Custodial Interrogations and Interviews Audit March 2025 – (Final)

(FOB and ISB)

Report # CI&I032025

Submitted by PSAB: March 26, 2025
Response from FOB/ISB: April 16, 2025
Final Report: April 16, 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) completed a Custodial Interrogations and Interviews Audit in March 2025 of data from September 2024 to February 2025. This audit excluded the 7th District as it was audited separately as part of the Consent Decree Sustainment agreement. Custodial Interrogations and Interviews Audits are conducted to ensure that New Orleans Police Department (NOPD) officers conduct custodial interrogations in accordance with the subjects' rights secured or protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including the rights to counsel and against self-incrimination. NOPD agrees to ensure that custodial interrogations are conducted professionally and effectively, to elicit accurate and reliable information. This process is regulated by Chapter 42.11 of the New Orleans Police Department's Operations Manual, along with sections of Chapters 1.9.1, 55.4 and 55.5.1.

This audit, conducted from March 10, 2025, to March 25, 2025, was completed using the latest Custodial Interrogations and Interviews Audit Protocol dated March 11, 2022. The audit addresses the following Consent Decree (CD) questions: Log Entries, Video/Audio Documentation; Detective Notes; Miranda Rights; and LEP rights as documented in Consent Decree paragraphs 163, 164, 165, 166, 167 and 168.

Scores of 95% or higher are considered substantial compliance. Supervisors should address any noted deficiencies with specific training through In-service Training classes or Daily Training Bulletins (DTBs). This training should be reinforced by close and effective supervision in addition to Supervisor Feedback Logs entries.

The overall score of the **Custodial Interrogations Audit** is as follows: **99%**; the previous audit was scored 99.6%. The following metric was non-compliant in the overall score in the "Interrogation" scorecard, there were deficiencies as noted:

- Question 16B (Notes in Case File) – Non-compliant **(87%)**

The overall score of the **Custodial Interview Log check** is as follows: **93%** (Compliant); the previous audit was scored 98%.

More detailed results are embedded in the Scorecard Table and Conclusion sections.

Table of Contents

Introduction

The Audit and Review Section (ARS) of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau (PSAB) previously conducted a Custodial Interrogations and Interview Audit in September of 2024. This current audit was conducted in March 2025.

Purpose

In Chapter 42.11 pg. 1, Custodial Interrogations are defined as, "Direct questioning of a suspect in custody (not free to leave), about a crime or suspected crime, or any words, statements, or actions by officers that the officers know or should know are reasonably likely to elicit an incriminating response from the suspect". The audits are completed to ensure custodial interrogations conducted effectively and in accordance with the rights secured or protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States. These requirements are regulated by the following policies of the New Orleans Police Department's Operations Manual:

Chapter 42.11 - Custodial Interrogations
Chapter 1.9.1 - Miranda Rights
Chapter 55.4 - Limited English Proficiency
Chapter 55.5.1 - Communication with Persons Who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing

In addition, Consent Decree paragraphs 163, 164, 165, 166, 167 and 168 should be understood and referenced as needed.

This list is inclusive of all pertinent areas regarding the audit.

Objectives

This audit is designed to ensure that all custodial interrogations conducted by NOPD officers are done so in accordance with the U.S. Constitution, DOJ Consent Decree and NOPD policies. All Custodial Interrogations conducted by NOPD officers must be documented in the Custodial Interrogation log either electronically or in a written log. During the audit, while reviewing the log, auditors need to ensure that it was accurately completed. The audit qualitatively assesses custodial interrogations to ensure compliance, and each audit consists of a random sample of all Custodial Interrogations conducted by officers/detectives in the duty location since the prior PSAB audit.

Generally, each auditor is responsible for verifying and documenting that the NOPD conducted a proper custodial interrogation through:

1. Inspection of the Custodial Interrogations log to determine compliance with stated requirements.
2. Documentation must exist in each case file as evidence of compliance with the following:
    - All log entries are properly identified as Interrogations or Interviews

- All custodial interrogations that took place in a police facility were audio/video recorded. The custodial interrogation log requires an entry as to where the recording was made.
- All interrogations that involved suspected homicides or sexual assaults were audio/video recorded.
- There is a video/audio recording of the statement as listed in the log.
- The duty location does have a designated interview room(s) equipped with functioning audio and video recording technology that allows for recording and maintenance of all phases of interrogation.
- The recording does not reflect any threat or use of physical violence on the individual or the individual's family.
- The custodial interrogation recording was recorded in its entirety.
- The custodial interrogation recording was not preceded by a "pre-interview."
- The recording equipment was not turned off during any part of the interview.
- If the recording was turned off, it was the suspect's decision that he/she did not want the interrogation recorded.
- If the recording was turned off, and it was the suspect's decision that the interrogation was not to be recorded, the suspect's request was recorded and documented in the case report.
- There was not a video/audio equipment failure during the recording of an interrogation.
- If there was a video/audio equipment failure during the recording of an interrogation, it is noted in the case file.
- If there was a video/audio equipment failure during the recording of an interrogation, it is noted in the EPR.
- If there was a video/audio equipment failure during the recording of an interrogation, it is noted in a memo to the appropriate Deputy Chief.
- If the interrogation was not able to be video and audio recorded because of equipment failure or malfunction, the detectives recorded the interrogation by means of a digital or cassette recorder, body worn camera, or another recording device.
- The case file contains all the officers' notes taken during interviews and interrogations.
- The interview was conducted in the accused person's primary language.
- If an interpreter was a police department employee, the case file shows that the interpreter identified himself/herself as an officer or employee of the Department.
- The interpreter is authorized by the Department to interpret.
- The interpreter is trained in using interpretation protocols.
- The log entry is complete; correct item number, location of interrogation, name of subject being interrogated, name of officer conducting the interrogation.

Background

Custodial Interrogations Audits have been conducted since May of 2016 in various formats. This

was the sixth comprehensive Custodial Interrogations Audit utilizing the enhanced protocol. The resulting audit is a more detailed, and deeper diving review of the most fundamental actions taken by police conducting interrogations and interviews.

Methodology

Auditors qualitatively assessed each incident using the Custodial Interrogation and Interview form listed below to ensure each interrogation and interview is compliant with legal requirements and NOPD policy. Auditors analyzed reports, field interview cards, and L3 interview room video and/or body-worn camera recordings, to ensure officers conducted a legal, constitutional interrogation or interview; those officers documented such encounters, and that documentation was complete and accurate. The Custodial Interrogation and Interview Audit form (Appendix A) was used to document the audit criteria.

Auditors read the guidance in the audit forms as required. Changes to audit forms are clearly communicated to auditors by the audit supervisor. Auditors re-read policies when guidance in audit forms recommends, they do so or when the policy requirements are not clear enough to the auditor to allow him/her to confidently score an audit criterion.

When audit results require comments, auditors thoroughly explain the evidence they observed that led to their determination of the result for the audit criteria in question. Drawing on their knowledge of NOPD policies, auditors note any policy violations they observe that are not specifically addressed in the Custodial Interrogations and Interviews Audit tools in the "Auditor Comments" section of the form.

All documents and related incidents that are in the sample and are not audited must be deselected. All deselections are recorded in the Deselection Log. A review of the Deselection Log shows there were two (2) items de-selected for this audit. Of the items de-selected, both were conducted by outside agencies.

NOTE: Deselected Items have no impact on results of the audit as they are not included in the audit score calculations.

Deselection Reason
Handled by an outside agency, St Bernard Parish Sheriff Department.
Handled by an outside agency, Stanislaus County Sheriff's Office (SCSO – California).

Initiating and Conducting the Custodial Interrogations and Interviews Audit

By applying the audit forms as a guide, the auditors qualitatively assessed the Custodial Interrogation and Interview data to determine whether officers/detectives substantively met the requirements of policy.

1. Two weeks prior to the audit, districts/units were notified of the audit to ensure the duty location had been prepared for the audit and that all documentation was available for review.
2. Auditors were assigned to each district/unit to be audited utilizing a single review process.
3. The auditors utilized the digital audit form to input the results of the audit.
4. The auditors inspected any necessary related documents provided by the district/unit as evidence of compliance or reviewed online data.
5. When the documentation was unavailable at the time of the audit, the district/unit was given until the end of the audit period to provide the documentation.
6. Once the auditors entered their audit results, compliance scores were determined for the requirements listed above. This final report documents whether the compliance rate for each requirement met the threshold for substantial compliance (95%).

Reviews – Compliance Scores Table

Audit results data in Excel spreadsheet, raw data based on individual questions on the Custodial Interrogations and Interviews Audit Forms.

Custodial Interviews and Interrogations Table

Report Period: March 2025

ARU percentages for Consent Decree requirements for Custodial Interrogations Checklist Audit.

Review (Sample) Period: Sep 2024 - Feb 2025

	Check-List Questions	Score	Y	N	U	NA*	Consent Decree ¶	NOPD Policy Chapters	NA - Notes
1	All custodial interrogations that took place in a police facility were audio/video recorded	100%	48	0	0	1	164	Ch 42.11 p5-p7	1 exchange took place on the campus of Xavier University
2	All interrogations that involved suspected homicides or sexual assaults, were audio/video recorded	100%	12	0	0	37	164	Ch 42.11 p5-p7	37 interrogations NOT related to homicides or sexual assaults
3	There is a video/audio recording of the statement as listed in the log	100%	49	0	0	0	164	Ch 42.11 p5-p7	
4	The duty location does have a designated interview room(s) equipped with functioning audio and video recording technology that allows for recording and maintenance of all phases of Interrogations	100%	48	0	0	1	167	Ch 42.11 p8	1 exchange took place on the campus of Xavier University
5	The recording does not reflect any threat or use of physical violence on the individual or the individuals' family	100%	49	0	0	0	163	Ch 42.11 p2, p4	
6	The custodial interrogation recording was recorded in its entirety	96%	46	2	0	1	164	Ch 42.11 p6-p7	1 exchange took place on the campus of Xavier University
7	The custodial interrogation recording was not preceded by a "pre-interview"	100%	49	0	0	0	164	Ch 42.11 p5, p9	
8	The recording equipment was not turned off during any part of the interview	98%	48	1	0	0	164	Ch 42.11 p10	
9	If the recording was turned off, it was the suspect's decision that he/she did not want the interrogation recorded	n/a	0	0	0	49	164	Ch 42.11 p10	49 incidents video never turned off - not applicable to question
10	If the recording was turned off and it was the suspect's decision that the interrogation was not to be recorded, the suspect's request was recorded and documented in the case report	n/a	0	0	0	49	164	Ch 42.11 p10	49 incidents video never turned off - not applicable to question
11	There was NOT a video/audio equipment failure during the recording of an interrogation (Information Only)		49	0	0	0	165	Ch 42.11 p28	
12	If there was a video/audio equipment failure during the recording of an interrogation, it is noted in the case file	n/a	0	0	0	49	165	Ch 42.11 p29	49 incidents video no failure - not applicable to question
13	If there was a video/audio equipment failure during the recording of an interrogation, it is noted in the EPR	n/a	0	0	0	49	165	Ch 42.11 p29	49 incidents video no failure - not applicable to question
14	If there was a video/audio equipment failure during the recording of an interrogation, it is noted in a memo to the appropriate Deputy Chief	n/a	0	0	0	49	165	Ch 42.11 p29	49 incidents video no failure - not applicable to question
15	If the interrogation was not able to be video and audio recorded because of equipment failure or malfunction, the detectives recorded the interrogation by means of a digital or cassette recorder, body worn camera, or another recording device	n/a	0	0	0	49	165	Ch 42.11 p28	49 incidents video no failure - not applicable to question
16A	The number of case files where it appears notes were taken during interviews and interrogations (Informational Only)		15	0	0	34	166	Ch 42.11 p21	34 cases where no notes were observed being written
16B	The case file contains all of the officers' notes taken during this interview/interrogation, if seen in A/V taking notes	87%	13	2	0	34	166	Ch 42.11 p21	34 cases where no notes were observed being written
17A	The interview was conducted in the accused person's primary language	100%	49	0	0	0	168	Ch 42.11 p21, p24, Ch 55.4	
17B	Miranda was given in person's primary language	100%	48	0	0	1	168	Ch 42.11 p4, p26 Ch 1.9.1, Ch 55.4	1 subject asked for lawyer prior to Miranda given; detective halted interview
18	If an interpreter was a police department employee, the case file reflects that the interpreter identified himself/herself as an officer or employee of the Department	100%	2	0	0	47	168	Ch 42.11 p25, Ch 55.4	47 incidents where no "DEPT" or NOPDAI interpreter used
19	The interpreter is authorized by the Department to interpret	100%	2	0	0	47	168	Ch 42.11 p24, Ch 55.4	47 incidents where no "DEPT" or NOPDAI interpreter used
20	The interpreter is trained in using interpretation protocols	100%	2	0	0	47	168	Ch 42.11 p24, Ch 55.4	47 incidents where no "DEPT" or NOPDAI interpreter used
21	The log entry is complete if the following are included in the log: Correct Item Number Location of Interrogation Date and Time Name of Subject being Interrogated Name of Officer Conducting the Interrogation	96%	47	2	0	0		Ch 42.11 p20, p22	
	Total Interrogations Score	**99%**	**512**	**7**	**0**	**510**			
I	**Percentage of Interviews Logged Correctly as Interviews**	**93%**	**41**	**3**	**0**	**1**			

General Comments

ARU audited the sample list case files for the defined period, for completeness and accuracy as required by the Consent Decree.

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

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

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

Scores below **95%** are highlighted in **red.**

Custodial Interviews and Interrogations Scorecard By District

ARU percentages for Consent Decree requirements for Custodial Interrogations Checklist Audit.

Report Period: March 2025

Review (Sample) Period: Sep 2024 - Feb 2025

		Districts/Units												
	Check-List Questions	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**SOD**	**Homicide**	**Sex Crimes**	**Child Abuse**	**Overall Score**
1	All custodial interrogations that took place in a police facility were audio/video recorded	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	**100%**
2	All interrogations that involved suspected homicides or sexual assaults, were audio/video recorded	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	**100%**
3	There is a video/audio recording of the statement as listed in the log	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	**100%**
4	The duty location does have a designated interview room(s) equipped with functioning audio and video recording technology that allows for recording and maintenance of all phases of Interrogations	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	**100%**
5	The recording does not reflect any threat or use of physical violence on the individual or the individuals' family	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	**100%**
6	The custodial interrogation recording was recorded in its entirety	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	67%	100%	**96%**
7	The custodial interrogation recording was not preceded by a "pre-interview"	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	**100%**
8	The recording equipment was not turned off during any part of the interview	80%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	**98%**
9	If the recording was turned off, it was the suspect's decision that he/she did not want the interrogation recorded	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**
10	If the recording was turned off and it was the suspect's decision that the interrogation was not to be recorded, the suspect's request was recorded and documented in the case report	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**
11	There was not a video/audio equipment failure during the recording of an interrogation (Informational Count Only)	5	5	4	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	3	2	**49**
12	If there was a video/audio equipment failure during the recording of an interrogation, it is noted in the case file	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	If there was a video/audio equipment failure during the recording of an interrogation, it is noted in the EPR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**
14	If there was a video/audio equipment failure during the recording of an interrogation, it is noted in a memo to the appropriate Deputy Chief	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**
15	If the interrogation was not able to be video and audio recorded because of equipment failure or malfunction, the detectives recorded the interrogation by means of a digital or cassette recorder, body worn camera, or another recording device	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**
16A	The number of case files where it appears notes were taken during interviews and interrogations (Informational Count Only)	0	1	0	3	2	4	0	2	1	0	2	0	**15**
16B	The case file contains all of the officers' notes taken during this interview/interrogation, if seen in A/V taking notes	-	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	-	50%	100%	-	50%	-	**87%**
17A	The interview was conducted in the accused person's primary language	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	**100%**
17B	Miranda was given in person's primary language	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	**100%**
18	If an interpreter was a police department employee, the case file reflects that the interpreter identified himself/herself as an officer or employee of the Department	100%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**100%**
19	The interpreter is authorized by the Department to interpret	100%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**100%**
20	The interpreter is trained in using interpretation protocols	100%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**100%**
21	The log entry is complete if the following are included in the log: Correct Item Number Location of Interrogation Name of Subject being Interrogated Name of Officer Conducting the Interrogation	100%	100%	100%	100%	60%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	**96%**
	Total Interrogations Score	**96%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**96%**	**100%**	**-**	**98%**	**100%**	**100%**	**94%**	**100%**	**99%**
x	**Percentage of Interviews Logged Correctly as Interviews**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**80%**	**100%**	**-**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**50%**	**93%**

General Comments

ARU audited the sample list case files for the defined period, for completeness and accuracy as required by the Consent Decree.

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

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

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

Scores below **95%** are highlighted in **red.**

Conclusions

The results of this audit are verified through a thorough custodial interrogations and interviews review and reconciliation process. This process has now concluded, and the districts/units will have an opportunity to review all the audit results and scorecards. If they identify any discrepancies or have any concerns, an Audit Re-Evaluation Request Form can be submitted to PSAB documenting their concerns.

Custodial Interrogations and Interviews - as noted above, requires that officers/detectives conduct these in compliance within all U.S. laws, consent decree agreements and department policies to ensure the trust and safety of individuals in the community, and provide counseling, redirection, and support to officers.

The compliance percentage for requirements in the Custodial Interrogations and Interviews audit are as follows for the reviews of up to 5 samples or 15% whichever is greater, per district/unit:

1. **The overall Custodial Interrogation sample, which consisted of 49 interrogations, is determined to be substantially compliant at 99**%. No questions are identified as opportunities for improvement: Note that Q16B regarding notes in case file scored low for two districts due to missing notes auditors observed being taken during interrogation.

2. **The overall Custodial Interview Log Check sample, which consisted of 45 randomly selected interviews, is determined to be non-compliant at 93% with 3 log entries incorrectly labeled as interviews when they were determined to be interrogations instead.**

Recommendations

The following category in this audit scored below the substantial compliance threshold of 95%. There are opportunities to improve the scores in the following areas by using targeted corrective action. See below:

- Question 16B having notes saved in case files; detectives need to be reminded to maintain all records regarding the interactions with subjects.

1. This report will serve as the notification of district/unit performance during this audit.

District Re-evaluation Requests and PSAB Responses

Districts had no re-evaluation requests regarding this audit.

Timothy A. Lindsey
Innovation Manager, Auditing
Auditing and Review Section
Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau

Appendix A – Custodial Interrogations and Interviews Audit Forms

Custodial Interrogations Audit Forms:

Custodial Interrogation Audit

Auditor

Find items

Item Number

Unit

Find items

Reporting Year

Find items

Reporting Month

Find items

Interrogation DateTime

12/31/2001 00 : 00

Interrogation Location

Please indicate the Log Entry type from the Log as identified by the district completing the logbook.

Log Entry Type

Find items

Is the log book entry type (interrogation or interview) correct as indicated by the district?

Auditor Log Entry Type

Find items

Look at L3 video. Determine who the police are speaking with. If the person is suspected of a crime, and the police are questioning them as a suspect, it is an interrogation. If the person is not suspected of a crime (such as a witness or information/intelligence), it is an interview.

Stop here. If the log entry is correctly identified as an interview, then skip all the remaining questions. If the log entry is identified as an interrogation, proceed with the below questions.

1. If the interrogation took place in a police station, was it audio/video recorded? (L3 system)

Interrogation Conducted in Police Facility Was Recorded

Find items

2. If the interrogation involved suspected homicide or sexual assault, it must be recorded.

Interrogation Involving Homicide or Sexual Assault Was Recorded

Find items

3. There is an audio/video recording of the statement as listed in the log.

Recording Exists As Listed in Log

Find items

4. Did the duty location have a designated room equipped with functioning audo and video recording technology that allowed for the recording and maintenance of all phases of this interrogation? CD 167

Unit has Interrogation Rm with Audio/Video

Find items

5. This audio/video recording did NOT reflect any threats or use of physical violence against the individual or the individual's family.

No Threats of Violence

Find items

6. This custodial interrogation was recorded in its entirety. Video is considered complete if the following conditions are met: 1) Suspect must be seen walking into the empty room 2) Subject must be given the Miranda warning and seen answering questions (or denying to) 3) Subject must be seen leaving the room and not returning.

Entire Interrogation A/V Recorded

Find items

7. This custodial interrogation was NOT preceded by a "pre-interview"

No Pre-Interview Before Interrogation

Find items

8. The recording equipment was NOT turned off during any part of this interrogation.

A/V Recording Not Turned Off During Interview

Find items

9. If the recording was turned off, it was the suspects decision that they did not want the interrogation recorded.

If Recording Halted, It was Suspect's Decision

Find items

10. If the recording was turned off, and it was the suspects decision to do so, then the request was recorded and documented in a case report.

If Recording Halted, Suspect's Decision Recorded and Documented

Find items

11. There was not audio/video equipment failure during this interrogation.

No A/V Equipment Failure During Recording

Find items

12. If there was audio/video recording equipment failure, it was documented in the case file.

If A/V Equipment Failure, Documented in Case File

Find items

13. If there was audio/video recording equipment failure, it was documented in an EPR.

If A/V Equipment Failure, Documented in EPR

Find items

14. If there was audio/video recording equipment failure, it was documented in a memo to the appropriate Deputy Chief.

If A/V Equipment Failure, Memo sent to Deputy Chief

Find items

15. If the interrogation was not able to be audio/video recorded due to equipment failure or malfunction, then a Body Worn Camera, digital or cassette recorder, or another recording device was used to complete this interrogation

If A/V Equip Failure, BWC, Digital Recorder, Other Device Used

Find items

16A. Audio/video recording appears to show the detective took case notes.

Detective Took Notes

Find items

16B. If the detective appears to take case notes (#16A is "Yes") then the notes are located in the case file.

Notes In Case File

Find items

17A. The interrogation was conducted in the primary language of the accused.

Interview Conducted in Primary Language of Accused

Find items

17B. The Miranda Warning was given the person's primary language.

Miranda in Primary Language

Find items

18. If an interpreter was used, and it was a police department employee, the case file and/or audio/video recording indicates the interpreter identified himself/herself as a department employee or officer of this department during the interrogation.

Interpreter Identified Himself As Police Employee As Required

Find items

19. The interpreter is authorized by the department to interpret, if used.

Interpreter is Authorized via NOPDAI, if Used

Find items

20. The interpreter is trained in using interpretation protocols, if used.

Interpreter Is Qualified in Interrogation Techniques, If Used

Find items

21. Is the log entry complete? The log entry is complete if it contains the following:
1) Correct Item Number
2) Location of Interrogation
3) Name of Subject being Interrogated
4) Name of Officer conducting Interrogation

Log Entry Complete

Find items

Auditor Comments Custodial

Auditor Comments Custodial

Reviewer Comments Custodial

Back to Search

Submit Audit

Appendix B – Report Distribution

Superintendent - NOPD

Chief Deputy Superintendent– Field Operations Bureau

Deputy Superintendent – Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau

Deputy Superintendent – Investigative Services Bureau

Director – NOPD Education & Training Services

City Attorney – City Attorney's Office