



# Conducted Energy Weapon (CEW) Audit Report - Final October 2025

Report # CEW102025  
(Data Sample – Apr 2025-Sep 2025)

Submitted by PSAB: October 31, 2025  
Response by FOB: November 11, 2025  
Final Report: November 14, 2025

## **Audit Team**

This audit was managed and conducted by the Audit and Review Section of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau.

---

## ***Executive Summary***

---

The Audit and Review Section (ARS) of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau (PSAB) initiated a Conducted Energy Weapon (CEW) Audit in October 2025. The audit covered the period from April 2025 to September 2025. This audit is conducted to ensure that New Orleans Police Department (NOPD) officer's deployment of CEW's and follow-up investigations are conducted in accordance with the rights secured or protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States. NOPD agrees to ensure that audits are conducted professionally and effectively, to elicit accurate and reliable information.

This process is regulated by Consent Decree (CD) paragraphs include 54, 56, 57, 67, 78, 79, 81, 86. Also, Chapter 1.3.6 Reporting Use of Force, Chapter 1.7 Taser Energy Weapon (TEW), Chapter 1.7.1 Conducted Energy Weapon (CEW), and Chapter 41.3.10 BWC.

This audit was conducted on the following levels of force using the Use of Force Protocol:

- CEW Use of Force. The CEW audit addresses nine (10) checklist questions.

**Number of Non-Compliant CEW Checklist Questions (None):**

**Number of Completed Entries Used to Create the CEW Sample (33)**

**L1-L4 Sample Target to Audit (41):**

The sample target represented **100%** of available CEW entries less the entries that were part of previous Use of Force audit, or deselected. Of the eight (8) entries deselected, one was an exhibit (not deployed), and 7 were duplicates of entries already in sample.

The overall score of the CEW Audit is as follows: Overall – **99%**

More detailed results are embedded in the Scorecards and Conclusion sections.

---

## Table of Contents

---

Audit Team.....	1
Executive Summary.....	2
Introduction .....	4
Initiating and Conducting the CEW Audit .....	6
List of Case Files Reviewed by Auditor .....	7
CEW Scorecard .....	8
Compliance Score.....	11
<i>Final Results</i> .....	11
Conclusions & Recommendations .....	12
CEW Responses & PSAB Notes: .....	14
Appendix C – Report Distribution .....	15

---

## Introduction

---

The Audit and Review Section (ARS) of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted an audit of CEW incidents. The time span to conduct the audit was from October 6<sup>th</sup>, 2025, to October 29<sup>th</sup>, 2025.

### Purpose

The CEW audit is conducted to verify Departmental compliance with the Consent Decree and NOPD Operations Manual as it pertains to the use of CEWs and the subsequent investigations.

Consent Decree (CD) paragraphs include 54, 58, 67, 78, 79, 81, and 87. The following are the NOPD Policy Chapters involved:

Chapter 1.3.6 Reporting Use of Force

Chapter 1.7.1 Conducted Energy Weapon (CEW)

Chapter 41.3.10 BWC

### Scope

This audit assesses and documents whether the force employed by New Orleans Police Department (NOPD) officers is documented and recorded properly, and whether supervisors conducted thorough follow-up investigations related to use of CEWs. Once the review is completed, the audit manager will submit a report to the Deputy Chief of Field Operations Bureau (FOB), and the Captain of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau (PSAB) pointing out any deficiencies or confirming a thorough investigation. These audit reports will assist in ensuring officers and supervisors are informed of opportunities for improvement as it relates to the proper reporting and documentation of CEW use in the future. A “final report” will also be sent to the appropriate monitor from the OCDM. The audit assesses the following aspects of officer and supervisor responsibilities:

- Whether involved officers appropriately complied with pre-CEW requirements (e.g., de-escalation, warnings)
- Whether audited CEW use is consistent with policy and law
- Whether involved officers appropriately complied with post-CEW requirements (e.g., immediate notifications, provision of medical aid)
- Whether the involved officers and witness officers completed required reports
- Whether supervisors appropriately investigated, including reviews of available recordings
- Whether supervisors appropriately reviewed reports

### Methodology

Population source – IAPro Force Investigation Team (FIT) Incident List (NOPD source file)

Sample size – 100% of CEW incidents.

Documentation to be reviewed – All documents and investigative material contained within each individual Force Investigation Team (FIT) file, as well as associated police reports.

BWC/Video/Audio to be reviewed – All associated video footage for involved and/or witness officers, as well as Use of Force investigative rank or supervisor, as needed to corroborate the written reports and statements.

Testing Instrument(s) – New Orleans Police Department’s Operations Manual Chapters and ten (10) Checklist questions.

Each individual incident file will be audited in its entirety via “double-blind” auditing process by two (2) members of the Auditing and Review Section (ARS), to give a reliable and thorough review of each use of force incident.

**Data**

While the audit range is usually set for every three months (Quarterly), this review encompassed a period of six (6) months due to previous high compliance. The FIT IAPro system file dump provides the ARS team all item numbers that were investigated during that audit period. ARS then takes those item numbers and removes items previously audited as part of the Use of Force review. ARS then reviews 100% of the items within the audit range.

This audit’s universe consisted of 41 case files. The raw data used was for the period of April 2025 to September 2025.

---

## **Initiating and conducting the CEW Audit**

---

The initial raw data was downloaded from the IAPro system on October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2025, to prep the sample distribution file that would be utilized by ARS, for the current audit.

During this audit prep, the sample was then parsed and distributed to the assigned auditors for initial review of allocation count in preparation for the audit.

Each item case file was then systematically reviewed via “double-blind” audit process by the Auditing and Review Section, based on each case file’s compliance with the New Orleans Police Department’s Operations Manual Chapters, as it relates to “CEW” investigations. To facilitate this process, the team used the ten (10) point CEW audit checklist, as the tool to review and analyze the content of every case file.

---

## List of Case Files Reviewed by Auditor

---

The following is a breakdown of the case files by auditors that conducted each review:

### Double-Blind Review of CEW

Auditors (33 Audited)	
Deselected Items (8)	

**Total: Sample 41 CEW Case Files Note: (33 audited, 8 Deselected – 7 duplicated, 1 exhibition (not deployed))**

# CEW Scorecards

The following scorecards below were used by the auditing team to review each CEW case file.

## CEW (Conducted Energy Weapon) Summary Audit

ARS percentages for Consent Decree requirements for CEW Audit

Report Period: October 2025

Sample Period (Apr 2025 - Sep 2025)

Audit Questions	Score	Y	N	U	NA	NA Explanations	CD ¶	NOPD Policy
							/Chapter	Chapters
1 BWC was activated as required by officer who made scene	97%	31	1	0	1	NA - Officer was enroute to work when incident occurred. No BWC.	Ch 41.3.10	Ch 41.3.10 p11
2 Did Supervisor review the BWC if stated in report	100%	31	0	0	2	NA - Officer was enroute to work when incident occurred. No BWC. Incident #2: Officer did not activate BWC so no supervisor could review	86(d)	Ch 1.3.6 p33, Ch. 41.3.10 p35
3 Force Statement Found for all CEW officers	100%	33	0	0	0		78, 81	Ch 1.3.6 p16, p18
4 Force Details Documented in statement to describe force used	100%	33	0	0	0		78	Ch 1.3.6 p16, Ch. 1.7.1, p36
5 CEW activated (deployed) according to policy	97%	32	1	0	0		54	Ch 1.3.6 p28, p33
6 CEW video reviewed by Supervisor as required if video exists separately from BWC	n/a	0	0	0	33	All CEW video was BWC generated; none were from taser.	67	Ch 1.3.6 p33, Ch. 1.7.1 p 91, p104, p106, p113
7 Each Cycle Justified	100%	33	0	0	0		57	Ch 1.3.6 p16, Ch. 1.7.1, p36
8 CEW force statements consistent w/ video	100%	33	0	0	0		78, 81	Ch 1.3.6 p33, Ch. 1.7.1 p 91, p104, p106, p113
9 # CEW cycles explained in force statement / Total # CEW cycles	100%	40	0				58	Ch 1.3.6 p31, Ch. 1.7.1, p.53, p57
10 Supervisor UoF GISTS submitted before ETOD	97%	32	1	0	0		87	Ch 1.3.6 p28, Ch. 1.3 p21(e), Ch. 1.7.1 p45
<b>Total</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>36</b>			

**General Comments**

ARS audited the CEW( Conducted Energy Weapon) case files for the defined period, for completeness and accuracy as required by the Consent Decree. CEW's reviewed as part of the Use of Force audit were excluded from this review.

For an explanation of the procedures and scoring system for this review, see the associated "Protocol " document.

For a list of relevant policies, contact ARS as needed.

For the audit results for each case file, see the accompanying RawData spreadsheets.

Scores below 95% are highlighted in red.

# CEW (Conducted Energy Weapon) District Audit

ARS percentages for Consent Decree requirements for CEW Audit

Report Period: October 2025

Sample Period (Apr 2025 - Sep 2025)

## Audit Questions

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	SOD	Overall Score
1	BWC was activated as required by officer who made scene	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	83%	100%	100%	97%
2	Did Supervisor review the BWC if stated in report	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%
3	Force Statement Found for all CEW officers	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%
4	Force Details Documented in statement to describe force used	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%
5	CEW activated (deployed) according to policy	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	97%
6	CEW Reviewed by Supervisor as required if video exists separately from BWC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	Each Cycle Justified	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%
8	CEW force statements consistent w/ video	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%
9	# CEW cycles explained in force statement / Total # CEW cycles	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%
10	Supervisor GISTS submitted before ETOD	100%	100%	50%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	97%
	<b>Total</b>	97%	100%	94%	100%	100%	-	98%	100%	100%	99%

### General Comments

ARS audited the CEW( Conducted Energy Weapon) case files for the defined period, for completeness and accuracy as required by the Consent Decree.

CEW's reviewed as part of the Use of Force audit were excluded from this review.

For an explanation of the procedures and scoring system for this review, see the associated "Protocol " document.

For a list of relevant policies, contact ARS as needed.

For the audit results for each case file, see the accompanying RawData spreadsheets.

Scores below 95% are highlighted in red.

---

## Case File Reviews – CEW

---

The below listed information reveals the outcome of the Audit Team’s checklist reviews.

1. **Was BWC activated as required by officer who made scene?** The overall score for this category was **97%**. Of the 33 cases reviewed, 31 were audited as positive, 1 was negative (7<sup>th</sup>) and 1 was NA (3<sup>rd</sup>).
2. **Did supervisor review the BWC if stated in report?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 33 cases reviewed, 31 were audited as positive, and 2 were NA (7<sup>th</sup>) and 1 was NA (3<sup>rd</sup>).
3. **Were force statements found for all CEW officers?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 33 cases reviewed, all 33 were audited as positive.
4. **Were force details documented in statement to describe the force used?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 33 cases reviewed, all 33 were audited as positive.
5. **Was CEW activated (deployed) according to policy?** The overall score for this category was **97%**. Of the 33 cases reviewed, 32 were audited as positive and 1 was negative (1<sup>st</sup>).
6. **Was CEW reviewed by supervisor as required if video exists separately from BWC?** The overall score for this category was **N/A**. Of the 33 cases reviewed, all were N/A (not applicable as no CEW video existed separate from BWC).
7. **Was each CEW cycle justified?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 33 cases reviewed, 33 were audited as positive.
8. **Were CEW force statements consistent w/ video?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 33 cases reviewed, 33 were audited as positive.
9. **# CEW cycles explained in force statement / Total # CEW cycles:** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 40 CEW cycles used, all 40 were audited as positive.
10. **Supervisor GISTs submitted before ETOD?** The overall score for this category was **97%**. Of the 33 cases reviewed, all 32 were audited as positive and 1 as negative (3<sup>rd</sup>).

---

## Compliance Score

CEW Checklist- Based on the combined total of three-hundred and thirty (**330**) checklist items rated, from the sample size of ten (**33**) case files audited; the “**overall score**” of this CEW case file checklist audit conducted by the Auditing and Review Section was **99%**.

## Results (Final)

- The overall results of the audit have revealed that none (0) of the ten (**10**) checklist questions had compliance threshold scores **below 95%**.

---

## Conclusions (Final)

---

The following findings are as follows for those Districts where compliance was **below** 95%:

**Item 1:** Policy Violation: 3<sup>rd</sup> District supervisor failed to submit gist by ETOD. **Gist was submitted 7/25/2025 (6 days after the incident occurred).** NOPD: Chapter 1.3.6-Reporting Use of Force. P27. For all investigations into Level 2 or Level 3 use of force events the supervisor shall provide a written gist to the Division Commander by the end of his/her shift documenting his/her preliminary determination of the appropriateness of the use of force, including whether the force was reasonable and within policy, and whether the injuries appear proportionate to the use of force described. The written gist shall also include summaries of subject, witness, and officer statements.

---

## Recommendations

---

Following the CEW audit which covered April 2025 - September 2025, no “opportunities for improvement” are documented by the PSAB Audit and Review Section (ARS).

As previously identified by the Public Integrity Bureau’s (PIB’s) Force Investigation Team (FIT) for the Department to maintain or achieve 95% or better compliance rate, the following areas for improvement were communicated to the various Districts and Bureaus and are as follows:

1. Must ensure that BWCs are reviewed in a timely and effective manner by the supervisor.
2. The Consent Decree requires all taser deployments to be recorded, and as such, BWC should capture any taser deployments.

Continuing to take actions to ensure timely and effective reviews by supervisors and taking actions to review policy for enhancements which provide clarity of scope, will ensure that all Use of Force case files are complete.

---

## CEW Responses & PSAB Notes:

---

### District Re-evaluation Requests and PSAB Responses

**8th District Re-evaluation:** In reviewing the CEW Audit the 8th District was marked negative for not submitting a gist before ETOD under item.

Incident Date: 6/21/2025

Non-Compliant:

Policy Violation: Supervisor failed to submit gist by ETOD. NOPD: Chapter 1.3.6-Reporting Use of Force. P21. Upon notification by an officer of a Level 1 Use of Force, the supervisor shall: (f) Initiate a Blue Team entry by ETOD of the supervisor's NEXT Tour of Duty, which will list preliminary information regarding the use of force incident

**District Response:** A check of the NOPD Management Dashboard shows that the use of force was entered on June 21st, 2025. A check of the item number shows that it was initiated on June 21st, 2025, at 12:44am. An email was sent to the Captain on June 21st, 2025, at 3:50am requesting an extension and contained a gist of the Use of Force. The district believes that they are complaint with this, and their score should be changed to 100% for question 10.

**PSAB Response:** PSAB confirmed in IAPro that the supervisor did call in the incident. While no alert came out of the "Communications District", the back-up provided by the district confirmed that the FTN was generated on same day as incident. PSAB updated the district score to 100% reversing the initial deficiency score.

#### Attachments:

Excel Raw Data Spreadsheets April 2025 – September 2025.

*Timothy A. Lindsey*

**Innovation Manager, Auditing**

**Auditing and Review Section**

**Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau**

---

## **Appendix C – Report Distribution**

---

Superintendent – NOPD

Asst. Superintendent - NOPD

Deputy Supt. PSAB Bureau

Captain PSAB Bureau

Deputy Sup. FOB Bureau

Deputy Supt. PIB Bureau