

Para.	Paragraph Provision	IMR-18-01	IMR-18-02	IMR-18-06	IMR-18-07	IMR-18-08	IMR-18-03	IMR-18-09	IMR-18-04	IMR-18-10	IMR-18-05
41	Report UoF, prisoner injury, or UoF allegation	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
41	Report knowledge of UoF by another officer	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
42	Officer provides UoF narrative to reviewer	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
42a	Detailed account from officer's perspective	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
42b	The reason for initial police presence	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
42c	Specific description of acts leading to the UoF	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
42d	The level of resistance encountered	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A ¹	Y
42e	Description & justification for each UoF used (no boilerplate language)	Y	Y	Y	Y ²	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
43	Failure to report UoF or prisoner injury shall result in discipline	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
44	Request medical services after UoF (injury or complaint of injury)	N/A	Y ³	Y ⁴	Y	Y	N/A	N/A ⁵	N/A	N/A	N/A
44	Safest & most direct route to the medical facility - using APD vehicle	N/A	Y	N/A	Y ⁶	Y ⁷	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A
44 ⁸	Notify of the starting / ending mileage of APD vehicle	N/A	Y	N/A	Y	Y	Y	Y ⁹	N/A	N/A	N/A
46 ¹⁰	Specifies the three levels of UoF cases, complies w/ law, policy, best practices	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

¹ In this event the show of force involved a show of force with a firearm, and a deceased subject lying on a living room couch of a residence. There was a firearm in the subject's left hand. At the time of the show of force, the officer was not certain that the subject was deceased, so out of an abundance of caution he pointed his firearm. The subject died from a self-inflicted wound before officers made entry to the home.

² Officers utilized a grappler device on a fleeing stolen vehicle and the vehicle subsequently crashed.

³ Despite no visible or stated injuries, paramedics responded to the scene, but the subject refused any treatment. The subject was eventually transported to the hospital as a result of his mental status.

⁴ Despite no visible or stated injuries, and no criminal arrest, paramedics responded to the scene to transfer this subject to a hospital for a mental health evaluation.

⁵ Subject was arrested and transported to the hospital for evaluation due to his level of intoxication. The reported use of force event occurred at the hospital.

⁶ One subject was transported to the hospital by ambulance and another subject was transported to the hospital by APD personnel.

⁷ Despite being examined at the scene by paramedics, the subject eventually complained of shoulder pain and officers subsequently transported the subject to the hospital. The subject was medically cleared and transported to jail.

⁸ Paragraph 45 is not evaluated in this chart.

⁹ The investigating detective failed to include milage in their investigation, however, the initial responding supervisor properly documented the information.

¹⁰ Paragraph 47 is not evaluated in this chart.

48	Implementation of the three levels of UoF cases	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
49	Correct assignment of UoF (e.g., reviewer, IAFD, MATF, etc.)	Y ¹¹	Y ¹²	Y	Y ¹³	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
50	Supervisor shall respond to all UoF for UoF classification	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
50	Supervisor shall ensure FIS notified/dispatched to L2/3 UoF	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y ¹⁴	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
50	Supervisor provides written order indicating involved and witness officers to not speak about force incident	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
51	Supervisors involved in a UoF shall not review the incident or reports	Y	Y	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	Y
52	All reviewers of Level 1 UoF shall:										
52a	a) Respond to scene & immediately ID involved officer(s)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
52b	b) Review involved officer's OBRD to determine if it is a Level 1 UoF	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y ¹⁵	Y ¹⁶	Y
52c	c) Review OBRDs of other officers on-scene where uncertainty exists	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A
52d	d) Examine officers & subject for injuries & request med. attention	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
52e	e) Contact IAFD for a L2/L3 invest. if OBRD doesn't affirm a L1 UoF	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
52f	f) Gather any evidence located at the scene of the UoF	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
52g	g) Capture photos of the officer(s) and subject involved in the UoF	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

¹¹ A lieutenant utilized a show of force with an ECW, thus the review of this case was appropriately handled by IAFD.

¹² A lieutenant utilized a show of force with an ECW, thus the review of this case was appropriately handled by IAFD.

¹³ IAFD opined that officer use of a grapppler device does not constitute a use of force. IAFD still retained the case and investigated a show of force with a rifle. The IMT will discuss the mechanics of the grapppler device with APD personnel.

¹⁴ IAFD was summoned to the scene, but ultimately determined this was a Level 1 use of force matter.

¹⁵ The officer who used the ECW as a show of force could not connect their OBRD for review at the scene. The supervisor reviewed the OBRD of another officer at the scene to make the initial classification. The involved officer's OBRD was connected and reviewed later when SOD returned from the scene.

¹⁶ The investigating detective did not review the involved officers body camera upon arrival at the scene. However, the initial supervisor on the scene did review the officers body camera when making an initial classification assessment. During the course of the review of the investigation a commander noted the detective's error.

52h	h) Require submission of UoF report from involved officers	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
52i	i) Conduct any other fact-gathering activities on-scene	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y ¹⁷
53	Reviewer shall complete /document review within one week	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y ¹⁸	Y	Y
53	Extensions of one week deadline must be auth. by a Commander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A
53	Reviews shall include:										
53a	All written / recorded UoF narratives or statements	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
53b	Review of relevant OBRD video	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
53c	Documentation of all evidence including witness information	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N ¹⁹	Y	Y	Y
53c	State if there are no known witnesses	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	Y	N/A	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
53c	State why information from witnesses was not collected	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
53c	All identifying info. for persons refusing to provide a statement	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
53d	Names of all other APD employees witnessing the UoF	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A
53e	Supervisor's narrative evaluating the UoF based on evidence	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y ²⁰	Y
53e	Determination of officer's actions complying with law & APD policy	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
53e	Tactical/Training assessment & if de-escalation could avoid UoF	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y	Y	Y

¹⁷ The suspect in this case was released from custody prior to the supervisor completing each task at the scene, because the victim initially declined to prosecute. However, the victim changed their mind and the supervisor was later able to inspect the subject for injuries and have photographs taken. This issue was documented in the chain of command review. A handwritten statement was taken from a civilian witness but included no information regarding the witness's observation of the use of force. APD should ensure that civilian witness statements are not conducted in a pro forma manner, and instead are used to collect relevant information to the use of force under investigation. In this case, the failure did not impact the formulation of proper investigation findings.

¹⁸ An extension request was made to extend the deadline for submission of the investigation.

¹⁹ The initial responding sergeant indicated that he could not obtain witness statements from hospital security guards that had reportedly left for the evening. One civilian witness statement was taken, but there is no evidence in the investigation that attempts were made to contact the security officers at a later time. The fact that there were additional potential witnesses not interviewed was not indicated in the detective's report.

²⁰ We note that the quality of documented narrative in the detective's Level 1 investigation was of a lesser quality than others we reviewed. We recommend APD review this case for potential areas of improvement.

53f	Documentation of policy / training / equipment / tactical concerns	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	N/A	Y ²¹	Y ²²
54	Forwarding review to unit supervisor to ensure complete and PoE	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y ²³	Y	Y	Y
54	Unit supervisor shall order additional review when appropriate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
54	Reviews shall be completed electronically & tracked in IA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
55	Unit supervisors or Commanders responsible for the accuracy/completeness of reviews	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
56	Appropriate intervention for repeated deficient reviews	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y ²⁴	Y ²⁵
56	IA notified Immediately when UoF indicates apparent criminal act	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
56	IA shall immediately initiate admin. & criminal invest	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
57	Complete UoF review - file shall be forwarded to Compliance and Oversight Division and periodically conduct audits	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
58	L1 reviews may be assigned at the discretion of the Chief	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
58	Assignment of L1 reviews shall be explained in writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
59	Bureau of Police Reform shall ensure appropriate action for policy violations	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

²¹ A supervisor noted in his review that the investigating detective failed to properly review the involved officer's OBRD, or articulate a full justification.

²² While a notation is made within the chain of command review regarding the need for the supervisor to alert their team that subjects of uses of force should be held for investigation of that force, there is no evidence of the information being captured in any APD system for future reference (I.e. EIS to identify patterns of performance).

²³ Command review indicated there were investigative shortcomings that were addressed through verbal counseling. However, there is no indication that the detective was ordered to locate and interview the hospital security guards noted in the responding sergeant's report. This footnote applies to additional paragraph requirements.

²⁴ We noted two cases involving the same detective with deficiencies in their investigations. The quality of investigations by this detective warrants oversight by APD to ensure performance deficiencies do not impact compliance in later monitoring periods.

²⁵ As noted above, investigative deficiencies were noted in the investigation, but there is no evidence that the information was documented in APD's EIS for future reference. In past reporting periods, the monitoring team observed many instances when within a use of force investigation there were deficiencies, there would be notations that could not be aggregated from an EIS for supervisory purposes.

