



DENVER
The Mile High City

*Police and Sheriff
Discipline and Critical Incident Report*

First Quarter 2012

Office of the
Independent Monitor



TABLE OF CONTENTS

DENVER[®]
THE MILE HIGH CITY

Chapter 1: Critical Incident Report

Introduction and Overview	1 - 3
DPD Investigation and Review Protocol	1 - 4
DPD Shooting Cases Pending at End of the Quarter	1 - 5
DPD In-Custody Death Cases Pending at End of the Quarter	1 - 5
DPD Shooting & In-Custody Death Cases Closed During the Quarter	1 - 6
DSD In-Custody Death Investigation and Review Protocol	1 - 8
DSD In-Custody Death Cases Pending at End of the Quarter	1 - 9
DSD In-Custody Death Cases Closed During the Quarter	1 - 9

Chapter 2: DPD New Complaints, Sustained Findings, and Discipline

New Complaints by Month Received	2 - 3
Internal Affairs Allegations Received by Case Type	2 - 3
Sustained Allegations on Formal Investigations by Month Closed	2 - 4
Denver Police Department Disciplinary Matrix Definitions	2 - 4
Discipline on Sustained Allegations Closed During the Quarter	2 - 5
Selected DPD Commendations Received During the Quarter	2 - 8

Chapter 3: DSD New Complaints, Sustained Findings, and Discipline

New Complaints by Month Received	3 - 3
Internal Affairs (IAB) Allegations by Month Received	3 - 3
Sustained Allegations for IAB Cases by Month Closed	3 - 4
Discipline on Sustained Sheriff Department Reprimands	3 - 4
Discipline on Sustained Internal Affairs Cases	3 - 5
DSD Commendations Received During the Quarter	3 - 6



CRITICAL INCIDENT REPORT

DENVER[®]
THE MILE HIGH CITY

CRITICAL INCIDENT RESPONSE

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

In order to ensure transparency in the investigation and review of critical incidents (officer-involved shootings and in-custody deaths) involving the Denver Police and Sheriff Departments (“Departments”), the Office of the Independent Monitor (“OIM”) submits this report each quarter regarding the status of investigations into these incidents and disciplinary decisions made, if any, by the Departments regarding officer conduct.

In all officer-involved shootings and in-custody deaths, the Denver Police Department (DPD) is initially charged with conducting a criminal investigation to determine whether any person should be held criminally liable for the death or serious bodily injury of any person killed or injured as the result of a law enforcement action. Thus, DPD’s Homicide Unit and the District Attorney’s Office immediately respond to the scene of all critical incidents to commence an investigation. In addition, the OIM generally responds to the scene of critical incidents for a walkthrough (consistent with the constraints of Fourth Amendment privacy rights) and a debriefing from command staff about the incident. Homicide detectives spend considerable time and effort interviewing all witnesses, every involved officer, and obtaining appropriate reports from all involved parties. The OIM monitors all video interviews conducted by the Homicide Unit and is given the opportunity to suggest additional questions to be asked at the conclusion of each interview. After the criminal investigation is complete, the administrative investigation and review process begins.

TIMELINESS

Timeliness of investigations is essential to ensure the integrity of Internal Affairs processes. Timely investigations are beneficial to those employees involved in the administrative review process and uninvolved peers, sending a strong message that adherence to departmental rules, policies, and procedures is important and that employees who violate such rules, policies, and procedures will be held accountable for any wrongdoing. It also affords the Police and Sheriff Departments the opportunity to amend in a timely fashion any of the rules, policies, and procedures for the safety of its officers and for the community in general. Additionally, timely investigations send a message to the public that the Departments adequately police themselves, ensuring the credibility of the administrative and disciplinary processes.

The OIM has established a goal that the DPD and DSD resolve critical incident investigations within six months of the incident. It must be acknowledged, however, that some cases will take longer to complete, due to their complexity or where policy violations are identified and discipline must be imposed.

DENVER POLICE DEPARTMENT

OFFICER-INVOLVED SHOOTING AND IN-CUSTODY DEATH INVESTIGATION AND REVIEW PROTOCOL

In all cases where a Denver police officer intentionally discharges his or her firearm at a person or where a person dies in police custody, the incident is automatically investigated by the Homicide Unit of the Denver Police Department under the supervision of the Denver District Attorney's Office. The investigation is actively monitored by the OIM. The District Attorney's Office and the OIM are both notified as part of the critical incident roll-out protocol. The District Attorney's Office is primarily concerned with determining whether the involved officer(s) committed any violation of the criminal law; the OIM is primarily concerned with potential violations of DPD rules, procedures and policies.

Once the District Attorney has decided whether it will file criminal charges against anyone involved in the incident (including the involved officer(s)), the Homicide Unit's reports are submitted to the DPD Internal Affairs Bureau to commence the administrative investigation to determine whether the involved officers' actions are in violation of any DPD rule, policy, or procedure. The OIM confers with Internal Affairs to determine whether further investigation is necessary from an administrative perspective. Once the administrative investigation is completed, the case is then submitted to a DPD Use-of-Force Board (consisting of the Commander of the Conduct Review Office, two DPD Commanders, and the involved officer's Commander) to determine whether any violations of the DPD's use-of-force policies have occurred. The OIM is present during all Use-of-Force Board proceedings and deliberations.

If the Use-of-Force Board finds that the officer's actions were in compliance with DPD policy ("in-policy"), the case is forwarded to the Chief of Police for his review. If the Chief of Police and the OIM agree there were no policy violations (in non-fatal shootings), the case is closed and no further administrative action is taken. If the incident involves a fatal shooting, the Manager of Safety makes the final determination and issues a public report.

If the Use-of-Force Board finds that the officer's actions were in violation of any Department policy ("out-of-policy"), the Use-of-Force Board then makes a recommendation to the Chief of Police as to whether the officer should be disciplined. The officer is then given the opportunity to respond to the allegations and provide any mitigating statements to the Chief of Police at a "Chief's Hearing" (also known as a pre-disciplinary meeting). The OIM will also make a disciplinary recommendation to the Chief of Police. Both the Chief's recommendation and that of the OIM are forwarded to the Manager of Safety for his or her consideration.

If the Monitor disagrees with a recommendation made by the Use-of-Force Board or the Chief of Police, that recommendation will be forwarded to the Manager of Safety, who is the ultimate decision-maker regarding such issues.

On a quarterly basis and in an Annual Report, which is released by March 15th of each year, the Independent Monitor reports to the public on all disciplinary orders issued by the Manager of Safety and specifically reports if the Monitor believes a decision was unreasonable. Also, within approximately six months of any critical incident, the Manager of Safety issues his or her own public statement on all police shootings resulting in a death or where the shooting has resulted in an injury and has been found to have been "out-of-policy."

**TABLE 1.1
 DPD OFFICER-INVOLVED SHOOTINGS PENDING ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW
 AS OF THE END OF THE FIRST QUARTER 2012**

Date	Summary	Status
January 26, 2012	An off duty officer fired a weapon during an attempted robbery at a local business. The suspects were neither hit nor injured.	<p>Since this was a non-hit shooting, no District Attorney letter is anticipated.</p> <p>The Homicide Bureau has completed its reports and the OIM was reviewing the investigation as of the issuance of this report.</p>

**TABLE 1.2
 DPD IN-CUSTODY DEATH CASES PENDING ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AS OF
 THE END OF THE FIRST QUARTER 2012**

Date	Summary	Status
None		

**TABLE 1.3
OFFICER-INVOLVED SHOOTING AND IN-CUSTODY DEATH CASES CLOSED IN
THE FIRST QUARTER 2012**

Date	Summary	Status
December 4, 2011	An officer shot and injured an individual who attacked the officer with a hammer while the officer was sitting in a patrol car.	<p>On December 20, 2011, the District Attorney issued a decision letter announcing no charges would be filed against the officer. (See www.denverda.org/News_Release/Officer-Involved shooting investigations.htm)</p> <p>The case was reviewed by the Use-of-Force Review Board and the Board found that the shooting was “in policy.” The Monitor concurred in the decision.</p>
December 29, 2011	A suspect in a domestic violence investigation died after jumping from a balcony on the seventh floor of an apartment building as officers entered his residence.	<p>The case was investigated and it was determined that there were no policy violations on the part of the officers. The Monitor concurred with the decision.</p> <p>No District Attorney letter or Manager of Safety letter was issued.</p>
July 18, 2011	A man died after being restrained by Denver Zoo security and Denver Police officers.	<p>A District Attorney decision letter was issued on October 21, 2011, concluding that no criminal charges would be filed against the involved officers. (See www.denverda.org/News_Release/Officer-involved_shooting_investigations.htm).</p> <p>A Use-of-Force Review Board was convened on March 7, 2012, and found the uses of force to be in policy.</p> <p>Homicide Reports were submitted to the Internal Affairs Bureau for review by the Monitor. After careful review of the investigation the Monitor requested further investigation, which was completed by IAB.</p> <p>The Manager of Safety issued a letter stating that the officers acted in accordance with the law, the department’s policies, and their training. The Monitor concurred that the uses of force were in policy.</p>

TABLE 1.3 (CONT.)

Date	Summary	Status
October 4, 2011	An officer shot at a domestic violence suspect at the conclusion of a foot pursuit. The suspect was neither hit nor injured.	No District Attorney letter was issued due to the suspect not being injured. No Manager of Safety letter was issued due to the suspect not being injured.
		The Homicide Bureau's reports were completed and provided to the Monitor by the Internal Affairs Bureau. Upon review of the reports the Monitor made requests for further investigation, which were generally complied with.
		A Use-of-Force Review Board was convened on March 7, 2012, and found the shooting to be "in policy." The Monitor concurred with the Use-of-Force Review Board's assessment.
August 6, 2011	A home invasion robbery suspect was shot and killed by officers after committing a serious assault and discharging a firearm in the presence of a victim. The suspect was confronted by officers after leading them on a high-speed chase. The suspect was shot after pointing a firearm at an officer.	A District Attorney letter was issued on August 19, 2011, and concluded that no criminal charges would be filed against the involved officers. (See www.denverda.org/News_Release/Officer_involved_shooting_investigations.htm).
		A Use-of-Force Review Board convened on October 26, 2011, and found the shooting to be "in policy."
		The Manager of Safety issued a letter on February 13, 2012 after determining that the officers acted in accordance with the law, the department's policies, and their training. Detailed facts are provided in the Manager of Safety's extensive report. The report may be accessed at http://www.denvergov.org/safety/ by clicking on the Public Statements from the Manager of Safety link.
		The Monitor reviewed the case and concurred with the Manager of Safety's assessment.

DENVER SHERIFF DEPARTMENT

IN-CUSTODY DEATH INVESTIGATION AND REVIEW PROTOCOL

In all cases where a person dies while in the custody of the Denver Sheriff Department (DSD), the incident is automatically investigated by the Homicide Unit of the Denver Police Department. The investigation is actively monitored by the OIM. The Sheriff Internal Affairs Bureau and the OIM are notified as part of the critical incident roll-out protocol. If the in-custody death is believed to have been the result of actions by an employee or other inmate, the District Attorney's Office is notified in order to respond to the scene and supervise the criminal investigation. The District Attorney is primarily concerned with determining whether the involved deputies or inmates committed any violation of the criminal law; the OIM is primarily concerned with potential violations of Sheriff Department rules and policies.

Once the District Attorney has made a filing decision (in those cases where an deputy is alleged to have caused a death), the Homicide reports are submitted to the Sheriff Internal Affairs Bureau for its review and handling. The Sheriff Internal Affairs Bureau will usually conduct additional investigation of the incident, as necessary. The OIM monitors any subsequent Internal Affairs investigation to ensure that it is thorough and complete. Once the investigation is deemed complete, it is submitted to the appropriate Division Chief for review and findings.

If the Division Chief finds that the involved deputy's actions were in compliance with Sheriff Department policy ("in-policy"), the case is forwarded to the Director of Corrections ("Director"). If the Director agrees there were no policy violations, the case is closed. The OIM reviews the Division Chief's findings and makes recommendations to the Director and the Manager of Safety.

If the Division Chief, the Director, or the Manager of Safety finds that the involved deputy's actions were in violation of any Department policy ("out-of-policy"), the case is referred to the Director for a "Pre-Disciplinary Hearing." That hearing is attended by the Department's three Division Chiefs and is chaired by the Director of Corrections. The OIM observes the hearing and the deliberations of the Command Staff. At that hearing, the involved deputy is given the opportunity to present his or her side of the story, including any mitigating factors that might exist. After hearing from the involved deputy, the OIM makes disciplinary recommendations to the Director. Both the Director's recommendation and those of the OIM are forwarded to the Manager of Safety for consideration. The Manager of Safety determines whether the deputy's actions were "in-policy" or "out-of-policy" and the appropriate level of discipline, if any.

On a quarterly basis and in an Annual Report, which is released by March 15th of each year, the Independent Monitor reports to the public on all disciplinary orders issued by the Manager of Safety.

**TABLE 1.4
DSD IN-CUSTODY DEATH CASES PENDING ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AT
THE END OF THE FIRST QUARTER 2012**

Date	Summary	Status
February 16, 2012	In-Custody medical death at the Denver Detention Center	The investigation was on-going as of the issuance of this report.

**TABLE 1.5
DSD IN-CUSTODY DEATH CASES
CLOSED IN THE FIRST QUARTER 2012**

Date	Summary	Status
None		



DENVER[®]
THE MILE HIGH CITY

Denver Police

**NEW COMPLAINTS,
SUSTAINED FINDINGS,
AND DISCIPLINE**

DENVER POLICE DEPARTMENT (DPD) COMPLAINTS AND ALLEGATIONS¹

**TABLE 2.1
NEW DPD COMPLAINTS
BY MONTH RECEIVED**

	Jan. 2012	Feb. 2012	Mar. 2012	Total
Citizen	39	28	44	111
Column %	85%	70%	86%	81%
Internal	7	12	7	26
Column %	15%	30%	14%	19%
Total	46	40	51	137

Table 2.1 provides the number of new citizen and internal complaints received during the quarter. Please note that

citizen and internal complaint numbers do not include scheduled discipline cases, such as when a DPD officer violates a traffic law, gets into a preventable traffic accident, or misses a court date, shooting qualification, or continuing education class.

**TABLE 2.2
DPD ALLEGATIONS
RECEIVED**

	Citizen	Internal	Total	Percent
Discourtesy	52	2	54	23%
Improper Procedure-Other	35	12	47	20%
Inappropriate Force	31	1	32	14%
Responsibilities To Serve The Public	28	0	28	12%
Search & Seizure	11	0	11	5%
Giving Name and Badge Number	10	0	10	4%
Failure to Make or File Reports	4	5	9	4%
Biased Policing	6	0	6	3%
Conduct Prejudicial	1	4	5	2%
Impartial Attitude	4	0	4	2%
Critical Incident Review	0	4	4	2%
Sexual Misconduct	2	1	3	1%
Respect for Fellow Officer	0	3	3	1%
Rough Handling of Dept. Property	0	2	2	1%
Misleading or Inaccurate Statements	0	2	2	1%
Law Violation - Theft	2	0	2	1%
Administrative Review	0	2	2	1%
Reporting for Duty	0	1	1	0.4%
Mistreatment of Prisoners/Suspects	1	0	1	0.4%
Conduct Prohibited by Law	1	0	1	0.4%
Agg. Conduct Prohibited by Law	1	0	1	0.4%
Domestic Violence	0	1	1	0.4%
Feigning Illness or Injury	0	1	1	0.4%
Discrim., Harassment, and Retaliation	1	0	1	0.4%
Total	190	41	231	100%

Table 2.2 shows the types of citizen/internal allegations reported during the quarter.

**TABLE 2.3
SUSTAINED ALLEGATIONS FOR CITIZEN AND INTERNAL
COMPLAINTS BY MONTH CLOSED**

Table 2.3 compares the number of "sustained" to "not sustained" allegations resulting from formal investigations of citizen and internal complaints for the first quarter of 2012.

	Jan. 2012	Feb. 2012	Mar. 2012
Sustained	9	6	10
Column %	50%	46%	59%
Not Sustained	9	7	7
Column %	50%	54%	41%
Total	18	13	17

* Note: "Not sustained" includes those allegations subjected to a formal investigation that resulted in a finding of "unfounded," "exonerated," or "not sustained."

**TABLE 2.4
DENVER POLICE DEPARTMENT MATRIX DEFINITIONS**

Category A

Conduct that has a minimal negative impact on the operations or professional image of the Department.

Category B

Conduct that has more than a minimal negative impact on the operations or professional image of the Department; or that negatively impacts relationships with other officers, agencies, or the public.

Category C

Conduct that has a pronounced negative impact on the operations or professional image of the Department, or on relationships with other officers, agencies, or the public.

Category D

Conduct substantially contrary to the values of the Department or that substantially interferes with its mission, operations or professional image, or that involves a demonstrable serious risk to officer or public safety.

Category E

Conduct that involves the serious abuse or misuse of authority, unethical behavior, or an act that results in an actual serious and adverse impact on officer or public safety or to the professionalism of the Department.

Category F

Any violation of law, rule or policy which: foreseeably results in death or serious bodily injury; or constitutes a willful and wanton disregard of Department values; or involves any act which demonstrates a serious lack of the integrity, ethics or character related to an officer's fitness to hold the position of police officer; or involves egregious misconduct substantially contrary to the standards of conduct reasonably expected of one whose sworn duty is to uphold the law; or involves any conduct which constitutes the failure to adhere to any contractual condition of employment or requirement of certification mandated by law.

TABLE 2.5
SIGNIFICANT DPD DISCIPLINE ON SUSTAINED CITIZEN/INTERNAL
COMPLAINT ALLEGATIONS CLOSED IN THE FIRST QUARTER 2012

Case Type	Rank	Incident Summary	Allegation	Discipline
Case 1: Internal	Officer	An officer was alleged to have falsified a grant log sheet and failed to work the hours as stated in her reports.	Commission of a Deceptive Act	Termination
			Conduct Prejudicial	Termination
Case 2: Internal	Officer 1	An officer made unprofessional comments and engaged in inappropriate conduct in the workplace.	Respect for Fellow Officer	Written Reprimand
			Discrimination, Harassment, and Retaliation	Not Reviewed
	Officer 2	An officer made unprofessional comments and engaged in inappropriate conduct in the workplace. The officer had prior discipline for similar conduct.	Respect for Fellow Officer	5 Suspended Days
Case 3: Internal	Officer	An officer was alleged to have called in sick for court, but worked a secondary employment job the same day.	Respect for Fellow Officer	2 Fined Days
			Conduct Prejudicial	3 Suspended Days
Case 4: Internal	Detective	Detective failed to contact an on-duty supervisor and request that a supervisor respond to the scene of a use of force.	Improper Procedure - Other	2 Fined Days
			Improper Procedure - Other	2 Fined Days
Case 5: Internal	Officer	An officer was captured on recorded video surveillance footage using inappropriate force on a handcuffed shoplifter. The officer failed to appropriately document that force.	Inappropriate Force	4 Suspended Days
			Failure to Make or File Reports	Written Reprimand
Case 6: Internal	Officer	An officer was on a police motorcycle when he attempted to contact a bicyclist for riding on the 16th Street Mall. The bicyclist failed to stop and the officer forced the cyclist off the bike, causing him to crash.	Improper Procedure - Other	Written Reprimand
			Inappropriate Force	Not Sustained

(TABLE CONTINUED ON THE NEXT PAGE)

**TABLE 2.5
(CONTINUED)**

Case Type	Rank	Incident Summary	Allegation	Discipline
Case 7: Citizen	Officer 1	A complainant alleged an officer contacted her after investigating a domestic violence incident and sent her inappropriate text messages. During the course of the investigation, several videos were found on the officer's phone that captured the officer engaging in inappropriate conduct directed at community members.	Conduct Prejudicial	Resigned
			Immoral Conduct	Resigned
			Sexual Misconduct	Resigned
	Officer 2	A witness officer failed to report several incidents in which another officer engaged in inappropriate conduct toward community members.	Improper Procedure - Other	Not Reviewed
			Responsibilities To Serve Public	Not Reviewed
			Conduct Prejudicial	10 Suspended Days
Case 8: Citizen	Officer	The subject officer was charged with Assault and Disorderly Conduct in relation to an off-duty incident that occurred at a golf course outside of Denver.	Conduct Prohibited by Law	2 Fined Days
Case 9: Citizen	Officer	An officer made a rude comment during the course of an arrest.	Discourtesy	1 Fined Day
Case 10: Citizen	Officer	An off-duty officer failed to request that a DPD supervisor respond to the scene of a minor, non-injury traffic accident.	Improper Procedure - Other	1 Fined Day
Case 11: Internal	Officer	An officer accidentally discharged a firearm into a "cleaning barrel" (which is a barrel that is designed to allow officers to unload their weapons safely).	Improper Procedure - Other	Written Reprimand
Case 12: Internal	Detective	A detective lost his police radio.	Rough/Careless Handling of Departmental Property	Written Reprimand
Case 13: Internal	Technician	An officer discharged a pepperball gun and did not complete a required Use of Force Report.	Improper Procedure - Other	Written Reprimand
	Sergeant	A sergeant was aware of pepperball gun being discharged, but did not complete a Use of Force Report.	Improper Procedure - Other	1 Fined Day

(TABLE CONTINUED ON THE NEXT PAGE)

**TABLE 2.5
(CONTINUED)**

Case Type	Rank	Incident Summary	Allegation	Discipline
Case 14: Internal	Officer	An officer was involved in a minor, single car, non-injury traffic accident, but did not report the accident at the time of the incident.	Rough/Careless Handling of Departmental Property	Written Reprimand
Case 15: Citizen	Sergeant	While off-duty, a sergeant was involved in a traffic accident outside of Denver, after which the other driver gave the Sergeant false information. The Sergeant used a confidential database to look up the other driver's home address, and went to the driver's house while on-duty, and in uniform, to demand that she provide vehicle insurance information.	Improper Procedure - Other	2 Fined Day
			Conduct Prejudicial	2 Fined Day
Case 16: Citizen	Technician	While off-duty, but in uniform, an officer exited his private vehicle to confront the driver of another vehicle over an alleged traffic infraction. The officer was videotaped yelling and using profanity toward the occupants of the other vehicle.	Verbal Assault and Abuse of the Public	16 Suspended Days
Case 17: Internal	Officer	An officer lost his department issued cell phone.	Rough/Careless Handling of Departmental Property	Written Reprimand
Case 18: Internal	Officer	An officer was ten minutes late for roll call. This was the fourth time he had been late in the last twelve months.	Reporting for Duty	1 Fined Day

**TABLE 2.6
DPD COMMENDATIONS RECEIVED IN THE
FIRST QUARTER 2012**

Commendation	First Quarter 2012
Official Commendation	47
STAR Award	6
Merit Award	4
Life Saving Award	6
Leadership Award	6
Department Service Award	5
Citizens Appreciate Police Award	2
Commendatory Letter	22
Community Service Award	0
Purple Heart	2
Distinguished Service Cross	0
Medal of Honor	4
Medal of Valor	0

Chapter Two Endnotes

¹ The data for this chapter are drawn from the Denver Police Department's Internal Affairs records management database (CUFFS II). The OIM is not a CUFFS II administrator and has little control over data entry into the database. Due to resource limitations, the OIM does not conduct governmentally approved audits of the databases for accuracy. When data entry errors are discovered, the OIM notifies the appropriate department in order to ensure errors are corrected. Because most data is entered by DPD personnel, and the OIM does not audit the data on a regular basis, the OIM cannot state with absolute certainty that all published statistics are 100% accurate. Finally, because the Internal Affairs command staff for the DPD are the final arbiters of what allegations to place in their databases and against which officers, the OIM cannot certify that the data presented (with respect to specific complaint allegations) is as it would be if the OIM were making those decisions.

Since these data were drawn from dynamic, live databases, the reported complaint, allegation, and timeliness numbers will fluctuate slightly over time and are subject to revision until all of the cases for a particular year are investigated and closed. The figures reported in this chapter only include complaints against sworn DPD officers. Citizen and internal complaint numbers do not include "scheduled discipline" cases (e.g., when a DPD officer allegedly violates a traffic law, gets into a preventable traffic accident, or misses a court date, shooting qualification, or continuing education class).



DENVER[®]
THE MILE HIGH CITY

Denver Sheriff

**NEW COMPLAINTS,
SUSTAINED FINDINGS,
AND DISCIPLINE**

DENVER SHERIFF DEPARTMENT (DSD) COMPLAINTS AND ALLEGATIONS¹

**TABLE 3.1
NEW DSD INTERNAL AFFAIRS COMPLAINTS
BY MONTH RECEIVED**

Table 3.1 reports the number of internal affairs complaints filed in the first quarter of 2012. Please note that these figures do not include complaints against civilian employees or division-level personnel complaints filed by a deputy's direct supervisor.

Month	Frequency	Percentage
January 2012	56	53%
February 2012	27	26%
March 2012	22	21%
Total	105	100%

**TABLE 3.2
DSD INTERNAL AFFAIRS COMPLAINT ALLEGATIONS
BY MONTH RECEIVED**

Table 3.2 provides a breakdown of the DSD internal affairs complaint allegations filed in the first quarter of 2012.

Allegations	Jan. 2012	Feb. 2012	Mar. 2012	Total
Improper Conduct	5	6	6	17
Column %	9%	22%	25%	16%
Improper Procedure	35	11	7	53
Column %	60%	41%	29%	49%
Law Violation	2	1	0	3
Column %	3%	4%	0%	3%
Lost Property	8	6	3	17
Column %	14%	22%	13%	16%
Service Complaint	8	2	8	18
Column %	14%	7%	33%	17%
Other	0	1	0	1
Column %	0%	4%	0%	1%
Total	58	27	24	109

**TABLE 3.3
SUSTAINED ALLEGATIONS FOR INTERNAL AFFAIRS CASES
BY MONTH CLOSED**

	Jan. 2012	Feb. 2012	Mar. 2012
Sustained	4	8	5
Column %	40%	44%	19%
Not Sustained*	6	10	21
Column %	60%	56%	81%
Total	10	18	26

* Note: "Not sustained" includes allegations subjected to a formal investigation that resulted in a finding of "unfounded," "exonerated," or "not sustained."

**OUTCOMES ON SUSTAINED INTERNAL AFFAIRS AND
REPRIMAND COMPLAINTS**

The next two tables provide descriptive information on sustained reprimand and internal affairs cases closed during the quarter. For reprimand cases, which are complaints issued by a deputy's direct supervisor (and which are not investigated by Internal Affairs), we report the allegation type and the disciplinary outcome (Table 3.4). For complaints investigated by Internal Affairs, we report the case type, number of officers involved, rank, complaint type, incident summary, finding, and discipline imposed for cases closed during the quarter (Table 3.5).

**TABLE 3.4
DISCIPLINARY OUTCOMES ON SUSTAINED SHERIFF
DEPARTMENT REPRIMANDS
CLOSED DURING THE QUARTER**

Complaint Description	Written	Verbal	Cautionary Letter
Failure to Participate in Firearms Program	1	2	0

TABLE 3.5
SIGNIFICANT DISCIPLINE ON SUSTAINED INTERNAL AFFAIRS
CASES CLOSED DURING THE QUARTER

Case	Rank	Complaint	Incident Summary	Discipline	Days Suspended
Case 1	Deputy	Improper Procedure	A Deputy Sheriff self-reported that he was involved in a minor accident while driving a DSD scout car.	Written Reprimand	
Case 2	Deputy	Improper Procedure	A Deputy Sheriff was found to have carried a pocket knife in a correctional facility.	Verbal Reprimand	
Case 3	Deputy 1	Commission of a Deceptive Act	A Deputy Sheriff was alleged to have met a female while she was in custody, and then engaged in an inappropriate relationship with the former inmate for approximately two years.	Termination	
		Reporting of Prohibited Associations		Termination	
		Improper Conduct		Termination	
Case 3	Deputy 2	Commission of a Deceptive Act	A Deputy failed to report an inappropriate relationship between another Deputy and an inmate, initially lied during an internal affairs investigation, and disobeyed a direct order to not discuss the pending IAB investigation with anyone.	Suspension-Termination in Abeyance	75 Days
		Disobeying of a Lawful Order		Suspension	2 Days Concurrent
		Reporting of Prohibited Associations		Suspension	2 Days Concurrent
Case 4	Deputy	Improper Procedure	A Deputy was involved in a minor non-injury traffic accident while driving a DSD vehicle.	Verbal Reprimand	
Case 5	Deputy	Improper Procedure	A Deputy Sheriff allowed an inmate to be released on probation while she had an active case pending in County Court.	Written Reprimand	

**TABLE 3.6
DSD COMMENDATIONS RECEIVED IN THE
FIRST QUARTER OF 2012¹**

Commendations	First Quarter 2012
Letters of Appreciation (from Supervisors/Director)	11
Commendations (from Supervisors/Director)	14
Employee of the Month (Downtown)	3
Employee of the Month (COJL)	3
Employee of the Quarter (DSD)	1
Community Service Award	0
Distinguished Service Award	0
#1 Academic Award	0
#1 Defensive Tactic Award	0
#1 Physical Fitness Award	0
Most Improved Physical Fitness	0
Top Gun	0
Valedictorian	0
Academy Medal	0
Merit Award	0
Life Saving Award	0
Purple Heart	0
Medal of Valor	0
Total	32

¹ Commendation counts were provided by the Denver Sheriff Department.

Chapter Three Endnotes

¹ The data for this chapter are drawn from the Denver Sheriff Department's Internal Affairs records management database. The OIM is not a IA database administrator and has little control over data entry into the database. Due to resource limitations, the OIM does not conduct governmentally approved audits of the databases for accuracy. When data entry errors are discovered, the OIM notifies the appropriate department in order to ensure errors are corrected. Because most data is entered by DSD personnel, and the OIM does not audit the data on a regular basis, the OIM cannot state with absolute certainty that all published statistics are 100% accurate. Finally, because the Internal Affairs command staff for the DSD are the final arbiters of what allegations to place in their databases and against which officers, the OIM cannot certify that the data presented (with respect to specific complaint allegations) is as it would be if the OIM were making those decisions.

Since these data were drawn from dynamic, live databases, the reported complaint, allegation, and timeliness numbers will fluctuate slightly over time and are subject to revision until all of the cases for a particular year are investigated and closed. The figures reported in this chapter only include complaints against sworn DSD deputies.

OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT MONITOR
WELLINGTON E. WEBB MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
201 W. COLFAX, DEPT. 1201
DENVER, CO 80202

PHONE (720) 913-3306
FAX: (720) 913-3305

[HTTP://WWW.DENVERGOV.ORG/OIM](http://www.denvergov.org/oim)