She allegedly was told they are always open. She came to the station, and it was allegedly closed. She called again to clarify. An officer was sent to her. The complainant tried to explain why she was at the station. The accused officer allegedly explained what he could do for her, gave her his card, and said he would make "notes." There was no sworn affidavit, so the case was administratively closed. The complainant requested that cases 2020-03, 2020-05, and 2020-06, all of which she filed, be closed.

Allegation: The complainant alleged that the accused officer (1) was not responsive to complainant's answers to her questions, and (2) attempted to deny the complainant proof that she reported an incident to him.

- **IRC Response to Allegation:**
 - *UCPD found the allegations administratively closed, and the IRC agrees.*
 - *Communication between the accused officer and complainant failed. Crisis training could have shown a better way for the accused officer to explain what the UCPD could do for the complainant.*

CR 2020-05

Case Summary: The issue was between the complainant and a couple regarding children in a swim class. There were concerns of racial bias. The complainant allegedly was told to meet police, but officers were not where they told her to meet them. There was no sworn affidavit, so the case was administratively closed. The complainant requested that cases 2020-03, 2020-05, and 2020-06, all of which she filed, be closed.

- **Allegation:** The complainant alleged that UCPD informed her that she needed to get her three children from the pool area as their swimming lessons ended. When she arrived, no officers were present.
- **IRC Response to Allegation:**
 - *UCPD found the allegations administratively closed, and the IRC agrees.*

- *The complainant and the accused officer were both very upset. De-escalation/crisis training would have been helpful.*

CR 2020-06

Case Summary: The complainant alleged that she was not informed of a UCPD officer’s body camera being on and did not give consent to be recorded. The interaction took place in her apartment lobby and in her apartment, where she had a reasonable expectation of privacy. The UCPD investigator noted that video footage showed that the accused officers neglected to give the “required warning” to the complainant as outlined in general order 529 Officer-Worn Body Cameras, Section 529.7: “The officer must provide notice of recording to any person if the person has a reasonable expectation of privacy and proof of notice must be evident in the recording. If exigent circumstances exist which prevent the officer from providing notice, notice must be provided as soon as practicable.” There was no sworn affidavit, however, so the case was administratively closed. The complainant requested that cases 2020-03, 2020-05, and 2020-06, all of which she filed, be closed.

Allegation: The complainant alleged that the accused UCPD officer did not inform complainant that his body camera was on and that she was being recorded, and did not ask her consent.

- **IRC Response to Allegation:**

- *UCPD found the allegations administratively closed, and the IRC agrees.*

III. IRC Analysis of UCPD Complaint Data

A. Since March of 2005, there have been 183 cases of complaint against UCPD. Forty-eight were internal investigations outside the purview of the IRC. The number of complaints under the purview of the IRC totals 135. All of the following are cumulative numbers, not percentages, since March of 2005:

Gender of complainant¹:

Female	53
Male	86
Unknown	1

Race of complainant:

Black	93
White	22
Asian	5
Hispanic	1
Unknown	19

Status of complainant:

Community	101
Students	17
Staff/Faculty/Academic Appointee/Postdoctoral Researcher	17
Alumni	5
Unknown	10

¹ The total number of complainants differs from the total number of citizen complaints because some complaints have more than one complainant. Some complainants also have more than one complaint.

*Race of the officer*²:

Black	93
White	60
Hispanic	15
Asian	2
Unknown	2

*Charges*³:

Violation of rights	102
Excessive force	43
Abusive language	43
Dereliction of duty ⁴	48
Intimidating conduct	8
Disrespectful/rude behavior	5

*Findings*⁵:

Not sustained	85
Unfounded	81
Sustained	73
Exonerated	17
Administratively Closed ⁶	52

Officers with multiple complaints:

7 complaints	1 officer (no longer employed by UCPD)
6 complaints	2 officer
5 complaints	6 officers
4 complaints	4 officers
3 complaints	5 officers
2 complaints	19 officers

B. The complaints tallied here constitute complaints since 2005 against officers who were employed by UCPD for all or part of the period March 6, 2019 through March 6, 2020:

Officers with multiple complaints:

7 complaints	1 officer (no longer employed by UCPD)
6 complaints	2 officers
5 complaints	3 officers
4 complaints	3 officers
3 complaints	4 officers
2 complaints	6 officers

² Some complaints contain allegations against multiple officers.

³ These figures reflect allegations not cases; that is, a single case may have multiple allegations. These figures represent only the allegations in cases reviewed by the IRC.

⁴ The following have been combined in this category: “failure to serve professionally,” “unprofessional conduct,” “failure to serve,” “bad driving,” and “sleeping on the job.”

⁵ The tabulation of findings includes internal investigations as well as public complaints. The data includes the outcomes of the former but not the charges. Further, some allegations refer to more than one accused officer, resulting in more than one finding.

⁶ “Administratively Closed” includes findings of “Complaint Terminated.”

Members of the IRC 2019–20

[\(https://safety-security.uchicago.edu/police/contact the ucpd/complaint process/\)](https://safety-security.uchicago.edu/police/contact-the-ucpd/complaint-process/)

Jennifer Nou, *Professor of Law, Law School and IRC Chair*

Erin Adams, *Joseph Regenstein Professor, Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology and the College*

Bennie Currie, *Community Member*

Jean Decety, *Irving B. Harris Distinguished Service Professor, Department of Psychology and the College*

Ingrid Gould, *Associate Provost and Staff to IRC*

Teresa Kilbane, *Community Member*

Mike McGroarty, *Graduate Student in the Harris School of Public Policy (graduated)*

Elizabeth Shanin, *Senior Associate General Counsel, Office of Legal Counsel*

Tamara Smith, *Assistant Director and Staff Support*

Malay Trivedi, *Student in the College*

Daniel Urbina-McCarthy, *Graduate Student in the Chicago Booth School of Business (graduated)*

Belinda Cortez Vazquez, *Associate Dean of Students, Office of Campus and Student Life*

Steven Washington, *Community Member*

Figure 1. Complaints Reviewed by the Independent Review Committee, 2019-20								
CR Number	Filing Date	Decision Date	Gender of Complainant	Race of Complainant	Allegation	UCPD Disposition	IRC Disposition	
2019-04	26-Mar-20	17-Apr-20	M	B	1. Officer gave inaccurate information to complainant regarding an accident, 2. officer did not allow complainant to fully explain his side of the story regarding the incident, 3. officer did not inquire if complainant or his daughter (passenger) needed medical attention.	Administratively Closed	Administratively Closed	
2019-05	2-Jul-20	9-Aug-20	M	unk.	Officers used excessive force.	Administratively Closed	Administratively Closed	
2019-06	8-Jul-19	9-Aug-20	M	B	Officer racially profiled complainant.	Administratively Closed	Administratively Closed	
2019-08	26-Aug-19	23-Sep-19	M	W	Sergeant issued campus-wide criminal trespass warning without justification.	Exonerated	Not enough information	
2019-09	28-Aug-19	7-Oct-19	M	W	1. Officer used excessive force when placing complainant in custody, 2. Officer was unprofessional, did not explain or define his authority.	1. Exonerated, 2. unfounded	1. Exonerated, 2. unfounded	
2019-10	9-Sep-20	17-Sep-20	F	W	Officer threatened to shoot complainant's dog.	Unfounded	Unfounded	
2019-11	16-Oct-19	29-Oct-19	M	B	Officer was rude and unprofessional during a traffic stop.	Administratively Closed	Administratively Closed	
2019-12	21-Nov-19	30-Dec-19	M	B	Officer displayed rude and unprofessional behavior, used profane language.	Sustained	Sustained	
2020-02	27-Jan-20	9-Mar-20	M	B	Officer and sergeant refused to file criminal report after complainant reported being victim of a battery.	Administratively Closed	Administratively Closed	
2020-03	5-Mar-20	16-Apr-20	F	W	1. Officer was not responsive to complainant's answers to his questions, 2. Officer attempted to deny the complainant proof that she reported an incident to him.	Administratively Closed	Administratively Closed	
2020-05	9-Mar-20	20-Apr-20	F	W	Complainant was told that she needed to get her 3 children from the pool area as their swimming lessons had ended, and when she arrived at the agreed location no officers were present.	Administratively Closed	Administratively Closed	
2020-06	9-Mar-20	20-Apr-20	F	W	Officer did not inform complainant that his body camera was on or that she was being recorded; he did not ask her consent.	Administratively Closed	Administratively Closed	