



**DENVER**  
The Mile High City

*Police and Sheriff  
Discipline and Critical Incident Report*

*Second Quarter 2012*

Office of the  
Independent Monitor





# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**DENVER**<sup>®</sup>  
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 - 7
DSD In-Custody Death Cases Pending at End of the Quarter	1 - 8
DSD In-Custody Death Cases Closed During the Quarter	1 - 8

**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
Discipline on Sustained Allegations Closed During the Quarter	2 - 4
DPD Commendations Received During the Quarter	2 - 7
Chapter Notes	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 - 7
Chapter Notes	3 - 8





# CRITICAL INCIDENT REPORT

**DENVER**<sup>®</sup>  
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 SECOND 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.	The Homicide Bureau completes its report and the case was reviewed by the Use of Force Review Board. The officer's actions during the incident were found to be in policy, however, the officer was found to be in violation of policy for carrying a firearm not authorized for off duty use. The violation was reviewed by the Manager of Safety and discipline was imposed. The Independent Monitor concurred in the decision.
April 22, 2012	An off-duty officer was involved in a shooting incident with another individual in Aurora, Colorado.	The investigation by the Aurora Police Department is ongoing as of the issuance of this report.

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

Date	Summary	Status
April 19, 2012	Officers responded to a call regarding a suicidal individual who committed suicide immediately after being verbally contacted by officers	The Homicide Bureau completed its report and the case has been reviewed by the Use of Force Review Board. The officer's actions at the location were found to be in policy, however, another officer was found to have violated policy due to an accidental discharge of a less-lethal weapon away from the scene. The violation was reviewed by the Manager of Safety and discipline was imposed. The Independent Monitor concurred in the decision.

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

Date	Summary	Status
April 1, 2012	Officers contacted an individual on a traffic stop who shortly thereafter died while in the officers' custody.	The Homicide Bureau completed its report and the case has been reviewed by the Use of Force Review Board. The case was also reviewed by the Chief of Police and the Office of the Independent Monitor. No policy or procedure violations were found. The Independent Monitor concurred in this decision. The individual was found to have died of causes unrelated to the officers' actions.

# 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 a 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 SECOND QUARTER 2012**

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

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

Date	Summary	Status
None		



**DENVER**<sup>®</sup>  
THE MILE HIGH CITY

# **Denver Police**

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





# DENVER POLICE DEPARTMENT (DPD) COMPLAINTS AND ALLEGATIONS<sup>1</sup>

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

	April 2012	May 2012	June 2012	Total
Citizen	43	33	26	102
Column %	73%	94%	81%	81%
Internal	16	2	6	24
Column %	27%	6%	19%	19%
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>126</b>

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

note that: 1) 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; and 2) one complaint may have more than one allegation.

**TABLE 2.2  
DPD  
ALLEGATIONS  
RECEIVED**

	Citizen	Internal	Total	Percent
Discourtesy	59	2	61	26%
Responsibilities To Serve The Public	46	0	46	19%
Improper Procedure - Other	23	9	32	14%
Inappropriate Force	26	0	26	11%
Conduct Prohibited by Law	9	3	12	5%
Giving Name and Badge Number	10	0	10	4%
Discrim., Harassment, and Retaliation	4	1	5	2%
Failure to Make or File Reports	0	4	4	2%
Sexual Misconduct	3	0	3	1%
Impartial Attitude-Bias	3	0	3	1%
Other	14	21	35	15%
<b>Total</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 2.2 shows the ten most common types of citizen/internal allegations reported during the quarter. It is important to note that there may be more than one allegation in a single complaint.

**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 second quarter of 2012.

	April 2012	May 2012	June 2012	Total
Sustained	7	4	12	23
Not Sustained	0	4	10	14
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>37</b>

Note: “Not sustained” includes those allegations subjected to a formal investigation that resulted in a finding of “unfounded,” “exonerated,” or “not sustained.” Figures only include cases subject to a full formal investigation.

**TABLE 2.4  
SIGNIFICANT DPD DISCIPLINE ON SUSTAINED CITIZEN/INTERNAL  
COMPLAINT ALLEGATIONS CLOSED IN THE SECOND QUARTER 2012**

Case Type	Rank	Incident Summary	Allegations	Finding	Discipline
Case 1: Citizen	Officer	The complainant alleged that he was treated rudely by the subject officer and that the subject officer refused to give him her name and badge number.	Discourtesy	Not Sustained	
			Giving Name and Badge Number	Sustained	Written Reprimand
Case 2: Internal	Officer	An officer was off-duty and arrested for suspicion of DUI in a county outside of Denver.	Conduct Prohibited by Law	Sustained	14 Days Suspended
Case 3: Internal	Officer	An officer was off-duty and arrested for suspicion of DUI in a county outside of Denver.	Conduct Prohibited by Law	Sustained	10 Days Suspended
Case 4: Citizen	Sergeant	Complainant alleges he was pulled over due to racial profiling. He also alleges inappropriate force, an illegal search of his car, and being falsely accused of a crime. The officers notified a supervisor of injuries to the complainant, but the supervisor failed to respond.	Improper Procedure - Other	Sustained	16 Fined Hours

(TABLE CONTINUED ON THE NEXT PAGE)

**TABLE 2.4  
(CONTINUED)**

Case Type	Rank	Incident Summary	Allegations	Finding	Discipline
Case 5: Internal	Officer	Officer lost departmental issued phone.	Rough/Careless Handling of Departmental Property	Sustained	Written Reprimand
Case 6: Internal	Officer	The subject officer left the city to shop for a car for his son while on duty. Further, it is alleged that he tried solicit a deal from the car dealer after the officer stopped the car dealer's son.	Conduct Prejudicial	Sustained	16 Fined Hours
			Improper Procedure - Other	Sustained	Oral Reprimand
Case 7: Citizen	Detective	The subject officer provided confidential information from NCIC/CCIC to an unauthorized individual.	Improper Procedure - Other	Sustained	16 Fined Hours
Case 8: Internal	Officer	An officer who was placed on a performance improvement plan failed to adhere to the requirements of that plan.	Disobedience of an Order	Sustained	48 Fined Hours
Case 9: Citizen	Detective	A detective inappropriately assigned himself to a case without proper authority and he allegedly harrassed witnesses in the investigation. Further, he inappropriately received overtime for his work on the investigation.	Conduct Prejudicial	Sustained	10 Days Suspended
			Improper Procedure - Other	Sustained	16 Fined Hours
Case 10: Citizen	Lieutenant	An officer sent an email through the City email system that was insulting, degrading, unprofessional.	Conduct Prejudicial	Sustained	Written Reprimand
Case 11: Internal	Sergeant	A sergeant on a Use of Force incident did not follow proper procedures required by DPD policy.	Improper Procedure - Other	Sustained	16 Fined Hours
Case 12: Internal	Technician	The subject officer was involved in an incident of domestic violence at his home in a county outside of Denver.	Law Violation- Conduct Prohibited by Law	Not Reviewed	Resigned
Case 13: Internal	Officer	An officer arrested the wrong individual on a warrant.	Improper Procedure - Other	Sustained	3 Days Suspended
Case 14: Internal	Detective	A detective was involved in a traffic accident on-duty while driving his personal vehicle.	Improper Procedure - Other	Sustained	Oral Reprimand

**TABLE 2.4  
(CONTINUED)**

Case Type	Rank	Incident Summary	Allegations	Finding	Discipline
Case 15: Citizen	Detective	A complainant was involved in an accident with a police car and complained that the responding DPD traffic Investigator was rude and unprofessional.	Discourtesy	Sustained	3 Days Suspended
Case 16: Internal	Technician	Subject officers contacted a young male and female in the alley allegedly having sexual relations. The female was underage and the officers did not make the appropriate reports as required by policy.	Conduct Prejudicial	Sustained	16 Fined Hours
	Officer		Failure to Make or File Reports	Sustained	10 Days Suspended Held in Abeyance
Case 17: Citizen	Corporal	The complainant alleged that the subject officer struck the complainant's vehicle with a flashlight causing a dent. The subject officer also failed to obtain approval for this secondary employment shift.	Responsibilities To Serve The Public	Sustained	8 Fined Hours
			Improper Procedure - Other	Sustained	Written Reprimand
Case 18: Citizen	Detective	The complainant was arrested on a warrant. The subject officer failed to file appropriate paperwork in the criminal case resulting in this case being dismissed.	Failure to Make or File Reports	Sustained	16 Fined Hours
Case 19: Internal	Detective	An officer behaved in an inappropriate and unprofessional manner prior to testifying in court as a subpoenaed witness.	Court-Manner of Testifying	Sustained	Written Reprimand

**TABLE 2.5**  
**DPD COMMENDATIONS RECEIVED IN THE SECOND QUARTER OF**  
**2012** (COUNTS WERE PROVIDED BY THE DENVER POLICE DEPARTMENT)

Commendations	2nd Qtr	Percent
Commendatory Action Report	87	43.9%
Letter of Appreciation	51	25.8%
Official Commendation	21	10.6%
Commendatory Letter	15	7.6%
Citizen Letter	7	3.5%
Merit Award	4	2.0%
Department Service Award	2	1.0%
Other than DPD Commendation	2	1.0%
Chiefs Unit Citation	1	0.5%
Community Service Award	1	0.5%
Corporal of The Year	1	0.5%
Detective of The Year	1	0.5%
Lieutenant of The Year	1	0.5%
Officer of The Year	1	0.5%
Sergeant of The Year	1	0.5%
Technician of The Year	1	0.5%
Top Cop	1	0.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

## ***Chapter Two Endnotes***

- <sup>1</sup> The data for this chapter are extracted from the Denver Police Department's Internal Affairs records management database (CUFFS II) on July 10, 2012. 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**<sup>®</sup>  
THE MILE HIGH CITY

# **Denver Sheriff**

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





# DENVER SHERIFF DEPARTMENT (DSD) COMPLAINTS AND ALLEGATIONS<sup>1</sup>

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

Table 3.1 reports the number of internal affairs complaints filed in the second quarter of 2012. Please note that: 1) these figures do not include complaints against civilian employees; and 2) one complaint may contain more than one allegation.

Month	Frequency	Percentage
April 2012	31	32%
May 2012	25	26%
June 2012	40	42%
<b>Total</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>100%</b>

**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 second quarter of 2012. One complaint may have more than one allegation.

Allegations	April 2012	May 2012	June 2012	Total
Excessive Force	3	0	1	4
Column %	9%	0%	2%	4%
Improper Conduct	2	1	6	9
Column %	6%	4%	13%	9%
Improper Procedure	18	14	25	57
Column %	56%	54%	56%	55%
Law Violation	0	1	0	1
Column %	0%	4%	0%	1%
Lost Property	8	7	5	20
Column %	25%	27%	11%	19%
Service Complaint	1	3	8	12
Column %	3%	12%	18%	12%
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>103</b>

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

	April 2012	May 2012	June 2012	Total
Sustained	32	4	10	46
Not Sustained*	5	6	1	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>58</b>

Notes: "Not sustained" includes allegations subjected to a formal investigation that resulted in a finding of "unfounded," "exonerated," or "not sustained." Only includes cases subject to a full formal investigation.

**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
Deputy lost two ID Cards.	1	0	0
Deputy violated the uniform policy.	1	0	0
Deputy recorded incorrect information after fingerprinting an inmate.	2	0	0
Deputy did not conduct a proper key inventory.	1	0	0
Deputy did not participate in required firearms training.	1	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

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

Case	Rank	Incident Summary	Complaint	Discipline
Case 1	Deputy 1	Two deputies were involved in a physical altercation while working in Court Services.	Improper Conduct	6 Day Suspension
	Deputy 2		Improper Conduct	8 Day Suspension
Case 2	Captain	A captain was involved in the misappropriation of funds.	Improper Procedure	Termination
			Improper Procedure	Termination
	Deputy	A deputy was involved in the misappropriation of funds.	Improper Procedure	Termination
Case 3	Deputy	A deputy received a trespassing ticket in a jurisdiction outside of Denver. The deputy was found to be in an elementary school facility at approximately 11:30 P.M. The deputy did not have permission to be on school grounds after hours.	Improper Conduct	30 Day Suspension with Stipulations
			Law Violation	3 Day Suspension
Case 4	Deputy	A deputy failed to place a detainer on an inmate when he was transferred to another jurisdiction, which caused that inmate to be erroneously released.	Improper Conduct	10 Day Suspension
Case 5	Deputy	A deputy failed to place a detainer on an inmate when he was transferred to another jurisdiction, which caused that inmate to be erroneously released.	Improper Procedure	3 Day Suspension
Case 6	Deputy	An inmate asked a deputy several times to be moved from a DDC pod because he feared for his safety. The deputy did not notify a supervisor. Several hours after requesting that he be moved, the inmate got into a physical altercation with another inmate resulting in injuries.	Improper Procedure	18 Day Suspension
Case 6	Deputy	A deputy violated department policies by stopping and detaining two men near his home that he determined to be suspicious looking.	Improper Procedure	4 Day Suspension

(TABLE CONTINUED ON THE NEXT PAGE)

**TABLE 3.5 (CONT.)**

Case	Rank	Incident Summary	Complaint	Discipline
Case 7	Deputy	A deputy was seen reading an electronic book while on-duty at the Lindsay Flanagan Court-house.	Improper Procedure	10 Day Suspension
			Improper Procedure	10 Day Suspension/ Concurrent
			Improper Conduct	10 Day Suspension
			Improper Procedure	2 Day Suspension
Case 8	Division Chief	A commanding officer allegedly failed to immediately report and act pursuant to DSD policy and procedure upon learning of an allegation involving deputies possibly committing a serious criminal offense against another deputy.	Improper Conduct	Resignation

Note: This table does not include unauthorized leave cases, reprimand cases, or cases where a deputy allegedly failed to pay his/her union dues.

**TABLE 3.6  
DSD COMMENDATIONS RECEIVED IN THE  
SECOND QUARTER OF 2012<sup>1</sup>**

Commendations	Second Quarter 2012
Letters of Appreciation (from Supervisors/Director)	81
Commendations (from Supervisors/Director)	5
Community Service Award	5
Employee of the Month (Downtown)	3
Employee of the Month (COJL)	3
Commendation Award	2
Life Saving Award	2
Employee of the Quarter (DSD)	1
#1 Academic Award	1
#1 Defensive Tactic Award	1
#1 Physical Fitness Award	1
Most Improved Physical Fitness	1
Top Gun	1
Valedictorian	1
Merit Award	1
Academy Medal	0
Distinguished Service Award	0
Purple Heart	0
Medal of Valor	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>109</b>

Notes: Commendation counts were provided by the Denver Sheriff Department.

### ***Chapter Three Endnotes***

- <sup>1</sup> The data for this chapter were extracted from the Denver Sheriff Department's Internal Affairs records management database on July 10, 2012. 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  
EMAIL: [OIM@DENVERGOV.ORG](mailto:OIM@DENVERGOV.ORG)  
**[HTTP://WWW.DENVERGOV.ORG/OIM](http://WWW.DENVERGOV.ORG/OIM)**