

New Complaints and Commendations Overview:

23 complaints opened from March 1 to March 31:

- 7 Inquiries
- 12 Service Complaints
- 1 Allegation of Misconduct
- 3 Incident Reviews

24 Commendations were received during this period.



Highlights

- New Complaints **P.1**
- New Commendations **P.4**
- Closed Cases **P.4**
- News Items **P.10**
- Coming Up **P.11**
- About Us **P.11**

New Complaints

We opened 23 complaints from March 1 to March 31, 2020: 7 Inquiries, 12 Service Complaints, 1 Allegation of Misconduct, and 3 Incident Reviews; for a total of 75 complaints so far this year.

As a reminder, the complaints we receive are a first step in a thorough investigative process. Like complaints filed in court, they represent only one side of an interaction. Prior to the investigation, we have no way to discern the accuracy of the information provided in the complaint.

What you read here for initial complaints is not necessarily factual; it is an introduction to a complaint that will be thoroughly investigated, most often by our office watching body worn video/audio. For the purposes of space, the complaint summaries are brief. In particular, inquiries are often used to begin an investigation when the information provided to us from a complainant is limited. Many times inquiries are reclassified. Where reasonable, we try to not use gender identifying pronouns.

If a complaint is received that alleges criminal conduct on the part of the employee, the police auditor forwards the complaint and any associated information to the chief of police. We continue to monitor these cases.

Inquiries:

- 1) Three separate people contacted the Auditor's Office regarding an incident at the airport. An elderly person had come around to the terminal to pick up their partner who put their carry on into the car and went inside to get their bag. A security guard summoned an officer, who "belligerently" told RP they could not park there. RP circled around again and parked with the nose of the car in the crosswalk and began to get out of the car to help their partner. The officer yelled at RP to stay in the car as RP was being cited for being in the crosswalk. RP stated it was "ridiculous" how they were treated by the officer. Each of the independent callers were upset and concerned about how the elderly couple was treated by a police officer and expressed wishes to hear back from a supervisor.
- 2) RP reported an incident in which an officer had been coming to their daughter's door on two separate occasions at midnight. RP is unhappy with the time that officer had shown up due to safety issues with young girls opening their doors at that time of night. RP's daughter had recently broken up with a boyfriend and the issue seemed to involve that. On the

City of Eugene



Police Auditor's Office

800 Olive St. Eugene, OR. 97401
541-682-5016



second occasion the officer showed up, RP's daughter told the officer she would meet with the officer at the police station with her lawyer to answer questions. The officer became irritated and said "Nope, I'm arresting you", giving her the excuse that the boy was pestering him to make an arrest. RP's daughter was arrested for criminal mischief 2.

- 3) RP alleges that officers violated their rights when s/he was not allowed to decline medical assistance for a gunshot wound. RP was restrained to a gurney and given Ketamine. RP also believes s/he was struck several times during the encounter. RP further alleges that their vehicle was searched without their permission or a warrant.
- 4) RP reported that when they were arrested, they had \$800 from selling their car, and an officer laughed at them, and accused them of selling drugs. The officer then illegally seized their phone without a warrant. When RP asked the officer what "RAS" they had to take the phone, they laughed and said "we've got a lawyer", slammed the door and took the phone. RP feels this officer is targeting them because RPs are holding them accountable for their tyrannical behavior.
- 5) RP reported an EPD officer who was clearly going home and not on a call, talking on his cell phone while driving down I5.
- 6) RP is concerned about his daughter who has been pulled over twice, recently on her way home from work at 2330. Both times officers have pulled her over, they have approached the car without identifying themselves and shined a flashlight into her face. RP's daughter is a young woman alone at night and has no way of knowing if they are legitimate. The first stop was LCSO, the second was EPD. Once the officer

found it was a woman in the vehicle, they didn't even ask for ID and sent her on her way with no explanation for the stop. RP is also concerned that these stops at night are illegal fishing stops without probable cause.

- 7) RP is concerned about the way a welfare check on them was handled in February. RP's partner thought they heard RP's shotgun in the background and called police. At least 7 cops showed up, one hiding behind a tree with binoculars. The other officers were holding their M4's in their hands. RP repeatedly told them they were fine, not suicidal and to leave. As one officer continued to question RP, RP looked to their left and noticed another officer with their gun pointed right at RP. Finally, a supervisor told the others they could leave.

Service Complaints:

- 1) RP reported an unmarked vehicle that ran right through a red light at 7th and Madison, with no lights or sirens. Two other civilian vehicles followed them right through the light.
- 2) RP inquired into how EPD handled a case of theft from RP's home. RP made a report of theft from a worker in their home. About a month later, RP learned that the man had been picked up on a parole violation. As far as RP can discern, RP's report was never linked to the man and followed up on. In early February RP spoke with the supervisor at the downtown station with a hint at where the man might be. The supervisor seemed uninterested and said the police would have a better idea than them. At this point RP feels like they have been ignored and would like this looked into.
- 3) RP is confused with an officer's comment during a call for service in which a drunk semi-violent neighbor was harassing RP in their home. The neighbor was bashing on RP's door, and poured red paint on RP's windows. When officers finally arrived the officer's comment to RP was "In a perfect world what would you have me do?" To RP this was not helpful and confusing. The officer spoke with the neighbor, but as far as RP knows, was not cited for the vandalism and harassment.
- 4) RP reported an EPD officer in an SUV who was on a cell phone and failed to signal a turn.
- 5) RP requested to speak to a supervisor after someone had violated a restraining order. RP

claims officers were not truthful in their reports and did not interview all witnesses.

- 6) RP reported an officer who pulled them over after following them for a mile. The reason the officer provided for pulling them over was because the license plate wasn't readable. RP feels they were given a made up reason for being pulled over, violating their rights. Both RP and the officer looked at the plate and there was no violation. RP tried to get the officer's name but was admonished to back away from the officer due to safety concerns.
- 7) RP reported an officer who hesitated a longer than normal amount of time after the light turned green at an intersection, then quickly accelerated coming within 2-3 feet of a pedestrian before stopping.
- 8) RP reported an officer who threatened them 3 times with going to jail when s/he called about their ex trying to take their child. The officer failed to read the paperwork s/he provided which provided for a 60 day notice before the other parent could have the child. The officer allowed the ex to take the 3 year old child out of state. The officer also did not have body cam on which s/he knows is required.
- 9) RP was concerned that when s/he called 911 about a naked man standing and yelling on their front porch, s/he was told "We'll try and get help to you". 30 minutes later the man was still there and when s/he called again s/he was told "There's 15 calls ahead of you". RP didn't believe the call taker was very sympathetic to their concern as s/he has PTSD and didn't know what the man was going to do.
- 10) RP reported an incident in which an officer who came to their door for a noise complaint seemed to be trying to escalate the incident, and when s/he asked for the officer's name, the officer was rude and turned their back without providing a name.
- 11) RP is concerned that only Fire was dispatched when they reported a transient with an open fire under the awning of a property they own. Fire put out the flames and had the man move along. A no trespassing sign was on display below the man and RP wants to know why no officer was dispatched to cite the trespasser, as the property could have burned down.
- 12) RP reported an officer who went through a 'do not enter' sign in their neighborhood. It did not appear that the officer was going to a call or doing official business. The neighborhood

City of Eugene



worked hard to get the traffic calming sign that keeps people from turning into the area.

Incident Reviews:

- 1) Incident review into the use of force by several officers during the arrest of a noncompliant subject.
- 2) RP contacted the Auditor's Office with a concern that his client was racially profiled during a traffic stop. His client was stopped at gun point by officers, pulled from his car, slammed to the ground and handcuffed for over 30 minutes with no explanation as to why he was being detained. He was told "You are being detained, that's all you need to know." Evidently officers mistook him for someone else, but this all happened before he was asked for his name, ID, or registration for a car that is in his name. His client at one point asked for his handcuffs to be loosened, and was told, "If you check out, it will be over soon." The cuffs were not taken off for another 10 minutes when he was given 3 citations and released.
- 3) An anonymous person alleged that an officer assaulted them while the officer was intoxicated or on drugs. The officer seemed incredibly aggressive and unlawfully exerted authority. No date, time, or further details were provided on the complaint form

Allegation of Misconduct:

- 1) It is alleged that an officer's use of force during the arrest of a subject for Disorderly Conduct and Criminal Trespass was outside policy.

New Commendations

There were 26 commendations documented, during the month of March for a 2020 total of 79 so far. Most commendations are made through EPD. The Auditor's office accepts commendations as well.

Commendations are listed on the Police Department website at:

<http://www.eugene-or.gov/2763/Commendations>

Closed Cases

32 complaints were closed in the month of March 2020: 16 Service Complaints, 13 Inquiries, 1 Policy Complaint, and 2 Incident Reviews

Closed Service Complaints:

1) RP is confused with an officer's comment during a call for service in which a drunk semi-violent neighbor was harassing RP in their home. The neighbor was bashing on RP's door, and poured red paint on RP's windows. When officers finally arrived the officer's comment to RP was "In a perfect world what would you have me do?" To RP this was not helpful and confusing. The officer spoke with the neighbor, but as far as RP knows, was not cited for the vandalism and harassment.

Summary of Investigation: Investigators contacted RP after viewing body worn video and speaking with the officers. RP was advised that there was no probable cause to make an arrest during the incident based on what was articulated to officers on scene at the time. RP ultimately agreed everything was handled appropriately and agreed officers could have spoken with him about the final resolution. RP ended conversation by thanking him for the call and saying they appreciated the follow up.

2) RP reported an EPD officer in an SUV who was on a cell phone failed to signal a turn.

Summary of Investigation: Dismissed - Employee not Identifiable.

3) RP requested to speak to a supervisor after someone had violated a restraining order. RP claims officers were not truthful in their reports and did not interview all witnesses.

Summary of Investigation: Investigators reviewed reports and body worn video, which

included the involved officer's interviews with the complainant and a witness to the incident. The investigator determined that the officer completed a thorough investigation by interviewing the complainant and a witness, establishing that no crime had been committed, and writing a police report. The complaint was determined to be unfounded.

4) RP reported an officer who hesitated longer than a normal amount of time after the light turned green at an intersection, then quickly accelerated coming within 2-3 feet of a pedestrian before stopping.

Summary of Investigation: The supervisor of the involved employee reviewed in-car and body cam video of the incident date/time and found there was no video available of the specific incident. The supervisor then talked to the involved officer, who shared a similar recollection of the incident, except claiming to stop for the pedestrian at about 6 ft. The supervisor reminded the officer of the importance of maintaining an awareness to our surroundings to avoid incidents such as this, and followed up with RP, who seemed satisfied with the follow up.

5) RP reported an officer who threatened them 3 times with going to jail when s/he called about their ex trying to take their child. The officer failed to read the paperwork s/he provided which provided for a 60 day notice before the other parent could have the child. The officer allowed the ex to take the 3 year old child out of state. The officer also did not have body cam on which s/he knows is required.

Summary of Investigation: The supervisor of the involved officer discovered that the entire interaction was captured on another responding officer's body worn camera. Video was reviewed and it was determined that the officer did not threaten taking RP to jail. The only time jail was mentioned was when APA laws were explained to both parties. RP also never mentioned or provided any type of paperwork for the officer to review. Additionally, the officer did not allow anyone to take the child out of state, but rather explained to both parties that it was a civil issue and recommended them all going together to that specific state's tribal court to solve the custody issues. The supervisor also inquired why the officer did not have their body worn camera on, and it was determined that the officer left in a rush

from police headquarters. The importance of ensuring all equipment is on prior to leaving HQ was stressed to the officer.

- 6) RP was concerned that when s/he called 911 about a naked man standing and yelling on their front porch, s/he was told "We'll try and get help to you". 30 minutes later the man was still there and when s/he called again s/he was told "There's 15 calls ahead of you". RP didn't believe the call taker was very sympathetic to their concern as s/he has PTSD and didn't know what the man was going to do.

Summary of Investigation: The supervisor reviewed both calls made by RP and determined that both employees were professional and handled the calls within policy. The supervisor then called RP, whom advised their perception of the events may be somewhat skewed because they were scared. CAHOOTS and how to keep oneself safe was discussed, and the call was ended.

- 7) RP reported an incident in which an officer who came to their door for a noise complaint seemed to be trying to escalate the incident, and when s/he asked for the officer's name, the officer was rude and turned their back without providing a name.

Summary of Investigation: Body worn camera revealed that the officer was cordial in the interaction, provided their name when asked by RP, and called for a sergeant to respond to the location when prompted by RP. RP's allegations are unfounded.

- 8) RP reported an officer who went through a 'do not enter' sign in their neighborhood. It did not appear that the officer was going to a call or doing official business. The neighborhood worked hard to get the traffic calming sign that keeps people from turning into the area.

Summary of Investigation: The investigator found that the officer was attempting to locate a bicyclist that had alluded police during that time. The officer acted within department policy and law and acted within their scope of authority as a police officer making traffic stops.

- 9) RP has repeatedly reported a noise issue to EPD over the last seven months, with no results. The noise at times can be felt in RP's home and goes on until 1 or 2 a.m. RP has been told that officers have been sent out, but there has been no change. RP wonders if noise complaints in the University District are treated with more leniency.

Summary of Investigation: The investigation revealed that both EPD and UOPD have responded to that residence several times. The most recent incident involved UOPD failing to respond after telling RP to contact them if the noise started again after them leaving the scene. RP was very understanding of EPD's staffing shortage and understood the delay in the response time. During the supervisor's contact with RP, they were able to make a plan and RP was thankful for the response and assistance.

- 10) RP reported a hit and run driver who struck them. It took 4 days for EPD to contact RP to take their report, and they were told by the officer that since it had been so long and the other party lived in Harrisburg, nothing would be done. RP inquired if that was correct and if that was policy, since they had called at the time of the incident.

Summary of Investigation: Due to staffing levels officers were never dispatched on 02/21 and RP told dispatch they would call back in the morning. RP called back on 02/24 and stated they had been trying to make report all weekend. Once a complainant states to dispatch they will call back, it is their responsibility to contact police again when they are available. This occurred on 04/24 and an officer was dispatched to take the report the same day. The officer spent time explaining the difficult process of investigating hit and run criminal offenses; it is one of the most difficult crimes to prove without good evidence or corroboration. The officer explained that due to low staffing levels, the possible address associated to suspect vehicle being outside of the Eugene-Springfield area, and the fact that it was now four days after the initial crash, that locating the vehicle and determining the driver would be very difficult. After receipt of the complaint, the supervisor asked the officer to follow up at the Harrisburg address associated with the incident, The registered owner told officers the vehicle was

sold a year and a half prior to an ex co-worker and that the ex co-worker had since sold the vehicle to another local unknown male with no contact information. The investigation ended with no location or contact information for the possible suspect.

11) RP has been concerned about how fast EPD officers have been traveling down their residential street over the last few months.

Summary of Investigation: Investigator requested AVL information for both EPD and SPD units who responded to the area. It was found that during the time frame that RP reported patrol cars traveling through the area at a high rate of speed, two SPD units were in the area. RP was thankful for EPD's investigation and satisfied with the follow up of their complaint.

12) RP reported an incident in which they turned themselves in to EPD on weapons charges and refused to speak with a specific Detective due to past issues with them. When RP sat down with a different officer and declined to answer questions without their lawyer, that Detective burst into the room and threatened RP with going to jail for being uncooperative. The officers spoke with RP's mom and decided to release them with a citation. The Detective then took RP to be fingerprinted and processed. RP looked at the citation that they were given and commented that this would probably be dropped and that they were going to file a lawsuit. The Detective then yelled at RP to shut up or they'd be taken to jail. RP is unhappy with how they were treated by the Detective.

Summary of Investigation: Supervisor followed up with RP to ensure they understood their complaint, and spoke with the involved detective. Detective recognized that telling RP to shut up was not polite and agreed to avoid use of the phrase in the future.

13) RP contacted the Auditor's Office after encountering the man who stabbed them 15 times in the same park. When RP questioned an officer about why this person was not in jail, they were given no information and referred to the Auditor's Office. RP still has

much of the evidence of the stabbing, which was not taken by police as well as hospital records etc. RP wants to know what is happening with this case and why this person is still walking the streets.

Summary of Investigation: Investigators reviewed body worn footage of the altercation. Both RP and the other person involved sustained injuries and there was no clear evidence to determine who the primary aggressor was, but there was evidence that RP was actively involved in the altercation and caused injuries to the other involved who was transported to the hospital. RP did not have injuries consistent with being stabbed 15 times and there is no evidence to support their claim. Investigators could not contact RP due to them being lodged at Lane County Jail for stabbing a different person.

14) RP is upset that an officer failed to arrest a woman who was going through RP's trailer and took off with one of RP's bags. The officer appeared to not believe RP about what had happened because RP could not identify what was in that particular bag. RP also feels it was due to a bias, because of other interactions they have had with the officer and they are unhappy with the outcome of the incident.

Summary of Investigation: The investigation found that the officer conducted a thorough and appropriate investigation of the alleged theft and appropriately determined not having probable cause to make an arrest. Regarding disparate treatment due to the prior contact, the officer treated RP fairly and consistently with how they would treat any other complainant. The officer had a cadet rider with them the day of this incident and they related the prior stop to the cadet while driving between locations during that call. In that discussion all the evidence that led the officer to impound RP's truck at the earlier stop was detailed, and the officer did so in a way that was respectful and indicated no negative feelings toward RP then or now. At the conclusion of the investigation follow up with RP, he said he wanted to apologize to the officer and thank them for their efforts.

15) RP and their neighbors have been trying to get EPD or Parking Services to enforce an illegal parking situation behind their homes. Parking Services claims it's a private road and that EPD enforces that. EPD supposedly told the people illegally parking that they weren't going to enforce it and to go ahead and park there. RP would like to speak with someone to get this issue resolved.

Summary of Investigation: The investigator contacted the City of Eugene parking enforcement and discovered the street in question is privately-owned and that the City does not have jurisdiction to take parking enforcement action. RP was upset about this answer, and they were advised that this was a civil matter and they could take legal action if they chose to.

16) RP reported that after a brief wait to pick up their partner at the Eugene airport, an officer unprofessionally issued a parking citation for unknown reasons and altered the citation after filling it out. RP felt threatened and fearful of the officer.

Summary of Investigation: Investigator contacted RP and reviewed the officer's body worn camera video. RP was sitting in the driver's seat of their car and they were not actively loading or unloading. There were also various signs visible to RP showing other areas they could park while waiting for their partner.

Closed Inquiries:

1) RP is concerned about his daughter who has been pulled over twice recently on her way home from work at 2330. Both times officers have pulled her over, they have approached the car without identifying themselves and shone a flashlight into her face. RP's daughter is a young woman alone at night and has no way of knowing if they are legitimate. The first stop was LCSO, the second was EPD. Once the officer found it was a woman in the vehicle, they didn't even ask for ID and sent her on her way with no explanation for the stop. RP is also concerned that these stops at night are illegal fishing stops without probable cause.

Per Auditor: Dismissed – Auditor reviewed the officer's body cam, police and CAD records, and determined that the officer did not violate policy. After pulling her over, the officer walked up to the car, asked her if she was going home from work and told her she was pulled over because she was tailgating the car in front of her (as shown on video). The stop lasted approximately 30 seconds. The officer was professional throughout the stop. RP provided no specifics of the other incident.

1) RP reported that when they were arrested, they had \$800 from selling their car, and an officer laughed at them, and accused them of selling drugs. The officer then illegally seized their phone without a warrant. When RP asked the officer what "RAS" they had to take the phone, they laughed and said "we've got a lawyer", slammed the door and took the phone. RP feels this officer is targeting them because they are holding them accountable for their tyrannical behavior.

Summary of Investigation: After review of the officer's body cam, police and CAD records, the complaint was dismissed per the Auditor. RP's vehicle was stopped because it was reported to the police that the vehicle was involved in a shooting. The officers removed RP from the vehicle within policy, and officers were at no time discourteous at the jail.

2) RP alleges that officers violated their rights when s/he was not allowed to decline medical assistance for a gunshot wound. RP was restrained to a gurney and given Ketamine. RP also believes s/he was struck several times during the encounter. RP further alleges that their vehicle was searched without their permission or a warrant.

Summary of Investigation: The investigation revealed RP initially told officers they had been shot at, but later admitted they had shot themselves in an apparent suicide attempt. Initial claim dismissed; falls under community care-taking RP and RP's partner had been living in a borrowed van, and RP's partner gave officers permission to search the van.

3) RP reported an incident in which an officer had been coming to their daughter's door on two

separate occasions at midnight. RP is unhappy with the time that officer had shown up due to safety issues with young girls opening their doors at that time of night. RP's daughter had recently broken up with a boyfriend and the issue seemed to be involving that. On the second occasion the officer showed up, RP's daughter told the officer she would meet with the officer at the police station with her lawyer to answer questions. The officer became irritated and said "Nope, I'm arresting you", giving her the excuse that the boy was pestering him to make an arrest. RP's daughter was arrested for criminal mischief 2.

Summary of Investigation: The officer involved in the complaint works the graveyard shift, which is why they were contacting RP's daughter at that time of night. RP's contact with the auditor's office was based on what their daughter told them about the incident. Body worn video shows RP's daughter never told the officer they would meet with their lawyer. No policy violations were found, and RP appreciated the follow up on their concerns.

- 4) Three separate people contacted the Auditor's Office regarding an incident at the airport. An elderly person had come around to the terminal to pick up their partner who put their carry on into the car and went inside to get their bag. A security guard summoned an officer, who belligerently told RP they could not park there. RP circled around again and parked with the nose of the car in the crosswalk and began to get out of the car to help their partner. The officer yelled at RP to stay in the car as RP was being cited for being in the crosswalk. RP stated it was ridiculous how they were treated by the officer. Each of the independent callers were upset and concerned about how the elderly couple was treated by a police officer and expressed wishes to hear back from a supervisor.

Summary of Investigation: Sergeant reviewed body worn camera video and interviewed the officer, RP and other witnesses. Based on the investigation completed, Sgt. determined the officer was professional, their actions were appropriate, and they did not violate any

department policies or procedures. The officer raised their voice at appropriate times in order to maintain control over the situation and involved people. RP was apologetic to the officer and said he was willing to talk to the officer if they wanted. Both were advised the inquiry would be closed.

- 5) RP was concerned with how they were treated when they reported a restraining order violation. The officer used words like "If this happened..." The officer later allegedly said they would have to speak with the partner to believe RP. RP feels they were judged and treated like a criminal, and that the officer's mind was already made up about the incident.

Summary of Investigation: RP was contacted and asked what concerns they had over the interaction. RP alleged that the officer yelled and did not believe RP's claims. RP was also upset because the officer did not arrest the respondent of the Stalking Order RP petitioned. A review of the body worn video found that the officer was polite, direct and professional with their interaction with RP. RP concluded their statement by shaking hands with the officer. Furthermore, there was no probable cause to arrest for a violation of a protective order.

- 6) RP emailed our office with concern about a naked man in close proximity to the school. RP wanted to know why the school was not placed on lock down and the lack of communication and information following the incident.

Summary of Investigation: RP did not provide a phone number, so the investigator contacted RP via email. The investigator answered the questions RP asked and they indicated they were satisfied with the response.

- 7) RP claims that during their arrest, an officer confiscated their baseball card collection which were given by a friend. The officer claimed it was too expensive for RP to have, insinuated they were stolen, and wanted to verify if they had been reported stolen. RP claims the cards had nothing to do with the arrest and wants the cards returned.

Summary of Investigation: RP was initially contacted by officer at a store for a shoplifting call for service. During the contact, RP gave officers permission to search the vehicle, which contained backpack full of very expensive collector's set of baseball cards. Officers advised that RP did not have proof of ownership for the baseball cards. RP claimed they received the baseball cards from a friend but did not know his last name or contact number. Officers claim that RP gave them consent to safekeep the baseball cards at ECU until they could prove ownership. RP was contacted and provided info on who to contact and how they can retrieve their property back and they were appreciative.

8) RP and their partner contacted our office to report a series of incidents with EPD. RP claims EPD officers have been looking into their parked vehicles for several nights in a row with no explanation. RP feels they are being harassed and targeted for unknown reasons.

Summary of Investigation: The investigator searched for RP's address in CAD and failed to find a call for service in 2019 or 2020. It is unknown if officers were searching for anything near or around their residence. There is no indication that officers are targeting RP or purposely searching around their vehicle. Multiple attempts were made to contact RP or their partner at the cell number they provided to the auditor's office. Each time the phone appeared to be off and went straight to voicemail. The recording advised the voicemail box had not been set up yet and investigators was unable to leave a message. No evidence of officers actively looking for or searching around RP's vehicle.

9) RP alleged that police showed up at his door several hours after their partner called about an intruder at their apartment. RP claims officers pushed their way into the house, causing injury, and arrested RP for interfering and resisting arrest. RP also alleges that some property was not inventoried when taken to jail and is now missing. RP later left voicemail on Chief Skinner's line, in which they alleged officers were intoxicated, high on cocaine, and pointed a gun at their wife's head.

Summary of Investigation: The investigator confirmed via BWV that none of the officers or sergeant on scene ever pointed a firearm at RP or their wife, nor was there any indication they were intoxicated or high on narcotics. Claims by RP that money and their wedding ring were taken were also false, as shown in body worn video of everything that was collected and inventoried from their pockets. The alleged use of force was also deemed appropriate by the auditor.

10) RP alleges to not have received follow up on a mail fraud case they reported in July 2019. After the case was handed off to another officer, they have not been updated on the status, and there is now a new December incident they would like to add to the record. This situation has led to various financial issues and the RP is getting frustrated.

Summary of Investigation: A Lt. spoke with the detective working on the case and learned that they were still actively working on the case and there was currently an ATL for one of the suspects. The detective also spoke to RP and updated them on the case. RP was very appreciative of the work being done and happy with the explanation of where the investigation was at.

11) RP reported that their partner suffered three seizures due to an officer refusing to turn off his lights. RP had to call dispatch to have their lights turned off. The officer then arrested RP for driving while suspended and refused to view paperwork that alleged RP was not suspended. RP was also unhappy that a call taker refused to transfer them to the Chief's direct line to report the officer's conduct.

Summary of Investigation: RP's initial stop was lawful, as they violated ORS 811.520, driving without lights. The officer did inform RP of the reason for the traffic stop on initial contact, although the officer failed to identify themselves and that the contact was being recorded. It appeared this was unintentional by the officer as they were immediately engaged by a hostile RP. Dispatch informed the Sgt. that RP's license was suspended at felony status. The Sgt. turned off their overhead lights when it was safe and prudent to do so. Although unfortunate that the

passenger could suffer from seizure, the immediately hostility of RP and possible threat of violence would justify leaving them on until a cover unit could arrive. The use of overhead and spotlights provides a tactical advantage that officers depend on at night. RP, nor the passenger, at any time, informed officers on scene that they had suffered a seizure. The passenger was coherent and able to articulate thought throughout the entire stop. A review of calls by RP to Central Lane 911 showed that at no point did RP request to be transferred to the Chief. His request was for the Sgt. to turn off their lights and for other officers to respond. A second call was placed by his fiancé who also requested other officers respond. Both call-takers were polite and professional. A revision of body worn camera was done with the involved Sgt. to discuss better actions in the future.

12) RP was concerned that various police agencies kept contacting him demanding his phone number. He felt harassed since he is required to register as a sex offender and the info is available through those forms he fills out.

Summary of Investigation: The investigation showed that the EPD officer had a cordial and professional contact at RP's front door that was under 60 seconds. BWV showed that the officer was justified and professional. This inquiry should have been routed to Coburg PD or LCSO. Investigators contacted RP, but their phone goes straight to voicemail. A message was left with contact info for RP to contact investigators if there are any concerns.

Closed Policy Complaints:

1) RP is concerned about how officers handled a situation outside of the Fairgrounds during a protest of the logging conference. There was heavy traffic on 13th Avenue and trucks driving by gunning their engines, speeding, and flipping off people in the protest. RP talked with an officer who admitted that the vehicles were breaking the law, but they were not there at the time for that and they didn't have the resources to go after the speeders. RP suggested parking a police car, so it was visible to the traffic but was brushed off by the officer.

Summary of Investigation: Sgt. contacted RP and explained some of the reasons for why the officer responded the way they did during their interaction. Sgt. acknowledged that the idea of placing a vehicle in a visible location to deter some of the driving behavior could have been a good idea. RP was content with the conversation and thanked the Sgt. for their tenacity in getting in contact with RP.

Closed Incident Reviews:

- 1) An anonymous person alleged that an officer assaulted them while the officer was intoxicated or on drugs. The officer seemed incredibly aggressive and to unlawfully exert authority. No date, time, or further details were provided on the complaint form. **Dismiss per Deputy Auditor - insufficient details to investigate.**
- 2) 809 Taser Use: It is alleged that an officer's taser deployment on a UEMV suspect who was running away was outside policy.

Summary of Investigation: The use of force was determined to be within policy due to the suspect's active and physical resistance. Other than the probe strike locations, the suspect was uninjured during the incident. They were evaluated at the scene by Eugene/Springfield Fire, and cleared for admission to the jail. During the investigation, it was discovered that the officer's written police report lacked some relevant information relating to their decision to use force, and the case was referred back to the officer's direct supervisor to address identified concerns with the written report.

News Items

Tickets for speeding in excess of 100 mph surge 87% amid coronavirus shutdown, CHP says

<https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-04-22/tickets-for-drivers-speeding-more-than-100-mph-surges-87-amid-california-shutdown-chp-says>

Is domestic violence rising during the coronavirus shutdown? Here's what the data shows.

<https://www.themarshallproject.org/2020/04/22/is-domestic-violence-rising-during-the-coronavirus->

About Us

The Office of the Police Auditor operates independently. We report directly to, and are funded by, the Eugene City Council. We are an independent, civilian entity Responsible for civilian oversight of the Eugene Police Department; neither our funding nor management overlap with EPD.

City of Eugene Office of the Police Auditor

800 Olive St.
Eugene, OR 97401

Mark Gissiner,
Police Auditor

Leia Pitcher,
Deputy Police Auditor

Vicki Cox,
Senior Program Coordinator

Beatriz Otero Hernandez,
Community Engagement Coordinator &
Translation Specialist

Phone: (541) 682-5016

Fax: (541) 682-5599

Email:
policeauditor@eugene-or.gov

Website:
<http://www.eugene-or.gov/policeauditor>

Facebook:
www.facebook.com/EugenePoliceAuditor

Twitter:
@Eugene_IPA



[shutdown-here-s-what-the-data-shows](#)

DOJ thwarts hundreds of websites tied to coronavirus scams, security threats

<https://thehill.com/policy/cybersecurity/494142-justice-department-thwarts-websites-tied-to-coronavirus-scams-security-threats>

Coming Up

Due to the public health concerns, we are not accepting walk-ins at this time. Staff from our office continue to intake complaints and commendations from the public. Please continue to contact our office by:

- Visiting our website at www.eugene-or.gov/PoliceAuditor
- Calling us at 541-682-5016
- Emailing us: policeauditor@eugene-or.gov
- Filling out our complaint form located to the right of our door and placing through the mail slot

In addition, per City of Eugene guidelines, all public meetings have been cancelled until further notice. Please stay connected to our Facebook, Twitter and website, where we will announce our next Civilian Review Board meeting.

Thank you for your understanding.