



2024 ANNUAL REPORT

PREPARED BY

Office of the Director of Police Accountability

**APPROVED BY THE
POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY BOARD ON:**

August 7, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR OF THE POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY BOARD	3
MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
Personnel Complaints	6
Policy Review and Oversight.....	6
Community Engagement and Public Events.....	7
Stop Data Trends	8
BPD Training.....	8
Operational Challenges.....	8
Efforts to Enhance External Resourcing.....	9
Annual Report Governance Clarity and Charter Interpretation	9
INTRODUCTION.....	9
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	10
PAB & ODPa Recommendations	11
ODPA Recommendations.....	12
INVESTIGATIVE PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES (§125(16)(b)(2))	13
ANALYSIS OF COMPLAINTS AND DISPOSITIONS (§125(16)(b)(1)(i) - (§125(16)(b)(1)(ii)).....	14
BPD Complaint Data.....	16
Key Observations	18
OVERVIEW OF THE PAB'S POLICY WORK (§125(16)(b)(1)(iii)).....	20
Policy Subcommittees	20
Policy Review Workload.....	21
PAB-ODPA'S OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES (§125(16)(b)(1)(iv))	22
Oversight Leadership and National Engagement	25
Community Education and Outreach	26
BPD TRENDS AND PATTERNS IN VEHICLE AND PEDESTRIAN STOPS, AND OTHER ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES (§125(16)(b)(5))	26
Stop Data.....	26
Demographics of Individuals Being Stopped	29
Reason for Stops.....	30
Disposition of Stops	31
Geographic Distribution.....	32
BPD TRAINING, EDUCATION, AND EARLY WARNING SYSTEMS (§125(16)(b)(3)):	33

Training and Education	33
Early Warning System	33
BPD TRENDS AND PATTERNS REGARDING USE OF FORCE AND OFFICER INVOLVED	
SHOOTINGS (§125(16)(b)(6)).....	35
Behavioral and mental health factors	36
DEMOGRAPHIC DISPARITIES IN USE-OF-FORCE INCIDENTS.....	37
OFFICER INVOLVED SHOOTINGS.....	37
CHALLENGES	37
Incomplete Implementation of Charter Initiatives	37
Disputes Regarding Scope of Authority	38
Operational Constraints	38
Staffing and Classification Challenges	38
Infrastructure and IT Delays	39
Impact on Charter Functions	39
Strategic Initiatives and Grant Development.....	39
Annual Report governance	40
CONCLUSION	41
APPENDICES	44
APPENDIX 1. MEET THE POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY BOARD	44
APPENDIX 2. MEET THE OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY	45
APPENDIX 3. CASE & ALLEGATION DISPOSITIONS FOR 2024	46
APPENDIX 4. BPD TRAINING ORDERS DATA.....	123

MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR OF THE POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY BOARD

To the City and Community of Berkeley,

On behalf of the Police Accountability Board (PAB), I am honored to contribute to the 2024 Annual Report and reflect on a year of continued growth in Berkeley's civilian oversight system. This year has brought important opportunities for deepening our commitment to community-centered policing, strengthening our oversight role, and responding thoughtfully to the concerns of our residents.

As a volunteer body appointed to represent the public, the Board approaches its work with humility, seriousness, and an unwavering belief in the power of democratic accountability. Whether we are reviewing policy proposals, hearing complaints of misconduct, or participating in community forums, we remain guided by the Charter's intent to ensure that public safety in Berkeley reflects transparency, fairness, and shared values.

This past year, we engaged in some of our most substantive work to date—including policy reviews on law enforcement interactions with vulnerable populations, the role of specialized units, and finalized the year-long review of policies and practices related to the Berkeley Police Department's Downtown Task Force which stemmed from the publicly released improper text messages. At the same time, we continued to confront questions around institutional access, legal interpretation, and the evolving relationship between the Board, the Office of the Director of Police Accountability (ODPA), and other City entities. Navigating these issues has underscored the importance of procedural clarity, mutual respect, and a shared commitment to improving how oversight functions in practice and not just on paper.

Our participation in the 50th anniversary of civilian oversight and our joint presence at the 2024 NACOLE Conference were reminders that Berkeley's revamped system, while still maturing, is part of a broader national movement to reimagine public safety through community voice. We are proud to contribute to that movement and to represent Berkeley as both a student and a leader in this work.

As Chair, I want to extend my appreciation to my fellow Board members, past and present, for their dedication; to the ODPA staff for their expertise and partnership; and most importantly, to the Berkeley community for continuing to hold this system accountable. Oversight is not easy work, but it is essential, and with your continued engagement, we will keep moving forward together.

In partnership and public service,


Joshua Cayetano

Chair of the Police Accountability Board

MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

Dear Visitors and Residents of Berkeley,

With deep respect for our community and unwavering commitment to the principles of justice, transparency, and equitable public safety, I am honored to present the second Annual Report of the Office of the Director of Police Accountability (ODPA) under Berkeley's updated civilian oversight framework.

This report reflects both the progress and the growing pains of institutionalizing a modern system of independent oversight. It builds upon the foundation laid in the inaugural 2021–2023 Triennial Report and chronicles the collective efforts of the ODPA and the Police Accountability Board (PAB) in fulfilling their Charter mandates during 2024.

This past year was marked by significant milestones. We jointly commemorated Berkeley's 50th anniversary of civilian oversight, an event that reaffirmed the City's longstanding commitment to accountability and innovation. Regionally and nationally, we helped coordinate one of the highest jurisdictional turnouts at the 2024 NACOLE Conference. This remarkable presence was the result of intentional interdepartmental collaboration, with representatives from the ODPA, PAB, Berkeley Police Department, and the City Manager's Office's Department of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion coming together to elevate Berkeley's voice on a national stage.

At the same time, structural and operational challenges continue to limit the full realization of the Charter's vision. Persistent barriers, such as unresolved regulatory processes, institutional ambiguity, staffing constraints, and delays in IT infrastructure, have slowed implementation of key oversight functions. These obstacles have made it clear that there is a need for strengthened governance practices and clearer delineation of roles.

In my role as Director of Police Accountability for the City of Berkeley, I've had the opportunity to contribute to the continued development of our city's civilian oversight system. Much of this work has involved navigating evolving structures, building relationships across departments, and ensuring that the intent of our Charter is honored in practice. I've approached these responsibilities with a strong sense of duty and humility, knowing that meaningful oversight takes time, trust, and collaboration. While challenges remain, I'm proud of the progress we've made in making oversight more accessible, community-responsive, and structurally sound.

As we continue this journey, I remain optimistic about the path forward. The progress made this year, in investigations, policy reform, public engagement, and cross-agency collaboration, demonstrates both our resilience and our shared commitment to the Charter's democratic intent. I extend my sincere thanks to the residents of Berkeley, our oversight staff and Board members, and our City colleagues for their dedication to this vital work.

In solidarity and service,



Hansel A. Aguilar, PhD
Director of Police Accountability

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2024 Annual Report of the Police Accountability Board (PAB) and the Office of the Director of Police Accountability (ODPA) reflects the continued evolution of Berkeley's civilian oversight system. Pursuant to Section 125(16) of the Berkeley City Charter, this report documents the oversight activities conducted during the calendar year, including investigations, policy reviews, community engagement, data analysis, and systemic recommendations.

Now in its second full year of operation following the release of the inaugural 2021–2023 Triennial Report, the PAB–ODPA oversight structure has taken meaningful steps toward realizing the goals established by Measure II. In 2024, the bodies collectively addressed critical areas of public concern, including complaint handling, officer-involved use of force, surveillance technology, stop disparities, and Berkeley Police Department's (BPD) training accountability. These actions occurred amid persistent structural and operational challenges, such as staff turnover, IT delays, regulatory ambiguity, and disputes over access to records.

In compliance with Section 125(16), this report includes all Charter-mandated reporting components:

- Board Activities (§125(16)(b)(1)): A summary of the number, type, and disposition of complaints filed with both the Board and BPD; an overview of policy complaints; and any additional information requested by the Board or City Council.
- Investigation and Disciplinary Processes (§125(16)(b)(2)): A description of the procedures used by the ODPA and BPD to investigate misconduct and determine disciplinary outcomes.
- Training, Education, and Early Warning Systems (§125(16)(b)(3)): A summary of BPD's training initiatives and any early intervention systems in use.
- Policy and Training Issues Identified in Investigations (§125(16)(b)(4)): Key findings and concerns that emerged during complaint investigations.
- Trends in Stops, Citations, Arrests, and Searches (§125(16)(b)(5)): Data analysis on vehicle and pedestrian stops, including demographic breakdowns, reasons and outcomes of stops, and locations, in accordance with the City's Fair and Impartial Policing policies.
- Use of Force and Officer-Involved Shootings (§125(16)(b)(6)): An examination of patterns in use of force incidents and officer-involved shootings.

The structure of this report mirrors these Charter requirements, with each section dedicated to the specific mandates outlined above.

Personnel Complaints

In 2024, the PAB and ODPa received 53 complaints containing a total of 483 allegations. Of these, 51 complaints with 459 allegations were closed within the calendar year. The most common categories among the closed allegations were Discourtesy (107), Improper or Inadequate Investigation (79), Improper Search, Arrest, and Citation (76), and Discrimination (74). Collectively, these four categories represented approximately 70% of all allegations closed in 2024.

Separately, the Berkeley Police Department received 35 personnel complaints, including 24 external complaints, 13 referred by the PAB and 11 submitted directly to the Internal Affairs Bureau. Of these, 10 complaints were sustained, all involving allegations of Improper Procedure. The 35 complaints included a total of 153 individual allegations, with the most common being Improper Procedure (51), Improper Stop/Search/Seizure/Arrest (32), and Discourtesy (19). While only 10 allegations and 10 complaints were sustained, 86 allegations and 15 complaints were administratively closed, and 28 allegations and 7 complaints remained active at the time of reporting.

Policy Review and Oversight

The PAB received six policy complaints in 2024 and self-initiated two additional reviews. Four reviews were closed by year-end, while 14 remained open. The opened reviews included Artificial Intelligence (AI)-assisted report writing, the Downtown Ambassador program, Computer Voice Stress Analyzer (CVSA) use, BPD's interactions with persons in crisis, and procedural issues in complaint processing. In 2024, the PAB began exploring the development of a policy review planning structure, a formalized framework to guide how and when the Board undertakes policy reviews. This concept arose in recognition of the growing volume and complexity of policy-related complaints, as well as the Board's Charter-mandated responsibility to review and make recommendations on departmental policies, procedures, and practices.

The need for this framework became evident as the Board managed reviews on diverse and complex topics, including artificial intelligence-assisted reporting, crisis response protocols, and investigatory tools such as the CVSA. These topics often required extended research, legal interpretation, and community input, yet lacked a unified process to manage scope, timeline, and outcomes. The proposed structure seeks to address these inefficiencies and ensure that the PAB's policy oversight is strategic and effective.

Community Engagement and Public Events

In 2024, the PAB and ODPa commemorated 50 years of civilian oversight in Berkeley with a landmark community forum featuring past and present oversight leaders. This milestone event aligned with the Charter's mandate to promote transparency, elevate community voices, and build trust in law enforcement through independent review. Aligned with NACOLE's Code of Ethics ¹ and Principles of Effective Oversight, ² the agency prioritized integrity, fairness, transparency, community engagement, and continuous learning through strategic local and national efforts.

Image 1. Director Aguilar (right) welcomes Chief Louis (left) and Deputy Chief Tate (center) to the PAB-ODPA 50th Anniversary Celebration of Civilian Oversight.



Locally, ODPa hosted three public forums focused on use-of-force policy, collaborated with Berkeley High School's Law & Social Justice Pathway, participated in the City's Hispanic Heritage Month celebration, and engaged with youth at the Hayward Leadership Public Schools Career Fair. While the Hayward event was held outside of city boundaries, it provided an opportunity for Berkeley's oversight agency to demonstrate regional leadership in the specialized field of civilian police accountability. Collectively, these efforts resulted in engagement with hundreds of community members, students, and stakeholders. ODPa also continued trauma-informed outreach through its therapy and outreach dog, Lucky, who helped foster a welcoming presence at public events and educational forums. The Director and Lucky were featured in official media by the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST),³ showcasing Berkeley's leadership in integrating equity and inclusive practices into officer training. Through this collaboration, ODPa contributed subject matter expertise that helped shape statewide law enforcement education and advanced its oversight mission.

Regionally and nationally, both Board members and ODPa staff participated in the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) Annual

¹ NACOLE's Code of Ethics: https://www.nacole.org/nacole_code_of_ethics

² NACOLE's Principles of Effective Oversight: <https://www.nacole.org/principles>

³ The California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) was established by the Legislature in 1959 (Penal Code § 13500 et seq.) to set minimum selection and training standards for California law enforcement officers. POST develops statewide training curricula, certifies academies and courses, and provides resources to improve professionalism and effectiveness in policing across over 600 agencies in the state.

Conference, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE) 48th Annual Training Conference, and the Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy (CEBCP) Symposium. ODPa staff also attended the California Civilian Oversight Association (CCOA) Conference in San Francisco. These engagements support Berkeley's Strategic Plan goals to "champion and demonstrate social and racial equity" and promote innovation and continuous learning.

Stop Data Trends

In 2024, BPD conducted a total of 4,773 stops, a 7.61% decrease from the annual average reported during the 2021–2023 Triennial Report. Racial disparities persisted, with Black individuals comprising 29.7% of stops and 7.4% of Berkeley residents. Citations, arrests, and psychiatric holds occurred at rates consistent with prior years. Stop concentration was geographically skewed toward Districts 1, 2, 3, and 7. Informed by both stop data and community feedback, PAB subcommittees pursued inquiries into bias mitigation, geographic deployment patterns, and use of discretion.

BPD Training

In calendar year 2024, Berkeley Police Department personnel completed a total of 7,065 training hours. The most frequently covered topics included Supervisory Skills (1,464 hours), Crisis Management and Response (1,446 hours), Firearms Training (664 hours), Traffic Enforcement (620 hours), and participation in the Field Training Program (560 hours).

Operational Challenges

Despite notable accomplishments, the PAB and ODPa continued to experience delays stemming from limited staffing, outdated interim regulations, delayed Information Technology (IT) support, unresolved disputes over Charter authority, particularly related to investigatory access and policy review records, and significant setbacks in the development and adoption of permanent regulations. Public participation also fluctuated throughout the year, and certain outreach efforts were constrained by capacity limits, including the ODPa's limited ability to support outreach initiatives due to staff vacancies and the PAB's ongoing unfilled Board member positions. Resolving these structural challenges, including the prolonged regulatory delays, is critical to enhancing ODPa's ability to conduct timely investigations, expand equitable community engagement, and deliver more effective police oversight.

Efforts to Enhance External Resourcing

In 2024, the ODPa undertook proactive efforts to secure external funding to support innovation, accountability, and long-term sustainability. The ODPa was not awarded the grants they applied for but remains committed to exploring alternative funding sources.

Annual Report Governance Clarity and Charter Interpretation

As the Office and Board fulfill their respective duties under the Charter, the production of this annual report has also highlighted procedural tensions related to authorship, editorial scope, and institutional independence. Section 125(16)(b) of the Charter designates the Director of Police Accountability as the report's issuing authority; however, differences in interpretation and purpose have complicated the approval process contemplated by Section 125(16)(c)⁴. To promote clarity, transparency, and accountability, ODPa recommends that the City Council consider formalizing a bifurcated report model or issuing clarifying guidance regarding roles and expectations in future reporting cycles. Further discussion appears in the concluding section of this report.

INTRODUCTION

The 2024 Annual Report of the PAB and the ODPa serves as an overview of Berkeley's civilian oversight system. Guided by Section 125(16) of the Berkeley City Charter,⁵ this report details the work undertaken by both the Board and the Office

⁴ Berkeley City Charter Section 125(16)(b) states "This annual report shall be presented to the Board for approval. Upon adoption by the Board, it shall be presented to the Mayor and City Council, City Manager, and the Chief of Police at a City Council meeting, and shall include, where appropriate, recommendations for changes in the processes and procedures that were reviewed." Source: <https://berkeley.municipal.codes/Charter/125>

⁵ The Charter directs the Director of Police Accountability to prepare an annual report to the public which includes (but not limited to): (1) A description of the Board's activities during the year, including:

- (i) A summary of the number, type, and disposition of complaints filed with the Board; (ii) A summary of the number, type, and disposition of complaints filed with the Police Department by members of the public;
- (iii) Policy complaints undertaken; and (iv) Other such information that the Board or City Council has requested.

(2) The Department's and the Board's processes and procedures for investigating alleged misconduct, and for determining whether or not discipline is warranted and / or the level of discipline, for sustained findings of misconduct.

(3) Training and education, and any early warning system utilized by the Department.

(4) Training and/or policy issues that arise during the investigations of complaints by the Department, Director of Police Accountability, or Police Accountability Board.

(5) Trends and patterns in vehicle and pedestrian stops, citations, arrests, searches and seizures or other patterns by the Berkeley Police Department. Statistical data shall include the demographics of the complainant, reason for the stop, purpose of the stop and disposition, and location of stop, in compliance with policies, practices, and procedures of the City and Police Department, and the Police Department General Order on Fair and Impartial Policing.

throughout the calendar year, including investigative activities, policy reviews, recommendations, data analysis, and community engagement.

This second report of the new iteration of the City’s oversight system is rooted in the City of Berkeley’s enduring commitment to democratic governance, equity, and public accountability. Following the inaugural 2021–2023 Triennial Report, which captured the foundational years of the PAB and the ODPa, this 2024 Annual Report reflects the continued evolution and institutionalization of independent civilian oversight in Berkeley. It marks an important step toward realizing the full intent of Measure II⁶ and provides an opportunity to assess both achievements and areas where further progress is needed. Since the PAB became operational in mid-2021, and with the full staffing of the ODPa in the years that followed, Berkeley has undertaken an ambitious transformation of its oversight infrastructure. The 2024 report offers a moment to assess this transformation’s progress while also identifying gaps that still hinder full realization of the Charter’s vision.

Throughout the year, the PAB and ODPa worked to fulfill their respective mandates amid fluctuating staffing levels, data access challenges, and shifting public engagement patterns. Our collective work in 2024 included reviewing officer-involved shootings, analyzing stop data trends, investigating complaints from community members, and issuing formal recommendations on key departmental policies. The ODPa continued its use of modern tools and partnerships, including the expanded deployment of Sivil Technologies’ intake and dashboard platform and the strategic use of hybrid meeting technology to promote greater participation.

The PAB and ODPa remain committed to elevating community voices and ensuring that policing in Berkeley reflects the values of dignity, fairness, and accountability. This report offers detailed documentation of oversight activity across a wide range of operational domains, from complaint investigations to policy analysis, and community engagement to structural reform. By producing this report in accordance with Section 125(16)(b), we reaffirm our duty to the public and our belief that independent oversight strengthens the integrity of law enforcement and the safety of all Berkeley residents.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Drawing from their experiences in 2024, the PAB and ODPa developed the following recommendations to strengthen the City of Berkeley’s civilian oversight system,

(6) Trends and patterns regarding use of force and officer-involved shootings.

[https://berkeley.municipal.codes/Charter/125\(16\)](https://berkeley.municipal.codes/Charter/125(16))

⁶ <https://newspack-berkeleyside-cityside.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/2020-Measure-II-Berkeley-police.pdf>

enhance operational capacity, and promote greater accountability within the Berkeley Police Department.

PAB & ODPa RECOMMENDATIONS

The PAB and ODPa present the following joint recommendations:

1. Finalize and Adopt Permanent Oversight Regulations

The City, along with the ODPa, PAB, BPD, and other stakeholders, should prioritize finalizing permanent PAB-ODPa regulations to ensure clarity, consistency, and legal defensibility in handling personnel complaints, investigations, and policy complaints. The PAB passed its regulations on April 11, 2023, but has not yet completed the meet-and-confer process. Labor negotiations must be completed as soon as possible to strengthen procedural integrity and ensure compliance with the Charter's mandates for independence and transparency.

2. Address Racial Disparities in Police Stops and Use of Force

Consistent with prior findings and community concern, the City should continue supporting efforts to monitor, investigate, and reduce racial disparities in stops and uses of force. The Board and Office will further disaggregate complaint data and promote reforms rooted in procedural justice and equitable enforcement practices.

3. Enhance Public Engagement

The City Council's decision to allow the ODPa to use salary savings to conduct a community public safety survey in 2025 represents a vital investment in transparency. The Council should continue supporting the redirection of funds toward public engagement on public safety issues. Ongoing support for participatory feedback and proactive communication is key to strengthening community trust and guiding future oversight efforts.

4. Strengthen Oversight of Surveillance and Specialized Units

The Board's Surveillance Technology and Downtown Task Force subcommittees reflect the community's strong interest in transparency and accountability in these sensitive areas. Meetings where these topics have been considered by the Board have consistently drawn meaningful public engagement, allowing the PAB to focus on concerns most frequently raised by the community. In its review of both issues, the Board drew from community feedback and publicly reported data, which together informed its assessment of current practices. The city should continue to support the availability of such data and maintain mechanisms for ongoing community input and oversight, especially in historically over-policed or vulnerable neighborhoods.

5. Support Subcommittee Engagement and Policy Reform Capacity

With thirteen subcommittees formed since its inception, the PAB has demonstrated strong policy engagement. To maintain this momentum, the City should allocate appropriate staffing, clarify legal questions related to Board legal representation, and ensure administrative continuity to support the subcommittees' work.

ODPA RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on its independent observations and operational experience in 2024, the ODPa presents the following recommendations:

1. Establish Oversight-Specific Civil Service Classifications

To support stable, mission-aligned staffing, the City should implement specialized classifications tailored to civilian oversight functions, including a Deputy Director and Chief Investigator. These roles will bolster institutional continuity, leadership capacity, and recruitment pipelines aligned with oversight's unique operational and analytical demands.

2. Enhance Infrastructure and IT Coordination for Charter Compliance

Infrastructure and IT delays continue to undermine the Office's ability to meet confidentiality and operational mandates under Charter Section 125. For example, while the ODPa procured laptops for City Commissioners to use for official business, the devices have not been released to the ODPa since their purchase in July 2024. The City should adopt clear procurement pathways, a dedicated IT liaison model, and accountability structures to ensure the timely deployment of secure systems and devices to oversight staff and Board members.

3. Adopt Standardized Complaint Subcategorization and Improve Trend Analysis

Building on 2024's implementation of subcategories for "Improper or Inadequate Investigation," the City should standardize subcategorization across all high-frequency allegation types. This effort will promote more nuanced complaint tracking, trend analysis, and public education.

4. Ensure Adequate Resources for Civilian Oversight Operations

Staffing limitations and classification misalignment continue to hinder oversight delivery. The City should conduct a long-term staffing and resource needs assessment, ensuring ODPa can meet its investigative, policy, and community engagement mandates without compromise.

5. Invest in Youth Engagement and Inclusive Outreach

Expanding youth internship programs and diversifying outreach strategies, especially to underserved communities, should remain a strategic priority. Programs like YouthWorks can offer meaningful exposure to civic engagement while reinforcing transparency and accessibility goals in oversight work.

INVESTIGATIVE PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES (§125(16)(B)(2))

The PAB and ODPa are responsible for handling complaints of misconduct involving sworn members of the BPD, as outlined in the City Charter⁷ and the Interim Regulations approved in 2021⁸.

Step 1 - Filing a Complaint

Complaints may be submitted by individuals directly impacted, eyewitnesses, or their representatives. They must generally be filed within 180 days of the incident, unless tolling exceptions apply. Complainants may opt for mediation instead of investigation.

Step 2 - Screening and Investigation

Once a complaint is received, the Director screens it for sufficiency. If accepted, a notice of complaint is issued to subject officers within ten days. Investigations must be completed within 120–195 days, depending on the circumstances. Investigations are expected to be thorough, objective, and fair, and may include:

- Interviews with complainants, witnesses, and officers
- Review of relevant documentation (e.g., reports, photographs, video)
- Field visits to incident locations

Step 3 - Findings and Recommendations

At the conclusion of the investigation, the Director issues a report to the PAB with findings and recommendations. The PAB may accept, modify, or reject the recommendations. The PAB may also request that a hearing be held if they can't decide based on the presented findings and recommendations. If accepted, the findings are

⁷ Complaints filed with the Director of Police Accountability:
[https://berkeley.municipal.codes/Charter/125\(18\)](https://berkeley.municipal.codes/Charter/125(18))

⁸ Interim Regulations for Handling Complaints Against Sworn Officers of the Police Department:
https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-02/PAB-ODPA.Interim.Reggs_.Approved.2021-10-05.pdf

forwarded to the Chief of Police. The Chief may agree or disagree. If there is disagreement, the matter can be referred to the City Manager for final resolution.

Step 4 - Hearing Procedures

Hearings are convened when further fact-finding is necessary. A three-member panel from the PAB conducts closed hearings, during which both the complainant and the subject officer are required to testify. The panel then deliberates and votes on each allegation, and their findings are forwarded to the Chief of Police.

ANALYSIS OF COMPLAINTS AND DISPOSITIONS (§125(16)(B)(1)(I) - (§125(16)(B)(1)(II))

In 2024, a total of 53 complaints and 483 allegations were filed with the PAB and the ODPa across various categories of officer conduct. Of these, 51 complaints containing 459 allegations were closed within the calendar year. Among the closed allegations, one was sustained by the City Manager for Discourtesy, one by BPD for improper Police Procedures, and six by the PAB, including cases involving Discrimination, Improper use of force, Discourtesy, and Harassment, and are depicted in Table 1 below.

Among the 459 closed allegations, the most frequently cited category was Discourtesy (107), followed by Improper or Inadequate Investigation (79), a combined grouping of Improper Search, Arrest, and Citation (76), and Discrimination (74). Together, these four categories accounted for approximately 70% of all closed allegations in 2024. This distribution reflects recurring public concerns regarding officer conduct, investigative thoroughness, and perceptions of fairness in enforcement.

Table 1: 2024 PAB Complaint Statistics

2024 Police Accountability Board Statistics											
Complaints											
	Complaints Closed	Sustained		Not Sustained		Exonerated		Unfounded		Time-Barred	Admin. Closure
		PAB	BPD	PAB	BPD	PAB	BPD	PAB	BPD	PAB	PAB
Complaints	51	3	1	2	0	10	2	17	13	1	20
Allegations											
	Allegations Closed	Sustained		Not Sustained		Exonerated		Unfounded		Time-Barred	Admin. Closure
		PAB	BPD	PAB	BPD	PAB	BPD	PAB	BPD	PAB	PAB
Improper Use of Force	12	1	0	0	0	2	0	5	6	0	4
Discourtesy	107	1	0	0	0	4	3	18	16	0	80
Improper Search	68	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4	0	59
Improper Arrest	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	0	4
Improper or Inadequate Investigation	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	13	2	61
Improper Detention	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	2
Discrimination	74	2	0	0	0	2	0	12	13	0	56
Harassment	36	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	29
Improper Police Procedures	29	1	1	0	0	2	2	8	6	0	16
Threat to Arrest	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Unsafe Driving	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Dishonesty	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Improper Citation	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	30
Retaliation	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Identity Theft	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total Allegations	459	6	1	1	0	16	7	74	72	2	262

To better analyze and respond to community concerns, the ODPa disaggregated broad complaint categories into more detailed subcategories in 2024. This refined categorization allows for a clearer understanding of the types of allegations most frequently raised and the identification of potential patterns. One of the most common complaint categories, Improper or Inadequate Investigation, was broken down into the following subcategories:

Table 2: Sub-category Breakdown of Improper or Inadequate Investigation Allegations

2024 (Improper or Inadequate Investigation Sub-Category)	
Improper or Inadequate Investigation Sub-Categories	Total Number in 2024
Failure to Investigate	41
False or improper Police Report	35
Failed to Enforce a restraining order	2

Due to data limitations and system constraints, subcategories were only systematically tracked for the Improper or Inadequate Investigation allegation type in 2024. However, the Office is committed to increasing analytical precision across all high-frequency allegation categories. In particular, Discourtesy (107 allegations), Improper Stop/Search/Seizure/Arrest (76 allegations), and Discrimination (74 allegations) have been identified as priorities for future disaggregation. In the 2021 to 2023 Triennial Report, the Board documented 84 discourtesy allegations over the two and a half year reporting period. In comparison, 2024 alone saw 107 discourtesy allegations, representing a 274 percent increase from the annual average of approximately 28.7. Allegations of improper or inadequate investigation rose from 80 over three years to 79 in 2024, reflecting a nearly 200 percent increase from the previous annual average of 26.7. Similarly, improper stop, search, seizure, or arrest allegations increased from 70 in the three-year period to 76 in 2024, a 185 percent increase from the previous average of 23.3 per year. These year-over-year increases reflect a notable shift in complaint trends and underscore the need for disaggregation to better understand what is driving increased allegations in these areas.

BPD COMPLAINT DATA

In 2024, the Berkeley Police Department received a total of 35 personnel complaints, including 24 external complaints (13 from the Police Accountability Board and 11 from the Internal Affairs Bureau). Of these, 10 complaints were sustained—all involving allegations of Improper Procedure. A total of 153 individual allegations were associated with these complaints, with Improper Procedure (51), Improper Stop/Search/Seizure/Arrest (32), and Discourtesy (19) comprising the most frequent types. While only 10 allegations and 10 complaints were sustained, a significant number were administratively closed (86 allegations and 15 complaints), and 28 allegations and 7 complaints remained active at the time of reporting.

Table 3: 2024 BPD Complaint Statistics



BERKELEY POLICE DEPARTMENT MEMORANDUM



2024 INTERNAL AFFAIRS BUREAU STATISTICS

Complaints							
	Complaints Received	Sustained	Not Sustained	Exonerated	Unfounded	Admin Closed	Active Complaints
External PAB	13						
*External IAB	24						
*Total External	24	1	0	1	2	15	5
**Total Internal	11	9	0	0	0	0	2
Total Complaints	35	10	0	1	2	15	7
Allegations							
	Received	Sustained	Not Sustained	Exonerated	Unfounded	Admin Closed	Active
Improper Use of Force	13	0	0	0	3	8	2
Discourtesy	19	0	0	1	3	11	4
Improper Stop/ Search/Seizure/Arrest	32	0	0	3	6	19	4
Inadequate Investigation	16	0	0	2	2	8	4
Improper Detention (Jail)	2	0	0	0	0	2	0
Discrimination	21	0	0	0	7	11	3
Harassment	10	0	0	0	0	8	2
Improper Procedure	31	10	0	0	2	10	9
Improper Citation / Tow	5	0	0	0	0	5	0
Other	4	0	0	0	0	4	0
Dishonesty	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Allegations	153	10	0	6	23	86	28

These statistics include complaints on all employees of the Police Department.

*Complaints accepted by the PAB (or dual-filed with IAB and PAB) are counted in the total number of External IAB Complaints.

**Internal complaints include at-fault vehicle collisions and is counted as an Improper Procedure.

KEY OBSERVATIONS

In review of the 2024 complaint data for the PAB and the BPD, the following observations were made:

1. Higher community complaint volume in ODPa/PAB

In 2024, ODPa/PAB received 53 complaints compared to BPD’s 35. The average number of complaints filed with the ODPa during the Triennial Report period (2021-2023) was 34.6. In comparison, the number of complaints filed in 2024 represents a 53.2% increase. While this may reflect growing community reliance on the independent oversight body, further research is needed to determine the underlying factors driving this differential. To that end, the Berkeley City Council has authorized the ODPa to carry over salary savings to fund a citywide community public safety survey intended to assess public perceptions of safety and trust in oversight and policing systems.

2. Disparity in sustained findings

- BPD Internal Affairs recorded 10 sustained findings, 9 out of 10 (90%) were from internal complaints.
- One external complaint investigated by BPD IAB was sustained.
- ODPa/PAB had 3 sustained findings on public-initiated complaints.

Table 3. PAB Agreement Rates in 2024 with the Berkeley Police Department and City Manager

PAB and Chief Agree	Number of Allegations Reviewed	Agreement Rate
59	97	60.82%
Chief and CM Agree	Number of Allegations Reviewed	Agreement Rate
6	7	85.71%
PAB and CM Agree	Number of Allegations Reviewed	Agreement Rate
3	7	42.86%

The agreement rate, an essential measure of alignment between the PAB, the Chief of Police, and the CMO, continues to serve as a key indicator of procedural consensus in Berkeley’s police oversight framework.⁹ In 2024, the PAB reviewed 97 allegations that also received findings from the Chief of Police. Of these, the PAB and Chief reached the same finding in 59 instances, resulting in an agreement rate of 60.82

⁹ The agreement rate in this report is calculated by dividing the number of times the Chief of Police agreed with the PAB’s findings by the total number of allegations reviewed. This ratio is then converted into a percentage by multiplying by 100.

percent. This marks a substantial increase from the 30.38 percent agreement rate reported in the 2021 to 2023 Triennial Report.

Of the 97 allegations reviewed, the PAB sustained 6. The Chief agreed with only 1 of those findings, resulting in a sustained agreement rate of 16.67%, nearly identical to the 17.39% rate from the previous period.

The City Manager reviewed 7 allegations in 2024 following disagreement between the PAB and the Chief. Of those, the City Manager agreed with the PAB's findings in 3 instances (42.86 percent), an increase from 34.48 percent reported in the Triennial Report. The City Manager agreed with the Chief's findings for 6 allegations (85.71 percent), a decrease from the previous 100 percent alignment.

These findings indicate a noteworthy improvement in overall agreement between the PAB and the Chief. However, the consistently low sustained agreement rate continues to highlight divergent evaluative standards or evidentiary thresholds. Continued collaboration and clarification of expectations across the oversight and disciplinary review process will be essential to fostering transparency, consistency, and public trust.

3. Administrative closures

Both systems show a significant number of administrative closures — 20 in ODPa/PAB and 15 in BPD, pointing to common challenges in complaint viability (e.g., unclear allegations, jurisdictional limits, or withdrawal).

4. Discourtesy¹⁰ and discrimination remain leading concerns

Consistent with past trends, allegations of discourtesy and discrimination continue to feature prominently in both systems, even though few are sustained.

5. Active investigations

Both ODPa/PAB and BPD closed most complaints but had a handful of active cases rolling into 2025 (5 and 7 cases, respectively).

¹⁰ BPD Policy 1010.3 "Categories" defines discourtesy as "all allegations concerning a failure to be courteous and civil to the public. Complaints may include improper hand gestures or signs, and/or the failure of an employee to give a proper response or explanation to a citizen." Source: https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/RELEASE_20240301_T161429_Berkeley%20PD%20Policy%20Manual.pdf#Page=813

OVERVIEW OF THE PAB'S POLICY WORK (§125(16)(B)(1)(III))

The following section presents an overview of the PAB's policy work in 2024, as required under Section 125(16)(b)(1)(iii) of the Berkeley City Charter, which mandates reporting on policy complaints undertaken by the Board.

POLICY SUBCOMMITTEES

The PAB concluded 2023 with a total of eleven (11) subcommittees. In 2024, this number increased to thirteen (13), with two new subcommittees established during the year. Of these, one was subsequently dissolved, resulting in twelve (12) active subcommittees by the end of 2024. Of the active subcommittees, seven are specifically focused on policy-related matters. A summary of the subcommittees established by the PAB, along with their respective purpose, is provided below.

Table 4: 2024 PAB Subcommittees

Subcommittee Name	Stated Purpose	Establishment Date	Dissolution Date (As of 12/31/2024)
Regulations	Serve as the PAB's liaison in the meet-and-confer process to develop permanent PAB-ODPA regulations for handling complaints against sworn officers.	07-07-2021	N/A
Fair & Impartial Policing Implementation	Monitor and assess BPD's implementation of the City Council's Fair and Impartial Policing initiatives.	08-04-2021	N/A
Surveillance Technology Policy	Review BPD's surveillance technology acquisition reports in accordance with BMC 2.99.030(2).	06-07-2023	N/A
Policies and Practices Relating to the Downtown Task Force and Bike Unit Allegations	Review BPD policies, practices, and procedures related to the Downtown Task Force and Bike Unit inappropriate text messages allegations.	11-15-2022	N/A
Body-Worn Camera Policy	Review BPD Policy 425 and Policy 1300 regarding the use and oversight of body-worn cameras.	03-15-2023	N/A

Conflict of Interest	Explore legal questions concerning potential conflicts of interest arising from the PAB and BPD both being represented by the City Attorney’s Office.	03-29-2023	N/A
Policy Review	Oversee the conversion of general orders to Lexipol-format policies, updates to BPD policies, and other reviews requested by the PAB.	11-08-2023	N/A
Budget & Metrics	Analyze the budgets of the PAB and BPD and develops metrics to assess desired outcomes.	11-08-2023	N/A
Outreach & Engagement	Develop the PAB-ODPA outreach and engagement strategy and reviews commendations.	11-08-2023	N/A
Off-Duty Conduct	Review BPD Policy 344 concerning off-duty law enforcement actions.	10-11-2023	N/A
Operations & Processes	Assess ODPA-PAB operations and processes to ensure efficient execution of their work.	03-02-2024	N/A
BPD Policies 1010 & 1034 Review	Review BPD Policy 2020 and 1034 concerning the procedures for reviewing personnel complaints.	09-25-2024	N/A
2024 Strategic Planning Retreat	Plan the PAB’s 2024 Strategic Planning Retreat	12/06/2023	03/13/2024

In 2024, the PAB’s subcommittees completed several major projects. The Fair and Impartial Policing Subcommittee and the Policies and Practices Relating to the Downtown Task Force and Bike Unit Allegations Subcommittee each released significant reports addressing key community concerns. The Policy Review Subcommittee also worked with BPD to propose policy changes and helped develop an updated vehicle pursuit policy.

POLICY REVIEW WORKLOAD

During calendar year 2024, the PAB:

- Received six (6) new policy complaints, of which 4 were accepted
 - Deployment of Less-Than Lethal Munitions
 - BPD Interactions w/ Downtown Ambassadors
 - Mental Health Response and BPD Use of the SCU
 - BPD Record Maintenance and Release (Officer Rosters)
- Two (2) complaints were not accepted for review:
 - Disclosing of Badge Numbers

- Uncategorized
- Self-initiated two (2) reviews:
 - AI-Assisted Report Writing
 - Use of CVSA
- Closed four (4) policy complaint reviews by year-end:
 - Deployment of Less-Than Lethal Munitions
 - Policies and Procedures for the Processing of Personnel Complaints
 - Communications with the Public
 - Response to Noise Complaints & Community Mediation

As of the production of the present report, 14 policy reviews remain open.

Image 2. ODPa staff hosting the third and final community forum on the Berkeley Police Department’s Use of Force Policy.



**PAB-ODPA’S OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES
 (§125(16)(B)(1)(IV))**

To celebrate 50 years of civilian oversight in Berkeley, the ODPa hosted a special public event on January 12, 2024, bringing together oversight pioneers and contemporary leaders, including Jim Chanin, Barbara Attard, Kitty Calavita, and keynote speaker Izzy Ramsey. Director Hansel Aguilar provided closing reflections on the City’s journey from the original Police Review Commission to the current oversight model established by the 2020 Charter amendment. The event honored Berkeley’s longstanding legacy of independent oversight while renewing the commitment to strengthening community trust, transparency, and institutional resilience.

Image 3. Keynote Speaker- Ismail J. “Izzy” Ramsey, inaugural PAB Chair, former PRC commissioner and former U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of California (left), and John E. “Chip” Moore, former Chair of the PAB (right), at the 50th Anniversary Celebration of Civilian Oversight in Berkeley.



Image 4. Photo collage from the PAB-ODPA's 50th Anniversary Celebration of Civilian Oversight in Berkeley.¹¹



¹¹ For the complete photo gallery of the 50 Years of Civilian Oversight Celebration, please visit: <https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/zazhdffhp6obz8nfjvvyjy/AHQ4BfpVwxNXin2RmZTP8aU?rkey=e8j4h0riyinyps fzzd5rbkycb&st=yfukadbj&dl=0>

OVERSIGHT LEADERSHIP AND NATIONAL ENGAGEMENT

Image 5. ODPa's Therapy Animal at a POST Training Development Session



ODPA and PAB continued to build on this legacy throughout the year by engaging with regional and national oversight and public safety networks. A delegation attended the 2024 NACOLE Annual Conference, where Director Aguilar and Investigator Jayson Wechter presented on procedural justice and oversight implementation. Director Aguilar also served as a panelist at the California Civilian Oversight Alliance Conference focused on racial equity in oversight, and he, along with Chair John Moore, attended the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives Training Conference, engaging in sessions on equitable policing and community trust.

Additionally, Board Member Alex Mozes and Director Aguilar participated in the Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy Symposium, which explored research-practice integration and the future of accountability systems. Notably, Director Aguilar and Lucky were featured in official media by the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST), highlighting Berkeley's leadership in integrating equity, bias mitigation, and inclusive practices into officer training. By contributing subject matter expertise to POST's curriculum development and public-facing education materials, ODPa advanced its mission while shaping the professional development of officers statewide—demonstrating the broad impact of local oversight efforts.

Image 6. Director Aguilar and Board Member Mozes at a U.S. Capitol Building Tour after the GMU Conference



COMMUNITY EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

Locally, ODPa and PAB remained deeply committed to community education and outreach. They hosted three virtual Use of Force forums during the summer, covering critical topics such as de-escalation, accountability, transparency, and building community trust. The agency also maintained a strong presence at community events, including the Berkeley Juneteenth Festival, providing informational materials and engaging residents about police oversight. Outreach efforts included a visit to Berkeley High School's Law & Social Justice Pathway Program, where staff and board members led discussions on rights, complaint processes, and civilian oversight roles. ODPa also returned to the Leadership Public Schools – Hayward Career Fair to share information about careers in oversight and civic engagement. Additionally, ODPa participated in the City of Berkeley's Hispanic Heritage Month Celebration, contributing to programming centered on Latino voices in justice and equity work.

These activities reflect the continued dedication of the PAB and ODPa to fostering community partnerships, enhancing public trust, and promoting professional excellence. Their forward-looking strategy prioritizes research, accessibility, and responsiveness as core elements of Berkeley's civilian oversight model.

Image 7. Director Aguilar (right) and Policy Analyst Murillo (left) at the PAB-ODPA table at a 2024 National Night Out event.



BPD TRENDS AND PATTERNS IN VEHICLE AND PEDESTRIAN STOPS, AND OTHER ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES (§125(16)(B)(5))

The following section provides an overview of trends and patterns in vehicle and pedestrian stops, citations, arrests, searches, and related enforcement activities by the BPD as required under Section 125(16)(b)(5) of the Berkeley City Charter.

STOP DATA

The content presented in this section of the report is in fulfillment of the mandate set forth in Section 125(16)(b)(5)¹² of the Berkeley City Charter.

¹² Berkeley Charter Section 125(16)(b): [https://berkeley.municipal.codes/Charter/125\(16\)\(b\)\(5\)](https://berkeley.municipal.codes/Charter/125(16)(b)(5))

Specifically, it examines data related to vehicle and pedestrian stops, citations, arrests, searches, seizures, and other notable actions conducted by BPD personnel. Our analysis draws on a broad spectrum of statistical indicators, including but not limited to the demographics of individuals involved, the underlying reasons and stated purposes for stops, their outcomes, and geographic distribution across the city. The goal is to identify significant patterns and trends that may inform oversight and policy development.

We acknowledge and commend the BPD for its continued efforts to enhance public trust through data transparency. The Transparency Hub¹³ remains a critical resource in this regard, enabling the public to access and explore raw enforcement data independently. This platform supports greater civic engagement by equipping community members with the tools necessary to examine patterns of policing and draw informed conclusions.

In 2024, BPD conducted 4,773 stops, averaging approximately 13 stops per day. This represents a 3.92 percent stop rate relative to Berkeley's 2024 population of 121,749. While this ratio provides a general sense of enforcement scale, it should be interpreted with caution, as stop data does not distinguish between Berkeley residents and non-residents (e.g., commuters, visitors, unhoused individuals), nor does it account for repeat stops involving the same person.

Image 8: Total Stops Recorded by BPD in 2024




Figure 1. Total Stops by BPD at Monthly Intervals in 2024



Figure 2¹⁴ provides a month-by-month breakdown of stop volume in 2024. Several key trends emerge:

- First-quarter increase: Stops rose steadily from 306 in January to 507 in April.

¹³ To access stop data on the BPD Transparency Hub, visit:

<https://bpd-transparency-initiative-berkeleypd.hub.arcgis.com/pages/stop-data>

¹⁴ Berkeley Police Department Transparency Hub, "Total Stops Per Month" visualization. Dataset includes data from January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024: <https://bpd-transparency-initiative-berkeleypd.hub.arcgis.com/pages/f6a16acab35f4fe595147e8e981155d2%23c0qljgbkm>

- Mid-year fluctuation: A sharp drop in May (352) was followed by a modest recovery and stability through the summer months.
- September peak: With 547 stops, September marked the single highest month of enforcement activity.
- End-of-year plateau: Stop volume declined in October but remained relatively stable through December.

Compared to the 2021–2023 Triennial Report, which showed consistently higher monthly stop counts (often exceeding 500 or even 700), the 2024 data reflects both lower overall volume and greater month-to-month variability. This may suggest shifting enforcement priorities, changes in staffing or deployment, or external factors such as public events or safety trends. For example, the April and September peaks may correspond with targeted enforcement initiatives or citywide events, while mid-year declines could reflect seasonal staffing constraints or reduced operational intensity. Over the 2.5-year period measured in the 2021-2023 Triennial Report, stops equated to contact with approximately 10.4 percent of the city’s population, or roughly 4.16 percent annually. By contrast, the 2024 stop rate of 3.92 percent marks a slight reduction, suggesting a potential shift in strategy or operational capacity.

Figure 2. Racial Distribution of BPD Stops (2024 vs. Triennial Reporting)




Figure 3 presents the racial distribution of individuals stopped by the Berkeley Police Department between January 1 and December 31, 2024. When viewed alongside Berkeley’s 2024 Census population of 121,749 residents, this data provides critical insight into how BPD enforcement activity intersects with the city’s demographic composition.

The 2024 stop data, disaggregated by race, reveals disparities that merit close examination. As in previous years, certain racial groups appear to be overrepresented among those stopped relative to their share of the city's population. These disproportionalities raise important questions about the equity and consistency of enforcement practices.

When compared with data from the 2021–2023 Triennial Report (Figure 3), the racial distribution in 2024 shows persistent patterns that largely mirror prior years, though certain groups saw slight increases or decreases in their share of total stops.

DEMOGRAPHICS OF INDIVIDUALS BEING STOPPED

The 2024 stop data reveals significant disparities between the racial composition of individuals stopped by the Berkeley Police Department and the City's overall demographics. Out of a total of 4,773 stops conducted by BPD between January 1 and December 31, 1,418 stops (or 29.7 percent) involved Black or African American individuals. According to the 2024 U.S. Census¹⁵ estimates Black or African American residents make up only 7.4 percent of Berkeley's population (approximately 9,012 residents), meaning Black residents were stopped at nearly four times their representation in the city's population. Although they constitute fewer than one in thirteen residents, Black individuals accounted for nearly one in every three police stops.

In comparison, White residents, who comprise 54.8 percent of the population (approximately 66,742 individuals), were stopped 1,595 times in 2024, representing 33.42 percent of all stops. This marks a significant underrepresentation, as their share of stops falls more than 20 percentage points below their share of the population. Asian residents, who make up 20.7 percent of the city (around 25,191 residents), accounted for only 369 stops (or 7.73 percent), indicating another substantial underrepresentation. They were stopped at less than half the rate of their demographic proportion.

Meanwhile, Hispanic individuals, who represent 12.1 percent of the population (roughly 14,729 residents), were stopped 936 times, making up 19.6 percent of the total. This constitutes a moderate overrepresentation, with their stop rate exceeding their population share by more than 60 percent. The remaining 456 stops (about 9.54 percent) involved individuals categorized as multiracial, Native American, Pacific Islander, or other groups. These populations collectively make up around 5 to 6 percent of the city's population, suggesting a slight overrepresentation in this combined category as well.

The overrepresentation of Black and Hispanic individuals and the underrepresentation of White and Asian residents are persistent.

To better understand and address these disparities, the PAB and ODPa have also referred to the 2024 Fair and Impartial Policing Implementation Subcommittee, which

¹⁵ Gov Census Berkeley Population: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/berkeleycitycalifornia/PST045224>

analyzed stop data collected under the Racial and Identity Profiling Act (RIPA).¹⁶ As documented in the 2024 PAB FIP Report:

- Black motorists were 6.5 times more likely to be stopped than White motorists
- Black pedestrians were 4.5 times more likely to be stopped than White pedestrians
- Hispanic motorists were 1.7 times more likely to be stopped than White motorists
- 37 percent of all stops resulted in no citation, arrest, or warning

These findings point to systemic concerns, not only in deployment and enforcement practices, but also in how discretion and suspicion are operationalized during routine stops. They underscore the importance of examining the policies, training, and oversight structures that shape how and where police choose to engage.

REASON FOR STOPS

Figure 3. Reason for Stop



Figure 4¹⁷ visualizes the primary reasons for stops conducted by the Berkeley Police Department between January and December 2024. A detailed review reveals that traffic violations remain the leading cause, as in the Triennial Report, accounting for approximately 3,200 stops, representing more than two-thirds of all police-initiated encounters. This is followed by roughly 1,100 stops based on reasonable suspicion of criminal activity. Far fewer stops were conducted for outstanding warrants, truancy concerns, or consensual encounters and searches.

Reasonable suspicion stops, the second most common category in terms of volume when it comes to stops, also raise critical policy questions because these stops rely on officer interpretation rather than a concrete offense. Stops based on warrant information,

¹⁶ 2024 FIP Report: https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/legislative-body-meeting-attachments/2024-04-24_PAB_Special_Meeting_Packet_Revised_%281%29.pdf%23page=9

¹⁷ Berkeley Police Department Transparency Hub, "Reason for Stop" visualization. Dataset includes data from January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024: <https://bpd-transparency-initiative-berkeleypd.hub.arcgis.com/pages/f6a16acab35f4fe595147e8e981155d2%23c0qljgbkm>

truancy, or consensual encounters were relatively rare in 2024, reflecting more targeted and infrequent uses of law enforcement authority.

DISPOSITION OF STOPS

The disposition of stops by the BPD is a significant indicator of law enforcement outcomes and their implications for community policing. Of the 4,773 stops recorded between January 1 and December 31, 2024, BPD reported 878 arrests, 1,573 citations, 186 psychiatric holds, and 1,795 warnings.

Image 9: Dispositions of Stops by BPD in 2024

WARNINGS 1,795	PSYCHIATRIC HOLDS 186
CITATIONS 1,573	ARREST 878

Arrests, representing 18.4 percent of all stops, included 402 Black individuals (45.8 percent of all arrests), 282 White individuals (32.1 percent), 124 Hispanic individuals (14.1 percent), and 18 Asian individuals (2 percent). This distribution sharply contrasts with Berkeley's overall demographics, where Black residents make up just 7.4 percent of the population.

Citations, which accounted for approximately 33 percent of all stops, were more evenly distributed across racial groups and tended to show less pronounced disparities than other stop outcomes. However, disparities still persist. White individuals received 578 citations (36.7 percent of all citations), Black individuals received 264 citations (16.8 percent), and Hispanic individuals received 350 citations (22.3 percent). These numbers indicate that White residents, who make up over half the city's population, are underrepresented in citation rates, while Hispanic and Black residents are overrepresented relative to their population sizes.

Warnings, issued in 37.6 percent of stops, were similarly telling. Black individuals received 545 warnings (30.4 percent of all warnings), Hispanic individuals received 350 (19.5 percent), and White individuals received 545 (30.4 percent). Again, the data suggests a disproportionate volume of police interactions with Black and Hispanic residents.

Psychiatric holds accounted for 3.9 percent of all stops. Of the 186 total holds, 79 involved White individuals (42.5 percent), 69 involved Black individuals (37 percent), and 19 involved Hispanic individuals (10.2 percent).


Overlaying these outcomes with the city's racial demographics reveals troubling disparities in how stops are resolved. While population size alone does not fully explain law enforcement outcomes, these consistent patterns suggest possible implicit bias or

structural issues in the application of discretion, whether in deciding to arrest, cite, warn, or initiate a psychiatric hold.

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION

The 2024 stop data map from the Berkeley Police Department (BPD), shown in Figure 5¹⁸ illustrates notable geographic disparities in the distribution of police stops across the city's eight council districts. Stops were most frequent in Districts 1, 2, 3, and 4, with District 4 exhibiting the highest density, particularly around Shattuck Avenue. Districts 1, 2, and 3 show concentrations along major corridors such as University Avenue, San Pablo Avenue, and Adeline Street. Although Districts 5, 6, 7, and 8 have significantly fewer stops, they display a similar pattern of clustering along main streets.

Figure 5. Geographic Distribution of BPD Stops in 2024



¹⁸ Berkeley Police Department Transparency Hub, "Geographic Breakdown" visualization. Dataset includes data from January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024: <https://bpd-transparency-initiative-berkeleypd.hub.arcgis.com/pages/f6a16acab35f4fe595147e8e981155d2%23c0qjigbkm>

BPD TRAINING, EDUCATION, AND EARLY WARNING SYSTEMS (§125(16)(B)(3)):

As required under Section 125(16)(b)(3) and (4) of the Berkeley City Charter, this section provides an overview of BPD Training, education, and early warning systems used. The Charter mandates oversight of both BPD's policies and the training officers receive to ensure alignment with constitutional standards, professional expectations, and the values of the Berkeley community.

TRAINING AND EDUCATION

In calendar year 2024, Berkeley Police Department personnel completed a total of 7,065 hours of training, more than double the 3,283 hours recorded in 2023, reflecting a 115% year-over-year increase. These hours were distributed across five primary categories:

- Tactical and Operational – 2,859.5 hours
- Management and Leadership – 2,390 hours
- Conferences and Seminars – 1,437 hours
- Technology and Systems – 198.5 hours
- Legal and Legislative – 180 hours

The most frequently covered training topics included:

- Supervisory Skills – 2,228 hours
- Firearms Training – 728 hours
- Crisis Management and Response – 630 hours
- Specialized Equipment – 592 hours
- Traffic Enforcement – 556 hours
- Specialized Investigative Techniques – 438 Hours

Approximately 38.05% of the Department's total training hours were specifically certified by the California POST.

EARLY WARNING SYSTEM

The Early Warning System (EWS) is a proactive program designed to monitor BPD employee performance that may fall short of professional standards. Its purpose is to engage employees collaboratively to identify and address potential concerns before they escalate. As part of ongoing oversight efforts, supervisors are expected to monitor employee performance year-round in addition to any formal reviews.

Per Policy 1041, supervisors and commanders are expected to monitor the following indicators as part of the EWS review process:

- Excessive absences or potential abuse of leave

- Multiple formal complaints (sustained or not sustained)
- Numerous informal complaint inquiries
- Repeated use of force incidents
- Multiple resisting/obstructing arrest incidents
- Frequent involvement in vehicle collisions
- Substandard conduct or performance observed by a supervisor
- Unusual demographic patterns in stop data (pedestrian, bicycle, or vehicle), evaluated in the context of the assignment area, enforcement type, and nature of duties

In 2024, twenty (20) officers were selected using a randomizer tool across four random samples throughout the year.

Of the four EWS audits conducted, two did not raise any concerns regarding the randomly selected officers. The remaining two audits prompted the following departmental actions:

- **Informal Officer Training on Traffic Safety Strategy:** One officer received informal guidance focused on the department's three-prong traffic safety approach. The discussion emphasized addressing primary collision factors, responding to community-reported issues (e.g., suspected DUIs), and fulfilling the department's broader community caretaking responsibilities. This guidance reinforced the officer's understanding of data-driven enforcement and aligned with Berkeley's Vision Zero goals.
- **Review of Scheduling Violation Alerts:** The department evaluated its use of Careware's scheduling alerts to ensure compliance with overtime limits, consecutive workday restrictions, and other operational guidelines. This review supports proactive supervisor intervention to prevent personnel overburden and promotes balanced workload distribution.
- **Review of Modified Duty Assignments and Work Hour Compliance:** A review of one officer's modified duty assignment was conducted to ensure alignment with medically prescribed work hour limitations. The department confirmed that responsibilities were adjusted as needed to comply with labor laws and departmental policies, protecting employee well-being and ensuring appropriate task distribution.

- **Contextual Evaluation of Use of Force Data:** One officer’s higher number of uses of force incidents prompted a detailed review. When analyzed in relation to the officer’s total calls for service, the rate of force use was found to be consistent with departmental norms. The assessment included comparisons to department-wide averages and breakdowns by level of force, allowing for a nuanced understanding of the data.

BPD TRENDS AND PATTERNS REGARDING USE OF FORCE AND OFFICER INVOLVED SHOOTINGS (§125(16)(B)(6))

In February 2021, the Berkeley Police Department transitioned from its previous use-of-force policy to a new one that prioritizes de-escalation and has more stringent reporting requirements. The updated policy now includes four levels of force, with Level 1 involving non-injurious techniques such as grabs, control holds, or leverage, and Level 4 applying to firearm use or in-custody deaths. The definitions for each level are:

- **Level 1:** This level involves non-injurious techniques such as grabs, control holds, or leverage. It also includes the use of an officer's body weight to gain control over a subject. This level of force may cause momentary discomfort, but there should be no injury or complaint of pain from the subject.
- **Level 2:** This level of force applies when an officer points or deploys a firearm while interacting with someone. It also applies to a Level 1 force that involves more than momentary discomfort but does not result in an injury or complaint of pain.
- **Level 3:** This level parallels the department's previous Use of Force reporting standard and involves the use of a weapon, subject injury, or complaint of pain. It also applies to specific circumstances when an officer does not activate their body-worn camera.
- **Level 4:** This level of force applies when an officer uses a firearm or when there is an in-custody death. It represents the highest level of force and should only be used in situations where there is an immediate threat to the safety of officers or the public.

Image 10: UOF Incidents 2024

Under the previous policy, the reporting of use-of-force incidents focused on significant cases involving injury, pain complaints, or the use of a weapon, leaving out lower levels of force that officers use more frequently. The new policy requires officers to report any use of force to their sergeant, who documents the incident in a formal report. This policy is required to be reviewed annually by the BPD and the PAB.

In 2024, BPD reported 294 use-of-force incidents, involving 322 individuals and 742 officers.

TOTAL INCIDENTS	294
OFFICERS	742
SUBJECTS	322

BEHAVIORAL AND MENTAL HEALTH FACTORS

Use of Force was reported in incidents involving individuals perceived to be:

- Under the influence of alcohol: 40 incidents
- Under the influence of drugs: 54 incidents
- Exhibiting signs of mental instability: 333 incidents
- No apparent altered state: 63 incidents

Image 11: Perceived State of Individuals involved in UOF Incidents

ALCOHOL 40 Incidents	NO ALTERED STATE DETECTED 63 Incidents
DRUGS 54 Incidents	MENTALLY UNSTABLE 333 Incidents


Mental health-related encounters were the most common, with 333 mentions, surpassing the total number of incidents due to overlapping behavioral health assessments within individual cases. This underscores law enforcement's ongoing role as default responders to behavioral health crises. The prevalence of cases involving individuals perceived to be under the influence or experiencing mental distress highlights the persistent intersection of policing and public health. These patterns point to the need for alternative, health-centered response frameworks that reduce reliance on police intervention.

DEMOGRAPHIC DISPARITIES IN USE-OF-FORCE INCIDENTS

Of the 294 use-of-force incidents reported by BPD in 2024:

Image 12. Racial Breakdown of Use of Force Incidents (January–December 2024)

- Black individuals were involved in 154 incidents (47.83%)
- White individuals in 96 incidents (29.81%)
- Hispanic individuals in 45 incidents (13.98%)
- Asian, Bi-Racial, Native American, Indian, or Unknown: 16 incidents (5.44%)



Black or African American residents comprise 7.4% of Berkeley’s population, yet represented nearly 48% of all use-of-force subjects, over six times their population share.

The proportions of White individuals involved in use-of-force incidents increased from 22.96% in 2023 to 29.81% in 2024.

For Hispanic individuals, a supplemental comparison with the 2023 Triennial Report showed a decline from 16.21% to 13.98% in 2024.

OFFICER INVOLVED SHOOTINGS

In 2024, the Berkeley Police Department reported no officer-involved shootings.

CHALLENGES

Despite continued progress, the PAB and ODPa faced several significant challenges in 2024 that impacted the effective delivery of independent police oversight as envisioned by the Berkeley City Charter.

INCOMPLETE IMPLEMENTATION OF CHARTER INITIATIVES

Several core components of the Charter amendment passed under Measure II remain only partially implemented. Most notably, the permanent oversight regulations required to govern investigations and findings have yet to be finalized and adopted. As a result, the ODPa and PAB continue to operate under Interim Regulations adopted by the Berkeley City Council on October 5, 2021, which limit procedural clarity and restrict the operational autonomy anticipated by the Charter.

DISPUTES REGARDING SCOPE OF AUTHORITY

Throughout the year, ambiguity and institutional resistance continued to challenge the Charter-defined scope of the PAB and ODPa's authority, particularly in relation to:

- Investigatory powers in misconduct complaints, where access to timely information remains a concern;
- Policy, practices, and procedure review, where BPD has periodically delayed or withheld records, or declined to act upon PAB recommendations;

These limitations not only impede oversight effectiveness but also undermine the intent of Measure II by creating unnecessary barriers to civilian accountability.

OPERATIONAL CONSTRAINTS

The ODPa faced a series of operational challenges in 2024 that limited its ability to fully execute its Charter-mandated duties. These constraints were rooted in staffing instability, classification misalignment, and infrastructural support gaps that affected the Office's internal effectiveness and the broader functioning of PAB.

STAFFING AND CLASSIFICATION CHALLENGES

While ODPa has maintained consistency in its investigative staffing during the reporting period, turnover has persisted in analytical and administrative roles. This instability is partly due to structural issues in the City's classification and hiring system. As ODPa does not yet possess specialized civil service classifications tailored to its oversight mission, it must rely on generalized titles such as Associate Management Analyst and subsequently assign personnel to highly specialized duties in police oversight. The mismatch between the classification description and the specific expectations of ODPa roles makes it challenging to attract qualified candidates. While applicant pools generally meet the citywide requirements for Associate Management Analyst positions, they often lack directly transferable experience relevant to ODPa's oversight work. This has contributed to recruitment challenges and, in some cases, separations during probation when candidates' backgrounds do not align with the role's demands.

Berkeley's experience reflects broader structural challenges documented in the field. Based on interviews with directors of oversight agencies, Rosenthal (2018)¹⁹ found that staffing difficulties often arise from a lack of recognition of oversight's specialized

¹⁹ Rosenthal, R. A. (2018). Perspectives of directors of civilian oversight of law enforcement agencies. *Policing: An International Journal*, 41(4), 435–447.

nature within civil service systems. These systems frequently fail to align with the unique demands of oversight work, making it difficult to recruit and retain qualified personnel (pp. 441–444).

INFRASTRUCTURE AND IT DELAYS

Technology and infrastructure-related obstacles further strained ODPA's operational capacity in 2024:

- **Delayed Software Access:** Extended wait times for approval and installation of essential software tools on City-issued devices impeded ODPA's ability to efficiently process complaints and conduct analysis.
- **Permanent Office Setup:** Despite early planning, the City failed to install the necessary network infrastructure in the ODPA's new permanent office in a timely manner, forcing the Office to expend unbudgeted funds to support temporary workaround solutions.
- **PAB Member Laptops:** Laptops designated for PAB members were embargoed and not distributed to ODPA, limiting the department's ability to provide a secure, city-managed platform for the transmission and review of legally protected complaint information. As a result, ODPA was required to rely on external tools such as Dropbox and encrypted email. While functional, these tools introduce greater risk of unauthorized access and undermine ODPA's obligation to ensure the secure handling of confidential information, placing the City at potential legal risk, which is in tension with confidentiality provisions outlined in the Berkeley City Charter.

IMPACT ON CHARTER FUNCTIONS

The combined effect of staffing and infrastructure barriers has hindered the ODPA's ability to meet investigative deadlines, provide timely responses to public inquiries, and execute its policy review functions. These disruptions have also delayed the PAB's access to investigative findings and policy analyses, thereby limiting its ability to fulfill its Charter-mandated responsibilities.

STRATEGIC INITIATIVES AND GRANT DEVELOPMENT

The office independently developed and submitted two major proposals: the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) Smart Policing Initiative and the Bloomberg Philanthropies Mayors Challenge.

Both proposals emphasized ODPA's vision to leverage artificial intelligence (AI) tools and procedural justice frameworks to improve public trust and systematically monitor

body-worn camera (BWC) footage for signs of respectful communication, bias, and adherence to de-escalation protocols. These submissions were grounded in local data findings, including the Center for Policing Equity’s 2018 report and the Reimagining Public Safety Task Force Report, highlighting racial disparities in stops and searches, and longstanding community concerns around transparency and accountability.

The NIJ proposal outlined a pilot to integrate AI analysis of BWC footage with community surveys and policy review to identify patterns and inform training. The Bloomberg Mayors Challenge application positioned Berkeley as a potential national model for using technology to advance equitable public safety outcomes. In both efforts, ODPa served as the lead or originating office, coordinating cross-sector collaboration among law enforcement, academic institutions, technical vendors, and community stakeholders.

These efforts demonstrate ODPa’s strategic foresight, mission alignment, and commitment to enhancing oversight capacity despite limited internal grant-writing resources. They also reflect broader national trends in data-informed oversight and procedural justice reform. As the department moves forward, ODPa remains committed to pursuing external opportunities that expand its infrastructure, increase transparency, and reinforce its Charter mission of independent, community-centered accountability. While the ODPa was not successful in securing grant funding, the office remains committed to actively pursuing future funding opportunities.

ANNUAL REPORT GOVERNANCE

Section 16(b) of the Berkeley City Charter assigns responsibility for the production of the annual report to the Director of Police Accountability, while Section 16(c) requires the Police Accountability Board’s approval before the report is presented to the City Council. These provisions reflect the Director’s role as the head of an independent agency tasked with producing an impartial and data-driven public record of oversight activities and trends, while also affirming the Board’s oversight of certain operations of the Office.

In practice, the development of this report has raised important procedural questions about authorship, editorial input, and the appropriate balance between transparency and advocacy. While the Director is responsible for issuing the report, the PAB may also wish to provide additional narrative framing, reflections, or policy stances. Without clear process delineation, this dynamic can create confusion, slow production, and risk undermining the credibility of the report’s findings.

To uphold the Charter, promote institutional clarity, and protect the integrity of the oversight system, the Office recommends that the City Council consider one of the following options, each of which would be discussed in coordination with the City Attorney’s Office as appropriate:

1. Bifurcated Reporting Model

Authorize two distinct but complementary deliverables:

- A Director’s Annual Report, authored by ODPa staff in accordance with Charter requirements, focused on factual reporting, complaint trends, and policy review updates.
- A Board Annual Report authored by the PAB and released separately.

This model allows for clarity of voice and function, protects the legal authority of the Director, and provides the Board a platform to communicate its unique priorities.

2. Council-Issued Clarifying Guidance

Council may choose to issue formal directions, via resolution or memorandum, clarifying the intended scope, roles, and approval processes related to the annual report’s development. Such guidance could delineate which elements fall under the Director’s statutory authority and how the Board may contribute without compromising structural boundaries. ODPa would work in consultation with the City Attorney’s Office to ensure alignment with Charter language and applicable law.

3. Charter or Ordinance Amendment (Long-Term Consideration)

Should Council wish to explore more permanent structural adjustments, it may consider amending the Charter or relevant ordinances to reflect shared or distinct reporting responsibilities. Any such consideration would necessarily occur in coordination with the City Attorney’s Office and through the appropriate legislative or ballot procedures.

The Office remains committed to fulfilling its statutory duties while fostering meaningful collaboration. Clarifying the governance of the annual report process will enhance transparency, reduce conflict, and strengthen the public’s trust in the integrity of Berkeley’s civilian oversight system.

CONCLUSION

The year 2024 marked both a celebration of Berkeley’s 50-year legacy of civilian oversight and a continued reckoning with the evolving demands of public accountability. Through increased transparency, strengthened community engagement, and sharper analytical practices, the ODPa and PAB have furthered the City Charter’s vision of independent, community-centered oversight.

While progress has been made, key institutional barriers, particularly around staffing, classification alignment, and technological infrastructure, must be resolved for oversight to fully realize its potential. These barriers are not unique to Berkeley, but part

of a broader national pattern documented in recent oversight scholarship. The PAB and ODPa have noted that certain aspects of their authority under the charter remain unclear, and some sections are open to differing interpretations among stakeholders.

Looking ahead, the ODPa remains committed to advancing professional standards in civilian oversight, promoting equitable public safety outcomes, and honoring the community's longstanding demand for fair, transparent, and accountable policing.

--- END OF REPORT --

GUIDING DOCUMENTS AND AUTHORITY

U.S. Constitution:

<https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/constitution>

State of California Constitution:

<https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codesTOCSelected.xhtml?tocCode=CONS&tocTitle=+California+Constitution+-+CONS>

California Government Code:

<https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codesTOCSelected.xhtml?tocCode=GOV>

City of Berkeley Charter, Section 125. Police Accountability Board and Director of Police Accountability: <https://berkeley.municipal.codes/Charter/125>

Interim Regulations for Handling Complaints Against Sworn Officers of the Police Department:

https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-02/PAB-ODPA.Interim.Reggs_.Approved.2021-10-05.pdf

Berkeley Police Department Law Enforcement Manual

https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/RELEASE_20240301_T161429_Berkeley%20PD%20Policy%20Manual.pdf

[Memorandum of Understanding between City of Berkeley and Berkeley Police Association](#)


<https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Memorandum%20of%20Understanding%20between%20City%20of%20Berkeley%20and%20Berkeley%20Police%20Association.pdf>

Police Accountability Board's Standing Rules:

https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-02/PoliceAccountabilityBoard_StandingRules.pdf

City of Berkeley Commissioners' Manual, 2019 edition:

<https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-03/Commissioners-Manual.pdf>



THE PAB MEMBERS



**Joshua Buswell-
Charkow**



David Williams



Macharia Edmonds



Kitty Calavita



**Leah Wilson
(Vice-Chair)**




Juliet Leftwich



**Joshua Cayetano
(Chair)**



Randy Wells



THE ODPA TEAM



Hansel Aguilar
Director



Jose Murillo
Policy Analyst



Syed Mehdi
Data Analyst



Daniel Weinberg
Investigative Clerk

FINDINGS CATEGORIES

SUSTAINED	The allegation did occur and the action is not justified.
NOT SUSTAINED	The evidence fails to support the allegation; however, it has not been proven false.
UNFOUNDED	The alleged act did not occur.
EXONERATED	The alleged act did occur, but it was lawful, justified, and proper.
ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	<p>Refers to an Administrative Closure of a complaint before a confidential personnel hearing is held. According to the POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY BOARD and OFFICE of the DIRECTOR OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY Interim Regulations for Handling Complaints Against Sworn Officers of the Police Department, the grounds upon which a complaint may be administratively closed include but are not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Complaint does not allege prima facie misconduct or is frivolous or retaliatory. ii. Request for closure by the complainant. iii. Unavailability of complainant where staff has attempted at least 3 telephone, electronic mail and/or regular mail contacts. Attempts to reach the complainant by telephone and/or mail shall be documented in the recommendation for Administrative Closure. iv. Mootness of the complaint including but not limited to situations where the subject officer’s employment has been terminated or where the complaint has been resolved by other means. v. Failure of the complainant to cooperate, including but not limited to: refusal to submit to an interview, to make available essential evidence, to attend a hearing, and similar action or inaction by a complainant that compromises the integrity of the investigation or has a significant prejudicial effect. vi. Failure of ODPA staff to timely complete its investigation, as set forth in Section II.C.1.
N/A	Not Applicable
N/R	Berkeley Charter Section 125(18)(k) provides the discretion to the Director of Police Accountability to request further review from the City Manager. In this case “N/R” means a subsequent review after receiving the Chief’s Tentative findings was not requested and the Chief’s findings become Final.

Case Number	2023-CI-0007
Allegations	<p>Allegation 1. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>--Race or Ethnicity</p> <p>(OFFICER 1)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer's actions resulted from racial or ethnic bias against the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 2. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>--Failure to Investigate</p> <p>(OFFICER 1)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer failed to adequately investigate before forcing the complainant to leave the premises.</i></p> <p>Allegation 3. IMPROPER USE OF FORCE</p> <p>--Improper Physical Contact</p> <p>(OFFICER 1)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer improperly used physical force against the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 4. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES</p> <p>--Failure to Identify Oneself</p> <p>(OFFICER 1)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer failed to properly identify himself.</i></p> <p>Allegation 5. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>--Rudeness or Intimidating Attitude</p> <p>(OFFICER 1)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer exhibited a dismissive or intimidating attitude or behavior towards the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 6. HARASSMENT</p> <p>(OFFICER 1)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer harassed the complainant.</i></p>

DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. UNFOUNDED 5. UNFOUNDED 6. UNFOUNDED	1. SUSTAINED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. SUSTAINED 4. UNFOUNDED 5. UNFOUNDED 6. UNFOUNDED	1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. UNFOUNDED 5. UNFOUNDED 6. UNFOUNDED	1. -N/R- 125(18)(K) DISCRETION INVOKED BY DPA TO NOT SEND TO CM FOR FINAL DECISION

Case Number	2023-CI-0008		
Allegations	<p>Allegation 1. DISCOURTESY (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2) <i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide information.</i></p> <p>Allegation 2. DISCRIMINATION (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2) <i>Whether the subject officer's actions resulted in prejudicial treatment based on gender, national origin, or race and ethnicity.</i></p> <p>Allegation 3. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2) <i>Whether the subject officer failed to write or record an accurate report of the incident.</i></p> <p>Allegation 4. DISCOURTESY (OFFICER 2) <i>Whether the subject officer exhibited a dismissive attitude or behavior towards the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 5. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2) <i>Whether subject officers failed to follow proper procedures.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings

1. EXONERATED 2. EXONERATED 3. TIME-BARRED 4. TIME-BARRED 5. UNFOUNDED	1. EXONERATED 2. EXONERATED 3. TIME-BARRED 4. TIME-BARRED 5. UNFOUNDED	1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. UNFOUNDED 5. UNFOUNDED	1. -N/R- 125(18)(K) DISCRETION INVOKED BY DPA TO NOT SEND TO CM FOR FINAL DECISION
--	--	--	--

Case Number	2023-CI-0009
Allegations	<p>Allegation 1. IMPROPER USE OF FORCE (OFFICER 1) <i>Whether subject officers improperly used physical force against the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 2. IMPROPER DETENTION (OFFICER 1) <i>Whether subject officers improperly detained the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 3. DISCOURTESY (OFFICER 1) <i>Whether subject officers spoke to the complainant in a discourteous manner.</i></p> <p>Allegation 4. DISCOURTESY (OFFICER 1) <i>Whether subject officers failed to provide information to the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 5. IMPROPER ARREST (OFFICER 1) <i>Whether subject officers improperly arrested the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 6. IMPROPER SEARCH (OFFICER 1) <i>Whether subject officers improperly searched the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 7. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES (OFFICER 1)</p>

<p><i>Whether subject officers failed to give the complainant a Miranda warning.</i></p> <p>Allegation 8. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES</p> <p>(OFFICER 2)</p> <p><i>Whether subject officers questioned the complainant without reading him a Miranda admonition.</i></p>			
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. EXONERATED 5. UNFOUNDED 6. UNFOUNDED 7. EXONERATED 8. UNFOUNDED	1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. EXONERATED 5. UNFOUNDED 6. UNFOUNDED 7. EXONERATED 8. UNFOUNDED	1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. EXONERATED 5. UNFOUNDED 6. UNFOUNDED 7. EXONERATED 8. UNFOUNDED	1. -N/R- 125(18)(K) DISCRETION INVOKED BY DPA TO NOT SEND TO CM FOR FINAL DECISION

Case Number	2023-CI-0010
Allegations	<p>Allegation 1. IMPROPER DETENTION</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer improperly detained the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer spoke and acted in a discourteous manner.</i></p> <p>Allegation 3. IMPROPER CITATION</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer improperly issued a traffic citation to the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 4. DISHONESTY</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer falsified information on a traffic citation.</i></p> <p>Allegation 5. THREAT TO ARREST</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer improperly threatened to arrest the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 6. HARASSMENT</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer harassed the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 7. UNSAFE DRIVING</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer drove in an unsafe manner.</i></p>

DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. EXONERATED 2. SUSTAINED 3. EXONERATED 4. UNFOUNDED 5. EXONERATED 6. SUSTAINED 7. UNFOUNDED	1. EXONERATED 2. SUSTAINED 3. EXONERATED 4. UNFOUNDED 5. EXONERATED 6. SUSTAINED 7. UNFOUNDED	1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. UNFOUNDED 5. UNFOUNDED 6. UNFOUNDED 7. UNFOUNDED	1. UNFOUNDED 2. SUSTAINED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. UNFOUNDED 5. UNFOUNDED 6. UNFOUNDED 7. UNFOUNDED

Case Number	2023-CI-0011		
Allegations	<p>Allegation 1. IMPROPER DETENTION (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3) <i>Whether the subject officers improperly detained the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 2. HARASSMENT (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3) <i>Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 3. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3) <i>Whether the subject officers failed to follow proper procedures.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. EXONERATED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. EXONERATED	1. EXONERATED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. EXONERATED	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE – BPD DETERMINED COMPLAINT LACKED FACTUAL BASIS	1. -N/R- NO 125(18)(K) DISCRETION INVOKED BY DPA TO NOT SEND TO CM FOR FINAL DECISION

Case Number	2023-CI-0012
Allegations	<p>Allegation 1. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES <i>Whether the subject officer failed to make an arrest in violation of BPD</i></p>

	<p><i>Policies</i></p> <p>Allegation 2. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer failed to write or record an accurate report of the incident.</i></p> <p>Allegation 3. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer improperly redacted the police report.</i></p> <p>Allegation 4. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p><i>Whether any of the subject officer's actions resulted from racial or ethnic bias against the Complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 5. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p><i>Whether any of the subject officer's actions resulted from gender bias against Complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 6. DISCOURTESY</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer was discourteous when he failed to arrest a person who assaulted and threatened the Complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 7. DISCOURTESY</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer failed to provide Complainant with information regarding the investigation.</i></p> <p>Allegation 8. DISCOURTESY</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer exhibited rudeness or intimidating attitudes or behavior towards the Complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 9. DISCOURTESY</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer failed to provide Complainant with the properly requested copy of the incident report.</i></p> <p>Allegation 10. DISCOURTESY</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer failed to provide Complainant with the properly requested copy of the incident report.</i></p>			
	DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
	1. UNFOUNDED	1. UNFOUNDED	1. EXONERATED	1. -N/R-
	2. UNFOUNDED	2. UNFOUNDED	2. UNFOUNDED	125(18)(K)
	3. UNFOUNDED	3. UNFOUNDED	3. UNFOUNDED	DISCRETION
	4. UNFOUNDED	4. UNFOUNDED	4. UNFOUNDED	INVOKED BY
	5. UNFOUNDED	5. UNFOUNDED	5. UNFOUNDED	DPA TO NOT
	6. UNFOUNDED	6. UNFOUNDED	6. UNFOUNDED	SEND TO CM

7. UNFOUNDED 8. UNFOUNDED 9. UNFOUNDED 10. UNFOUNDED	7. UNFOUNDED 8. UNFOUNDED 9. UNFOUNDED 10. UNFOUNDED	7. UNFOUNDED 8. UNFOUNDED 9. UNFOUNDED 10. UNFOUNDED	FOR FINAL DECISION
---	---	---	-----------------------

Case Number	2023-CI-0013
Allegations	<p>Allegation 1. IMPROPER ARREST (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2)</p> <p><i>Whether subject officers improperly arrested the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 2. DISCRIMINATION -- Race or Ethnicity (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from racial or ethnic bias regarding the complainant and his wife.</i></p> <p>Allegation 3. DISCRIMINATION -- Disability (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from bias regarding the complainant's wife's disability.</i></p> <p>Allegation 4. IMPROPER USE OF FORCE -- Improper Physical Contact (OFFICER 2)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly used physical force against the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 5. IMPROPER USE OF FORCE -- Improper Use of Handcuffs (OFFICER 2)</p> <p><i>Whether subject officers improperly applied handcuffs on the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 6. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p>

-- Failure to Investigate
(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)
Whether the subject officers failed to adequately investigate the incident.

Allegation 7. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- False or Improper Police Report
(OFFICER 1)
Whether the subject officers failed to accurately record or report the facts in the police report.

Allegation 8. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURE

-- Failure to provide medical assistance
(OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)
Whether the subject officer failed to ensure that the complainant received proper medical assistance.

Allegation 9. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURE

-- Improper confiscation of property
(OFFICER 3)
Whether the subject officer improperly confiscated the complainant's property.

Allegation 10. HARASSMENT
(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2)
Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant by arresting him without cause.

Allegation 11. RETALIATION
Whether the subject officers retaliated against the complainant by contacting Adult Protective Services and making false allegations relating to the complainant.

DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. EXONERATED	1. EXONERATED	1. UNFOUNDED	1. -N/R-
2. UNFOUNDED	2. UNFOUNDED	2. UNFOUNDED	125(18)(K)
3. UNFOUNDED	3. UNFOUNDED	3. UNFOUNDED	DISCRETION
4. UNFOUNDED	4. UNFOUNDED	4. UNFOUNDED	INVOKED BY
5. UNFOUNDED	5. UNFOUNDED	5. UNFOUNDED	DPA TO NOT
6. UNFOUNDED	6. UNFOUNDED	6. UNFOUNDED	SEND TO CM
7. UNFOUNDED	7. UNFOUNDED	7. UNFOUNDED	

8. UNFOUNDED 9. NOT SUSTAINED 10. UNFOUNDED 11. UNFOUNDED	8. UNFOUNDED 9. UNFOUNDED 10. UNFOUNDED 11. UNFOUNDED	8. UNFOUNDED 9. UNFOUNDED 10. UNFOUNDED 11. UNFOUNDED	FOR FINAL DECISION
--	--	--	--------------------

Case Number	2023-CI-0014		
Allegations	<p>Allegation 1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Respond</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to properly respond to a report of violation of a restraining order.</i></p> <p>Allegation 2. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>-- Gender</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from gender bias.</i></p> <p>Allegation 3. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>-- Failure to investigate or make a police report</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report in violation of BPD policies.</i></p> <p>Allegation 4. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>-- Failure to enforce a restraining order</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to properly enforce a restraining order.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. UNFOUNDED	1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. UNFOUNDED	1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. UNFOUNDED	1. -N/R- 125(18)(K) DISCRETION INVOKED BY DPA TO NOT SEND TO CM

			FOR FINAL DECISION
--	--	--	--------------------

Case Number	2023-CI-0015		
Allegations	<p>Allegation 1. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer failed to remove trespassers or to cite or arrest trespassers in violation of BPD policies.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE ²⁰ CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2023-CI-0017		
Allegations	<p>Allegation 1. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer failed to write or record an accurate report of the incident.</i></p> <p>Allegation 2. DISCOURTESY (OFFICER 6)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer failed to provide the complainant with information regarding the investigation.</i></p> <p>Allegation 3. DISCRIMINATION (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 5)</p>		

²⁰ This case was administratively closed because of an inability to complete the process as indicated in the Charter within the 240-days.

	<i>Whether the subject officer failed to provide the complainant with information regarding the investigation.</i>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. UNFOUNDED 2. EXONERATED 3. EXONERATED & UNFOUNDED	1. UNFOUNDED 2. EXONERATED 3. EXONERATED & UNFOUNDED	1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED	1. -N/R- 125(18)(K) DISCRETION INVOKED BY DPA TO NOT SEND TO CM FOR FINAL DECISION

Case Number	2023-CI-0018		
Allegations	<p>Allegation 1. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to write or record an accurate report of the incident.</i></p> <p>Allegation 2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer failed to provide the Complainant with information regarding the investigation.</i></p> <p>Allegation 3. DISCOURTESY</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer exhibited rudeness or intimidating attitudes or behavior toward the Complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 4. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers discriminated against Complainant on the basis of race.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. UNFOUNDED	1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. UNFOUNDED	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE – BPD DETERMINED COMPLAINT LACKED FACTUAL BASIS	1. -N/R- 125(18)(K) DISCRETION INVOKED BY DPA TO NOT SEND TO CM FOR FINAL DECISION

Case Number	2023-CI-0019		
Allegations	<p>Allegation 1. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer failed to write or record an accurate report of the incident.</i></p> <p>Allegation 2. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer failed to investigate the incidents.</i></p> <p>Allegation 3. DISCOURTESY (OFFICER 2)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer failed to provide the complainant with the requested report number.</i></p> <p>Allegation 4. DISCRIMINATION (OFFICER 2)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer discriminated against the complainant on the basis of his national origin.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. EXONERATED 4. UNFOUNDED 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. EXONERATED 4. UNFOUNDED 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. EXONERATED 4. UNFOUNDED 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. -N/R- 125(18)(K) DISCRETION INVOKED BY DPA TO NOT SEND TO CM FOR FINAL DECISION

Case Number	2024-CI-0001
Allegations	<p>Allegation 1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer failed to provide warning tickets.</i></p>

	Allegation 2. HARASSMENT		
	<i>Whether the subject officer harassed the complainant by repeatedly towing his vehicles.</i>		
	Allegation 3. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION		
	<i>Whether the subject officer made a false or improper police report.</i>		
	Allegation 4. DISCRIMINATION		
	<i>Whether the subject officer discriminated against Complainant on the basis of his race or ethnicity.</i>		
Allegation 5. IMPROPER SEARCH			
<i>Whether the subject officer improperly searched the complainant's vehicle.</i>			
Allegation 6. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES			
<i>Whether the subject officer improperly confiscated the complainant's property when he towed his vehicles.</i>			
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. UNFOUNDED 5. UNFOUNDED 6. UNFOUNDED	1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. UNFOUNDED 5. UNFOUNDED 6. UNFOUNDED	1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. UNFOUNDED 5. UNFOUNDED 6. UNFOUNDED	1. -N/R- 125(18)(K) DISCRETION INVOKED BY DPA TO NOT SEND TO CM FOR FINAL DECISION

Case Number	2024-CI-0002
Allegations	Allegation 1. DISCOURTESY <i>Whether the subject officers used abusive language.</i>
	Allegation 2. DISCOURTESY <i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide the complainant with information on how to submit evidence and participate in the investigation.</i>

Allegation 3. DISCOURTESY

Whether the subject officers failed to respond.

Allegation 4. DISCRIMINATION

-- Disability, gender, race or ethnicity, and political affiliation

Whether the subject officers discriminated against the complainant on the basis of disability, gender, race or ethnicity, or political affiliation.

Allegation 5. HARASSMENT

Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.

Allegation 6. IMPROPER DETENTION

Whether the subject officers improperly detained the complainant.

Allegation 7. IMPROPER CITATION

Whether the subject officers improperly cited the complainant.

Allegation 8. IMPROPER ARREST

Whether the subject officers improperly arrested the complainant.

Allegation 9. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- Failure to Investigate

Whether the subject officers failed to adequately investigate the incident.

Allegation 10. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- False or Improper Police Report

Whether the subject officers failed to accurately record or report the facts in the police report.

Allegation 11. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES

-- Damage to property

Whether the subject officers improperly caused damage to property.

Allegation 12. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES

-- Improper Confiscation of property

Whether the subject officers confiscated property in violation of BPD

policies.

Allegation 13. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES

-- Failure to identify oneself or no badge visible

Whether the subject officers failed to identify themselves or had no badge visible.

Allegation 14. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURE

-- Failure to provide medical assistance

Whether the subject officer failed to ensure that the complainant receive proper medical assistance.

Allegation 15. IMPROPER SEARCH -

-- Home

Whether the subject officers improperly searched the complainant's home.

Allegation 16. IMPROPER SEARCH

-- Person

Whether the subject officers improperly searched the complainant's person.

Allegation 17. IMPROPER SEARCH

-- Vehicle

Whether the subject officers searched the complainants' vehicle.

Allegation 18. IMPROPER USE OF FORCE

-- Improper Physical Contact

Whether the subject officers improperly used physical force against the complainant.

Allegation 19. IMPROPER USE OF FORCE

-- Improper display of a firearm

Whether the subject officers improperly displayed their firearm against the complainant.

Allegation 20. IMPROPER USE OF FORCE

--Improper use of handcuffs

Whether the subject officers improperly used handcuffs.

DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A

Case Number	2024-CI-0005
Allegations	<p>Allegation 1. DISCOURTESY <i>Whether the subject officer used abusive language.</i></p> <p>Allegation 2. DISCOURTESY <i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide the complainant with information on how to submit evidence and participate in the investigation.</i></p> <p>Allegation 3. DISCOURTESY <i>Whether the subject officers failed to respond.</i></p> <p>Allegation 4. DISCRIMINATION <i>Whether the subject officer discriminated against Complainant on the basis of his race or ethnicity, and gender.</i></p> <p>Allegation 5. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION <i>Whether the subject officer failed to investigate the crash.</i></p> <p>Allegation 6. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION <i>Whether the subject officer made a false and improper police report.</i></p> <p>Allegation 7. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES</p>

	<p><i>Whether the subject officer failed to provide medical assistance to the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 8. IMPROPER USE OF FORCE</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer improperly grabbed the complainant's arm.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. UNFOUNDED 5. UNFOUNDED 6. EXONERATED 7. UNFOUNDED 8. UNFOUNDED 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. UNFOUNDED 5. UNFOUNDED 6. EXONERATED 7. UNFOUNDED 8. UNFOUNDED 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. EXONERATED 4. UNFOUNDED 5. REMOVED - LACKS PRIMA FACIA EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT MISCONDUCT AND WAS REMOVED 6. EXONERATED 7. REMOVED - DEMONSTRABLY FALSE AND WAS REMOVED FROM COMPLAINT. 8. REMOVED - DEMONSTRABLY FALSE AND WAS REMOVED FROM COMPLAINT. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. -N/R- 125(18)(K) DISCRETION INVOKED BY DPA TO NOT SEND TO CM FOR FINAL DECISION

Case Number	2024-CI-0006
Allegations	<p>Allegation 1. IMPROPER DETENTION</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly detained the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 2. IMPROPER CITATION</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer improperly cited the complainant.</i></p>

	Allegation 3. IMPROPER ARREST (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3) <i>Whether the subject officer improperly arrested the complainant.</i>		
	Allegation 4. IMPROPER SEARCH (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3) <i>Whether the subject officer improperly searched the complainant's person.</i>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. UNFOUNDED	1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. UNFOUNDED	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE – BPD DETERMINED COMPLAINT LACKED FACTUAL BASIS	1. -N/R- 125(18)(K) DISCRETION INVOKED BY DPA TO NOT SEND TO CM FOR FINAL DECISION

Case Number	2024-CI-0007		
Allegations	Allegation 1. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATE --Failure to investigate or make police report <i>Whether the subject officers failed to investigate the complainant's alleged attack.</i>		
	Allegation 2. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATE --False or improper police report <i>Whether the subject officers filed a false or improper police report.</i>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0008		
Allegations	Allegation 1. HARASSMENT		

	<p><i>Whether the subject officer harassed the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 2. IMPROPER DETENTION</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer improperly detained the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 3. IMPROPER CITATION</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer improperly cited the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 4. IMPROPER ARREST</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer improperly arrested the complainant.</i></p> <p>Allegation 5. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATE</p> <p>--Failure to investigate or make police report</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer wrote a false or improper police report.</i></p> <p>Allegation 6. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES</p> <p>-- Damage to property</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer improperly caused damage to property.</i></p> <p>Allegation 7. IDENTITY THEFT</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officer used identity theft against the complainant.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0010
Allegations	<p>1. DISCRIMINATION -- Race or ethnicity</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6) <i>Whether subject officers discriminated against the complainant.</i></p> <p>2. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION -- False or improper police report</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6) <i>Whether subject officers wrote a false or improper police report.</i></p>

	<p>3. IMPROPER USE OF FORCE --Improper physical contact</p> <p>(OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3) <i>Whether the subject officer improperly made physical contact with the complainant.</i></p> <p>4. IMPROPER USE OF FORCE --Improper use of handcuffs</p> <p>(OFFICER 3, OFFICER 5) <i>Whether the subject officer improperly used handcuffs.</i></p> <p>5. IMPROPER ARREST</p> <p>(OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3) <i>Whether subject officers improperly arrested the complainant.</i></p> <p>6. DISCOURTESY -- Abusive or Obscene Language</p> <p>(OFFICER 3) <i>Whether the subject officer was playing obscene music in her car while transporting the complainant.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. EXONERATED & UNFOUNDED 4. EXONERATED 5. UNFOUNDED 6. UNFOUNDED 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. EXONERATED & UNFOUNDED 4. EXONERATED 5. UNFOUNDED 6. UNFOUNDED 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. UNFOUNDED 5. UNFOUNDED 6. UNFOUNDED 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. -N/R- 125(18)(K) DISCRETION INVOKED BY DPA TO NOT SEND TO CM FOR FINAL DECISION

Case Number	2024-CI-0011
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY -- Failure to provide information <i>Whether the subject officer failed to provide the complainant with information.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY -- Failure to respond <i>Whether the subject officer failed to respond to the complainant.</i></p> <p>3. DISCRIMINATION -- Disability, gender, race or ethnicity, and political affiliation)</p>

	<i>Whether the subject officer discriminated against the complainant on the basis of disability, gender, race or ethnicity, or political affiliation.</i>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED	1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED 3. UNFOUNDED	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE – BPD DETERMINED COMPLAINT LACKED FACTUAL BASIS	1. -N/R- 125(18)(K) DISCRETION INVOKED BY DPA TO NOT SEND TO CM FOR FINAL DECISION

Case Number	2024-CI-0012		
Allegations	<p>1. DISCRIMINATION --Nationality & Race or ethnicity (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4) <i>Whether the subject officers discriminated against the complainant by not providing an interpreter.</i></p> <p>2. IMPROPER SEARCH --Vehicle (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4) <i>Whether the subject officers improperly searched a witness' vehicle.</i></p> <p>3. DISCOURTESY - Failure to provide information (OFFICER 2, OFFICER 5) <i>Whether the subject officers failed to respond to the complaints.</i></p> <p>4. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES - Improper body-worn camera use (OFFICER 2, OFFICER 1, OFFICER 4) <i>Whether the subject officer activated their body-worn camera as required by policy</i></p> <p>5. IMPROPER SEARCH - Person (OFFICER 2, OFFICER 1, OFFICER 4) <i>Whether the subject officers improperly did a pat-down search on a witness.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. SUSTAINED 2. EXONERATED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. SUSTAINED	1. SUSTAINED 2. EXONERATED 3. UNFOUNDED 4. SUSTAINED	1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED/EXONERATED	1. UNFOUNDED 2. UNFOUNDED

5. NOT SUSTAINED	5. NOT SUSTAINED	3. REMOVED – LACKED FACTUAL EVIDENCE OF CONSTITUTING A VIOLATION OF DEPARTMENT POLICY 4. SUSTAINED 5. UNFOUNDED	3. REMOVED 4. UNFOUNDED 5. UNFOUNDED
------------------	------------------	---	--

Case Number	2024-CI-0013		
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY --Failure to provide information (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2) <i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide the complainant with information.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY --Failure to respond (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2) <i>Whether the subject officer failed to respond to the complainant.</i></p> <p>3. DISCRIMINATION --Disability, gender, nationality, and race or ethnicity (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2) <i>Whether the subject officer discriminated against the complainant on the basis of disability, gender, nationality, and race or ethnicity.</i></p> <p>4. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATE --Failure to investigate or make a police report (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2) <i>Whether the subject officers failed to investigate the complainant's alleged attack.</i></p> <p>5. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATE --False or improper police report (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2) <i>Whether the subject officer filed a false or improper police report.</i></p> <p>6. IMPROPER SEARCH --Person (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2) <i>Whether the subject officer improperly searched complainant's person.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

--	--	--	--

Case Number	2024-CI-0016
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide information to the complainant.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p>3. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>--Disability</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions result from Disability bias against the complainant.</i></p> <p>4. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>--Gender</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Gender bias against the complainant.</i></p> <p>5. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>-- Nationality</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Nationality bias against the complainant.</i></p> <p>6. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>-- Race or ethnicity</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p>

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Racial or Ethnic bias against the complainant.

7. DISCRIMINATION

-- Religion

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Religious bias against the complainant.

8. HARASSMENT

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.

9. IMPROPER DETENTION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers improperly detained the complainant.

10. IMPROPER CITATION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers improperly cited the complainant.

11. IMPROPER ARREST

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers improperly arrested the complainant.

12. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- Failure to investigate or make a police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report.

13. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- False or improper police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.

14. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES

	<p>-- Damage to property</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly caused damage to property.</i></p> <p>15. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES</p> <p>-- Confiscation of property</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers confiscated property in violation of BPD policies.</i></p> <p>16. IMPROPER SEARCH - PERSON</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.</i></p> <p>17. IMPROPER SEARCH - VEHICLE</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0017
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide information to the complainant.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond</p>

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

3. DISCRIMINATION

--Disability

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Disability bias against the complainant.

4. DISCRIMINATION

--Gender

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Gender bias against the complainant.

5. DISCRIMINATION

-- Nationality

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Nationality bias against the complainant.

6. DISCRIMINATION

-- Race or ethnicity

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Racial or Ethnic bias against the complainant.

7. DISCRIMINATION

-- Religion

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Religious bias against the complainant.

8. HARASSMENT

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.

9. IMPROPER DETENTION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers improperly detained the complainant.

10. IMPROPER CITATION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers improperly cited the complainant.

11. IMPROPER ARREST

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers improperly arrested the complainant.

12. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- Failure to investigate or make a police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report.

13. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- False or improper police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.

14. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES

-- Confiscation of property

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers confiscated property in violation of BPD policies.

15. IMPROPER SEARCH - PERSON

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.

16. IMPROPER SEARCH - VEHICLE

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.

DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0018
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide information to the complainant.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p>3. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>--Disability</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Disability bias against the complainant.</i></p> <p>4. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>--Gender</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Gender bias against the complainant.</i></p> <p>5. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>-- Nationality</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Nationality bias against the complainant.</i></p>

<p>6. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>-- Race or ethnicity</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Racial or Ethnic bias against the complainant.</i></p> <p>7. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>-- Religion</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Religious bias against the complainant.</i></p> <p>8. HARASSMENT</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.</i></p>			
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0019
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide information to the complainant.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p>3. DISCOURTESY</p>

-- Abusive or obscene language

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

4. DISCRIMINATION

--Disability

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Disability bias against the complainant.

5. DISCRIMINATION

--Gender

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Gender bias against the complainant.

6. DISCRIMINATION

-- Nationality

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Nationality bias against the complainant.

7. DISCRIMINATION

-- Race or ethnicity

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Racial or Ethnic bias against the complainant.

8. DISCRIMINATION

-- Religion

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Religious bias against the complainant.

9. HARASSMENT

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.

	<p>10. IMPROPER DETENTION</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly detained the complainant.</i></p>
	<p>11. IMPROPER CITATION</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly cited the complainant.</i></p>
	<p>12. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>-- Failure to investigate or make a police report</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report.</i></p>
	<p>13. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>-- False or improper police report</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.</i></p>
	<p>14. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES</p> <p>-- Damage to property</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly caused damage to property.</i></p>
	<p>15. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES</p> <p>-- Confiscation of property</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers confiscated property in violation of BPD policies.</i></p>
	<p>16. IMPROPER SEARCH - PERSON</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.</i></p>
<p>17. IMPROPER SEARCH - VEHICLE</p>	

	(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3) <i>Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.</i>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0020
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide information to the complainant.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p>3. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>--Disability</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Disability bias against the complainant.</i></p> <p>4. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>--Gender</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Gender bias against the complainant.</i></p> <p>5. DISCRIMINATION</p>

-- Nationality

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Nationality bias against the complainant.

6. DISCRIMINATION

-- Race or ethnicity

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Racial or Ethnic bias against the complainant.

7. DISCRIMINATION

-- Religion

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Religious bias against the complainant.

8. HARASSMENT

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.

9. IMPROPER CITATION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers improperly cited the complainant.

10. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- Failure to investigate or make a police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report.

11. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- False or improper police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.

12. IMPROPER SEARCH - PERSON

	<p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.</i></p> <p>13. IMPROPER SEARCH - VEHICLE</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A

Case Number	2024-CI-0021
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Abusive or obscene language</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers used abusive or obscene language.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide information to the complainant.</i></p> <p>3. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p>4. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>-- Disability</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Disability bias against the complainant.</i></p>

5. DISCRIMINATION

-- Gender

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Gender bias against the complainant.

6. DISCRIMINATION

-- Nationality

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Nationality bias against the complainant.

7. DISCRIMINATION

-- Race or ethnicity

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Racial or Ethnic bias against the complainant.

8. DISCRIMINATION

-- Religion

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Religious bias against the complainant.

9. HARASSMENT

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.

10. IMPROPER CITATION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers improperly cited the complainant.

11. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- Failure to investigate or make a police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

	<p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report.</i></p> <p>12. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>-- False or improper police report</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.</i></p> <p>13. IMPROPER SEARCH - PERSON</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.</i></p> <p>14. IMPROPER SEARCH - VEHICLE</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0022
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Abusive or obscene language</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers used abusive or obscene language.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide information to the complainant.</i></p> <p>3. DISCOURTESY</p>

-- Failure to respond

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

4. DISCRIMINATION

-- Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Disability bias against the complainant.

5. HARASSMENT

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.

6. IMPROPER CITATION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers improperly cited the complainant.

7. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- Failure to investigate or make a police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report.

8. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- False or improper police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.

9. IMPROPER SEARCH - PERSON

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.

10. IMPROPER SEARCH - VEHICLE

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.

DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0023
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide information to the complainant.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to respond to the complainant.</i></p> <p>3. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>-- Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers discriminated against the complainant.</i></p> <p>4. HARASSMENT</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.</i></p> <p>5. IMPROPER CITATION</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers issued an improper citation.</i></p> <p>6. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>-- Failure to investigate or make a police report</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p>

	<p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report.</i></p> <p>7. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>-- False or improper police report</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.</i></p> <p>8. IMPROPER SEARCH - PERSON</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.</i></p> <p>9. IMPROPER SEARCH - VEHICLE</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0024
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide information to the complainant.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to respond to the complainant.</i></p>

3. DISCRIMINATION

-- Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers discriminated against the complainant.

4. HARASSMENT

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.

5. IMPROPER CITATION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers issued an improper citation.

6. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- Failure to investigate or make a police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report.

7. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- False or improper police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.

8. IMPROPER SEARCH

-- Person

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.

9. IMPROPER SEARCH -

-- Vehicle

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.

DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0026
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Abusive or obscene language</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers used abusive or obscene language.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide the complainant with information.</i></p> <p>3. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6)</p> <p>4. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>-- Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Disability bias against the complainant.</i></p> <p>5. HARASSMENT</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6)</p>

Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.

6. IMPROPER DETENTION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6)

Whether the subject officers improperly detained the complainant.

7. IMPROPER CITATION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6)

Whether the subject officers improperly cited the complainant.

8. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- Failure to investigate or make a police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6)

Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report.

9. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- False or improper police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6)

Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.

10. IMPROPER SEARCH

-- Person

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6)

Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.

11. IMPROPER SEARCH -

-- Vehicle

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6)

Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.

DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0027
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Abusive or obscene language</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers used abusive or obscene language.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide the complainant with information.</i></p> <p>3. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)</p> <p>4. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>-- Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Disability bias against the complainant.</i></p> <p>5. HARASSMENT</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.</i></p> <p>6. IMPROPER DETENTION</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly detained the complainant.</i></p>

7. IMPROPER CITATION
(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)
Whether the subject officers improperly cited the complainant.

8. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION
-- Failure to investigate or make a police report
(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)
Whether the subject officers failed to make a police report.

9. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION
-- False or improper police report
(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)
Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.

10. IMPROPER SEARCH
-- Person
(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)
Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.

11. IMPROPER SEARCH -
-- Vehicle
(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)
Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.

DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0028
Allegations	1. DISCOURTESY -- Failure to Provide Information

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers failed to provide the complainant with information.

2. DISCOURTESY

-- Failure to respond

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers failed to respond to the complainant.

3. DISCRIMINATION

-- Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers discriminated against the complainant.

4. IMPROPER CITATION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers issued an improper citation.

5. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- Failure to investigate or make a police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers failed to make a police report.

6. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- False or improper police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.

7. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES

-- Improper confiscation of property

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers improperly confiscated the complainant's property.

8. IMPROPER SEARCH

	<p>-- Person</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.</i></p> <p>9. IMPROPER SEARCH -</p> <p>-- Vehicle</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0029
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide the complainant with information.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to respond to the complainant.</i></p> <p>3. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>-- Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers discriminated against the complainant.</i></p>

	<p>4. HARASSMENT</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.</i></p>		
	<p>5. IMPROPER CITATION</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers issued an improper citation.</i></p>		
	<p>6. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>-- Failure to investigate or make a police report</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to make a police report.</i></p>		
	<p>7. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>-- False or improper police report</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.</i></p>		
	<p>8. IMPROPER SEARCH</p> <p>-- Person</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.</i></p>		
<p>9. IMPROPER SEARCH -</p> <p>-- Vehicle</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.</i></p>			
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0030		
Allegations	<p>1. IMPROPER OF INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION DETENTION <i>Whether the subject officer failed to investigate or make a police report.</i></p> <p>2. IMPROPER OF INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION <i>Whether the subject officer prepared a false or improper police report.</i></p> <p>3. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES <i>Whether the subject officer failed to provide medical assistance.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE PER COMPLAINANTS REQUEST	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE PER COMPLAINANTS REQUEST	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0032		
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY -- Abusive or obscene language (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7) <i>Whether the subject officers used abusive or obscene language.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY -- Failure to Provide Information (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2) <i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide the complainant with information.</i></p> <p>3. DISCOURTESY -- Failure to respond (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2) <i>Whether the subject officers failed to respond to the complainant.</i></p>		

4. DISCRIMINATION

-- Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Disability bias against the complainant.

5. HARASSMENT

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2)

Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.

6. IMPROPER DETENTION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2)

Whether the subject officers improperly detained the complainant.

7. IMPROPER CITATION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2)

Whether the subject officers improperly cited the complainant.

8. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- Failure to investigate or make a police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2)

Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report.

9. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- False or improper police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2)

Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.

10. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES

-- Improper confiscation of property

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2)

Whether the subject officers improperly confiscated the complainant's property.

11. IMPROPER SEARCH

	<p>-- Person</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.</i></p> <p>12. IMPROPER SEARCH -</p> <p>-- Vehicle</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0033
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Abusive or obscene language</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers used abusive or obscene language.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide information to the complainant.</i></p> <p>3. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to respond to the complainant.</i></p>

4. DISCRIMINATION

-- Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5,
OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)

Whether the subject officers discriminated against the complainant.

5. HARASSMENT

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5,
OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)

Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.

6. IMPROPER DETENTION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5,
OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)

Whether the subject officers improperly detained the complainant.

7. IMPROPER CITATION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5,
OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)

Whether the subject officers improperly cited the complainant.

8. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- Failure to investigate or make a police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5,
OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)

Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report.

9. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- False or improper police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5,
OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)

Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.

10. IMPROPER SEARCH - PERSON

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5,
OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)

	<p><i>Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.</i></p> <p>11. IMPROPER SEARCH - VEHICLE</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0034
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Abusive or obscene language</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers used abusive or obscene language.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide information to the complainant.</i></p> <p>3. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to respond to the complainant.</i></p> <p>4. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>--Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion</p>

	<p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers discriminated against the complainant.</i></p> <p>5. HARASSMENT</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.</i></p> <p>6. IMPROPER CITATION</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly cited the complainant.</i></p> <p>7. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>-- Failure to investigate or make a police report</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report.</i></p> <p>8. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>-- False or improper police report</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.</i></p> <p>9. IMPROPER SEARCH - PERSON</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.</i></p> <p>10. IMPROPER SEARCH - VEHICLE</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.</i></p>
--	---

DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0035
--------------------	--------------

<p>Allegations</p>	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide information to the complainant.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to respond to the complainant.</i></p> <p>3. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>-- Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers discriminated against the complainant.</i></p> <p>4. HARASSMENT</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.</i></p> <p>5. IMPROPER CITATION</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly cited the complainant.</i></p> <p>6. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>-- Failure to investigate or make a police report</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report.</i></p> <p>7. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>-- False or improper police report</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.</i></p> <p>8. IMPROPER SEARCH - PERSON</p>
---------------------------	--

	<p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.</i></p> <p>9. IMPROPER SEARCH - VEHICLE</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0036
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Abusive or obscene language</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers used abusive or obscene language.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide information to the complainant.</i></p> <p>3. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to respond to the complainant.</i></p> <p>4. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>-- Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Disability bias against</i></p>

	<p><i>the complainant.</i></p> <p>5. HARASSMENT</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.</i></p> <p>6. IMPROPER DETENTION</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly detained the complainant.</i></p> <p>7. IMPROPER CITATION</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly cited the complainant.</i></p> <p>8. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>-- Failure to investigate or make a police report</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report.</i></p> <p>9. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>-- False or improper police report</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.</i></p> <p>10. IMPROPER SEARCH - PERSON</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.</i></p> <p>11. IMPROPER SEARCH - VEHICLE</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

--	--	--	--

Case Number	2024-CI-0037
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Abusive or obscene language</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers used abusive or obscene language.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide information to the complainant.</i></p> <p>3. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to respond to the complainant.</i></p> <p>4. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>-- Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers discriminated against the complainant.</i></p> <p>5. HARASSMENT</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.</i></p> <p>6. IMPROPER DETENTION</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly detained the complainant.</i></p> <p>7. IMPROPER CITATION</p>

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)
Whether the subject officers issued an improper citation.

8. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION
 -- Failure to investigate or make a police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)
Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report.

9. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION
 -- False or improper police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)
Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.

10. IMPROPER SEARCH - PERSON
 (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)
Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.

11. IMPROPER SEARCH - VEHICLE
 (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5)
Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.

DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0038
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY -- Abusive or obscene language (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3) <i>Whether the subject officers used abusive or obscene language.</i></p>

2. DISCOURTESY

-- Failure to Provide Information

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers failed to provide information to the complainant.

3. DISCOURTESY

-- Failure to respond

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers failed to respond to the complainant.

4. DISCRIMINATION

-- Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers discriminated against the complainant.

5. HARASSMENT

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.

6. IMPROPER DETENTION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers improperly detained the complainant.

7. IMPROPER CITATION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers issued an improper citation.

8. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- Failure to investigate or make a police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report.

9. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- False or improper police report

	<p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.</i></p> <p>10. IMPROPER SEARCH - PERSON</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.</i></p> <p>11. IMPROPER SEARCH - VEHICLE</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0039
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Abusive or obscene language</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers used abusive or obscene language.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide the complainant with information.</i></p> <p>3. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5,</p>

OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)

4. DISCRIMINATION

-- Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5,
OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Disability bias against the complainant.

5. HARASSMENT

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5,
OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)

Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.

6. IMPROPER DETENTION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5,
OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)

Whether the subject officers improperly detained the complainant.

7. IMPROPER CITATION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5,
OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)

Whether the subject officers improperly cited the complainant.

8. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- Failure to investigate or make a police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5,
OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)

Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report.

9. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- False or improper police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5,
OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)

Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.

10. IMPROPER SEARCH

	<p>-- Person</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.</i></p> <p>11. IMPROPER SEARCH -</p> <p>-- Vehicle</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.</i></p>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0040
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Abusive or obscene language</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers used abusive or obscene language.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide the complainant with information.</i></p> <p>3. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p>4. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>-- Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion</p>

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Disability bias against the complainant.

5. HARASSMENT

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.

6. IMPROPER DETENTION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers improperly detained the complainant.

7. IMPROPER CITATION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers improperly cited the complainant.

8. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- Failure to investigate or make a police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers failed to make a police report.

9. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- False or improper police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.

10. IMPROPER SEARCH

-- Person

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.

11. IMPROPER SEARCH -

-- Vehicle

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)

	<i>Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.</i>		
DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0041
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Abusive or obscene language (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers used abusive or obscene language.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide the complainant with information.</i></p> <p>3. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p>4. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>-- Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Disability bias against the complainant.</i></p> <p>5. HARASSMENT</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.</i></p> <p>6. IMPROPER DETENTION</p>

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)
Whether the subject officers improperly detained the complainant.

7. IMPROPER CITATION
(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)
Whether the subject officers improperly cited the complainant.

8. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION
-- Failure to investigate or make a police report
(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)
Whether the subject officers failed to make a police report.

9. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION
-- False or improper police report
(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)
Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.

10. IMPROPER SEARCH
-- Person
(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)
Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.

11. IMPROPER SEARCH -
-- Vehicle
(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)
Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.

DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1) ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1) ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0042
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Abusive or obscene language (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers used abusive or obscene language.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide the complainant with information.</i></p> <p>3. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p>4. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>-- Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Disability bias against the complainant.</i></p> <p>5. HARASSMENT</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.</i></p> <p>6. IMPROPER DETENTION</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly detained the complainant.</i></p> <p>7. IMPROPER CITATION</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly cited the complainant.</i></p> <p>8. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p>

-- Failure to investigate or make a police report
(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)
Whether the subject officers failed to make a police report.

9. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- False or improper police report
(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)
Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.

10. IMPROPER SEARCH

-- Person
(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)
Whether the subject officers searched the complainant without justification.

11. IMPROPER SEARCH -

-- Vehicle
(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3)
Whether the subject officers searched a vehicle without justification.

DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-

Case Number	2024-CI-0043
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Abusive or obscene language (OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4) <i>Whether the subject officers used abusive or obscene language.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p>

-- Failure to Provide Information

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers failed to provide the complainant with information.

3. DISCOURTESY

-- Failure to respond

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers failed to respond to the complainant.

4. DISCRIMINATION

-- Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Disability bias against the complainant.

5. HARASSMENT

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.

6. IMPROPER DETENTION

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers improperly detained the complainant.

7. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- Failure to investigate or make a police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report.

8. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION

-- False or improper police report

(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)

Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.

9. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES

	<p>-- Damage to property</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly caused damage to property.</i></p> <p>10. IMPROPER POLICE PROCEDURES</p> <p>-- Improper confiscation of property</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly confiscated the complainant's property.</i></p> <p>11. IMPROPER SEARCH -</p> <p>-- Home</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly searched the complainant's home.</i></p> <p>12. IMPROPER SEARCH</p> <p>-- Person</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly searched the complainant's person.</i></p> <p>13. IMPROPER SEARCH</p> <p>-- Vehicle</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly searched the complainants' vehicle.</i></p> <p>14. IMPROPER USE OF FORCE</p> <p>-- Improper physical contact</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers made improper physical contact with the complainant.</i></p>			
	DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings

1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-
---------------------------	---------------------------	----------	----------

Case Number	2024-CI-0044
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Abusive or obscene language</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers used abusive or obscene language.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide the complainant with information.</i></p> <p>3. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to respond to the complainant.</i></p> <p>4. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>-- Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Disability bias against the complainant.</i></p> <p>5. HARASSMENT</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.</i></p>

	<p>6. IMPROPER DETENTION</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly detained the complainant.</i></p>		
	<p>7. IMPROPER CITATION</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers issued an improper citation.</i></p>		
	<p>8. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>-- Failure to investigate or make a police report</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report.</i></p>		
	<p>9. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>-- False or improper police report</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.</i></p>		
	<p>10. IMPROPER SEARCH</p> <p>-- Person</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly searched the complainant's person.</i></p>		
	<p>11. IMPROPER SEARCH</p> <p>-- Vehicle</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched the complainants' vehicle.</i></p>		

DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-
---------------------------	---------------------------	----------	----------

Case Number	2024-CI-0047
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Abusive or obscene language</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers used abusive or obscene language.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide the complainant with information.</i></p> <p>3. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to respond to the complainant.</i></p> <p>4. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>-- Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Disability bias against the complainant.</i></p> <p>5. HARASSMENT</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.</i></p>

	<p>6. IMPROPER DETENTION</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly detained the complainant.</i></p>		
	<p>7. IMPROPER CITATION</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers issued an improper citation.</i></p>		
	<p>8. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>-- Failure to investigate or make a police report</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report.</i></p>		
	<p>9. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>-- False or improper police report</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.</i></p>		
	<p>10. IMPROPER SEARCH</p> <p>-- Person</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly searched the complainant's person.</i></p>		
	<p>11. IMPROPER SEARCH</p> <p>-- Vehicle</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched the complainants' vehicle.</i></p>		

DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-
---------------------------	---------------------------	----------	----------


Case Number	2024-CI-0048
Allegations	<p>1. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Abusive or obscene language</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers used abusive or obscene language.</i></p> <p>2. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to Provide Information</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to provide the complainant with information.</i></p> <p>3. DISCOURTESY</p> <p>-- Failure to respond</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to respond to the complainant.</i></p> <p>4. DISCRIMINATION</p> <p>-- Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers' actions resulted from Disability bias against the complainant.</i></p> <p>5. HARASSMENT</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers harassed the complainant.</i></p>

	<p>6. IMPROPER DETENTION</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly detained the complainant.</i></p>		
	<p>7. IMPROPER CITATION</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers issued an improper citation.</i></p>		
	<p>8. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>-- Failure to investigate or make a police report</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers failed to investigate or make a police report.</i></p>		
	<p>9. IMPROPER OR INADEQUATE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>-- False or improper police report</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers prepared a false or improper police report.</i></p>		
	<p>10. IMPROPER SEARCH</p> <p>-- Person</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers improperly searched the complainant's person.</i></p>		
	<p>11. IMPROPER SEARCH</p> <p>-- Vehicle</p> <p>(OFFICER 1, OFFICER 2, OFFICER 3, OFFICER 4, OFFICER 5, OFFICER 6, OFFICER 7)</p> <p><i>Whether the subject officers searched the complainants' vehicle.</i></p>		

DPA Findings	PAB Findings	BPD Findings	CMO Findings
---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSURE	1. -N/A-	1. -N/A-
---------------------------	---------------------------	----------	----------

APPENDIX 4. BPD TRAINING ORDERS DATA



This chart illustrates the distribution of 7,065 total training hours completed by Berkeley Police Department personnel in 2024—a 115% increase from the previous year. The majority of hours were concentrated in the Tactical and Operational (2,859.5 hours) and Management and Leadership (2,390 hours) categories. Conferences and Seminars accounted for 1,437 hours, while Technology and Systems (198.5 hours) and Legal and Legislative (180 hours) received comparatively fewer training hours.

The following chart lists all training subcategories completed by Berkeley Police Department personnel in 2024, along with the total number of hours recorded for each. It includes 29 distinct topics and reflects how the Department’s 7,065 total training hours were distributed across various subject areas.

2024 BPD Training Subcategories	
Training Topic	Total Training hours
Supervisory Skills	2228
Firearms	728
Crisis Management and Response	630
Specialized Equipment	592
Traffic Enforcement	556
Specialized Investigative Techniques	438
Public Relations and Communications	272
Tactical Response	246
Defensive Tactics	232
Health & Wellness	132
DUI Enforcement	124
Medical and Emergency Response	120
Intelligence & Analysis	107
Sexual Assault Investigations	104
Diversity and Inclusion	72
Social Media Practices	68.5
Internal Affairs Investigations	64
Digital Evidence	61.5
Field Training Program	48
Search & Seizure	48
Inclusivity & Diversity	40
Child Abuse Investigations	40
Drug Enforcement	36
Domestic Violence Investigations	24
Technology & Systems	16
Financial Crime Investigations	10
Recruitment Development	10
Counter-Terrorism	10
Public Records & Compliance	8
Grand Total	7065

Of the 7,065 total training hours completed across five categories and 29 subcategories, approximately 38% were certified by the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST). POST-certified training refers to instruction that meets statewide standards for law enforcement training in California and is officially recognized for professional development, compliance, and continuing education requirements.

