



Stops, Searches & Arrest Audit

June 2025 (FOB and ISB)

Sample Period June 1st, 2024 – May 31st, 2025

Report# **SSA062025**

Submitted by PSAB: July 9, 2025

Response from NOPD: July 31, 2025

Report: August 4, 2025

Note: date of Previous Final Amended Audit: 9/17/2024.

Audit Team

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

Executive Summary

The Audit and Review Section of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted an audit of Stops, Searches and Arrests (SSA) related to incidents which occurred between June 2024 and May 2025. In addition to the primary SSA audit, three (3) sub-audits, Probation & Parole, Consent to Search, and Strip/Cavity, are conducted as part of the overall SSA audit. These sub-audits encompassed incidents which also occurred between June 2024 and May 2025. The audit is designed to measure compliance with NOPD policies and the Consent Decree, thereby ensuring that all stops, searches, and arrests are conducted and executed consistently with those policies and constitutional law. The audit also ensures all incidents are documented appropriately, that the documentation is complete and accurate, and that stops, searches, and arrests are carried out with fairness and respect. This audit spans the period during which the NOPD Field Operations Bureau (FOB) SSA Corrective Action Plan (CAP) continues to be executed, following its implementation as an outcome of the May 2021 SSA audit results.

Stops, Searches, and Arrests – Audit

- **SSA Overall** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **96%**. The previous audit compliance score was 98%.
- **SSA Incidents** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **92%**. The previous audit score was 95%. The categories include all the following from the “Summary Table”: “FIC Exists, If Required”, “FIC Submitted By ETOD”, “FIC Reviewed in 72 Hrs.”, “No Boilerplate”, “Videos and Reports Are Consistent”, “Arrested in Residence with Consent, Warrant, or Exigent Circumstances”, and “Supervisor Made Scene, If Required”. Most of the categories on this scorecard pertain to the officer documenting his/her action with the public. NOPD continues to implement the FOB Corrective Action Plan. This has led to sustained performance in creating FICs as required (100% compliance rate, as with the previous audit). Video to report consistency dropped to 88% from the previous score of 93%. Specific training with In-service Training classes or Department Training Bulletins (DTBs) continue being utilized to reinforce close and effective supervision.

Although Field Interview Cards (FICs) and Electronic Police Reports (EPRs) should be complete, accurate and timely, FIC submittal and approval timeliness remains below NOPD goals due to officers and supervisors being late in submitting and approving reports. There are many reasons for this, including work overload, being inefficient in prepping reports, non-timely responses to correcting report mistakes, etc.

- Compliant CD paragraphs include 123, 124, 126, 136, 145, 149, and 150 (sub-paragraph: Evidence).
- CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage include 150 (sub-paragraph: report submittal and review timeliness). Both audit questions (“FIC Submitted by ETOD” and “FIC Reviewed in 72 Hrs.”) show improvements vs. previous audit. Timely submission of FICs improved from 85% to 86%. The timeliness of supervisor approvals of FICs scored 83%. The previous score was 91%.

- **SSA Procedural Justice** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **98%**. The previous audit score was 99%. The categories considered by the procedural justice scorecard include the following: “Officers Introduced Themselves”, “Officers Explained Reason for Stop”, “Officers Allowed Subject to Explain”, “Officers Responded to Subject's Reasonable Questions”, “Officers Communicated Result Stop”, “Took No Longer than Necessary”, and “Officers Were Reasonably Courteous and Professional”. The “Officer Introduced Themselves” category scored **90%** versus the previous audit score of 94%. When reasonably possible, officers should identify themselves as soon as practical on a stop.
 - Compliant CD paragraphs include 181 (sub-paragraph 2-4-Explanation, Timely, Professional).
 - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage include 181 (sub-paragraph: 1-Identified). The audit question continues to show improvement.

- **SSA Stops** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **96%**. The previous audit score was 99%. The categories include the following: “Officer had RS/PC for Stop”, “Officer Adequately Documented RS/PC to Stop”, “and Reason for Handcuffs Documented in Report” and “Handcuffing within Policy”. The “Reason for Handcuffs Documented in Report” score was 98% versus 93% in the previous audit. The Department has continued to educate officers, using DTBs, in-service training, as well as utilizing the FOB CAP (corrective action plan) developed after the 2021 audit. However, the score indicates a need to continue to focus on the report writing end as narratives continue to be written without needed additional context to explain certain actions. This also includes the narrative section for handcuffing.
 - Compliant CD paragraphs include 122, 123, 126, 149, and 150 (sub-paragraph-Documentation).
 - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage – None.
 - Note: Handcuffing is NOT audited as a CD paragraph, but as NOPD Policy. Ch. 1.3.1.1 P25

- **SSA Searches** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **97%**. The previous audit score was 99%. The categories include the following: “Officer Had Valid Legal Basis to Search Subject” and “Officer Adequately Documented Legal Basis to Search”. The score for “Officers adequately documenting a legal basis to search” scored **99%**. The score was also 99% in the previous audit. This signifies consistency for three consecutive audits. This can be attributed to the fact that the Department has continued to educate officers, using DTBs, in-service training, as well as utilizing the FOB CAP developed after the 2021 audit.
 - Compliant CD paragraphs include 123, 130, 149, and 150 (subparagraph-Documentation).
 - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage - None.

- **SSA Arrests** - scorecard has an overall compliance score of **98%**. The previous audit score was 99%. The categories include the following: “Supervisor Approved Gist Prior to Booking”, “Officer had Probable Cause to Arrest Subject”, “Officer Adequately Documented

PC to Arrest”, and “Miranda Given, if required”. The “Miranda Given, if required” metric scored **95%**. The previous audit score was 96%. Probable cause, approved arrest summaries (Gist’s), and documentation policies continue to be adhered to in a consistent, and timely manner.

- Compliant CD paragraphs include 141, 144, and 145.
- CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage – None.
- Note: Miranda is NOT audited as a CD paragraph, but as NOPD Policy.

Probation & Parole Sub-audit - Stops, Searches, and Arrests.

The Audit and Review Section of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted this sub-audit of Stops, Searches and Arrests (SSA) related specifically to incidents where the person stopped, searched, or arrested was on probation or parole. The sample was derived using data provided by Louisiana State Probation and Parole New Orleans District office. This sub-audit was conducted as part of the overall SSA audit and encompassed incidents which also occurred between June 2024 and May of 2025. The entire universe of people on probation or parole during this time-period (June 1, 2024 – May 31, 2025) was 1,450. Of these, 20 were listed on an FIC/EPR during the audit period as being searched. This was the universe of individuals on probation or parole who were stopped, searched, and/or arrested by NOPD officers during the audit period. All of those encountered were included in this probation and parole audit.

- **SSA Overall – Probation & Parole** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **94%**. The previous audit compliance score was 97%. This sub-audit looked at a targeted sample of SSA data specifically involving persons either on probation and/or parole.
- **SSA Incidents – Probation & Parole** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **84%**. The previous audit score was 89%. The categories include the following: “FIC Exists, If Required”, “FIC Submitted By ETOD”, “FIC Approved in 72 Hrs.”, “No Boilerplate”, “Videos and Reports Are Consistent”, “Arrested in Residence with Consent, Warrant, or Exigent Circumstances”, and “Supervisor Made Scene, If Required”. As in the SSA audit, most of the categories on this scorecard pertain to the officer documenting his/her action with the public. FICs and EPRs should be complete, accurate and timely. The deficiencies regarding FIC submittals and approvals within policy timeframes, currently being addressed through the SSA Inspections as part of the FOB Corrective Action Plan. Video to Report consistency decreased from 96% to **90%**.
- - Compliant CD paragraphs include 123, 124, 126, 136, 145, 149, and 150 (sub-paragraph: Evidence).
 - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage include 150 (sub-paragraph: report submittal and approval timeliness).
- **SSA Procedural Justice – Probation & Parole** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **99%**. The previous audit score was 99%. The categories include the following: “Officers Introduced Themselves”, “Officers Explained Reason for Stop”, “Officers Allowed Subject to Explain”, “Officers Responded to Subject's Reasonable Questions”, “Officers

Communicated Result Stop”, “Took No Longer than Necessary”, and “Officers Were Reasonably Courteous and Professional”. The “Officer Introduced Themselves” category scored a **95%** compliance rate. This was an improvement from the previous audit score of 91%. When reasonably possible, officers should identify themselves as soon as practical on a stop.

- Compliant CD paragraphs include 181 (sub-paragraph 1-4-Identified, Explanation, Timely, Professional).
 - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage – none
- **SSA Stops – Probation & Parole** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **100%**. The previous audit score was 100%. The categories include the following: “Officer had RS/PC for Stop”, “Officer Adequately Documented RS/PC to Stop”, “Reason for Handcuffs Documented in Report” and “Handcuffing within Policy”.
- Compliant CD paragraphs include 122, 123, 126, 149, and 150 (sub-paragraph-Documentation).
 - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage – None.
 - Note: Handcuffing is NOT audited as a CD paragraph, but as NOPD Policy. Compliant.
- **SSA Searches – Probation & Parole** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **97%**. The previous audit score was 100%. The categories include the following: “Officer Had Valid Legal Basis to Search Subject” and “Officer Adequately Documented Legal Basis to Search”. The score for “Officers adequately documenting a legal basis to search” is **97%**. **The previous audit score was 100%**.
- Compliant CD paragraphs include 123, 149, 130 (sub-paragraph-Documentation), 150.
 - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage: None
- **SSA Arrests – Probation & Parole** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **98%**. The previous audit score was 100%. The categories include the following: “Supervisor Approved Gist Prior to Booking”, “Officer had Probable Cause to Arrest Subject”, “Officer Adequately Documented PC to Arrest”, and “Miranda Given, if required”. Probable cause, approved arrest summaries (Gist’s), and documentation policies continue to be adhered to in a consistent, and timely manner.
- Compliant CD paragraphs include 141, 144, and 145.
 - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage – None.
 - Note: Miranda is NOT audited as a CD paragraph, but as NOPD Policy. Non-Compliant.

Consent to Search Sub-audit - Stops, Searches and Arrests.

The Audit and Review Section of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted this sub-audit of Stops, Searches and Arrests (SSA) related specifically to incidents where the FIC or EPR indicated that the search legal basis was “Consent to Search”. The sample was derived using this data. This sub-audit was conducted as part of the overall SSA audit and encompassed

incidents which also occurred between June 2024 and May of 2025. This audit consists of seven (7) incidents and comprises the entire universe of consent searches for the period audited.

- **SSA Overall – Consent to Search** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **97%**. The previous audit compliance score was 97%. This sub-audit looked at a targeted sample of SSA data specifically involving incidents where legal basis consent to search given or consent to search in narrative. Two (2) of the seven (7) incidents audited were not actually consent to searches but the FIC search legal basis had erroneously been checked as “consent to search”.
- **SSA Incidents – Consent to Search** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **90%**. The previous audit score was 86%. The categories include the following: “FIC Exists, If Required”, “FIC Submitted By ETOD”, “FIC Reviewed in 72 Hrs.”, “No Boilerplate”, “Videos and Reports Are Consistent”, “Arrested in Residence with Consent, Warrant, or Exigent Circumstances”, and “Supervisor Made Scene, If Required”. As in the SSA audit, most of the categories on this scorecard pertain to the officer documenting his/her action with the public. FICs and EPRs should be complete, accurate and timely. The deficiencies regarding FIC submittals and approvals within policy timeframes, are currently being addressed through the SSA Inspections as part of the FOB Corrective Action Plan. Video to Report consistency was **94%**. The previous audit score was 57%. FIC submittal and approval timeliness remains below NOPD goals due to current system limitations.
 - Compliant CD paragraphs include 124, 126, 136, 145, 149, and 150 (sub-paragraph: Evidence).
 - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage include 123, 150 (sub-paragraph: report submittal and approval timeliness)
- **SSA Procedural Justice – Consent to Search** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **100%**. The previous audit score was 100%. The categories include the following: “Officers Introduced Themselves”, “Officers Explained Reason for Stop”, “Officers Allowed Subject to Explain”, “Officers Responded to Subject's Reasonable Questions”, “Officers Communicated Result Stop”, “Took No Longer than Necessary”, and “Officers Were Reasonably Courteous and Professional”.
 - Compliant CD paragraphs include 181(sub-paragraph 2-4-Explanation, Timely, Professional, Identified).
 - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage – None.
- **SSA Stops – Consent to Search** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **97%**. The previous audit score was 100%. The categories include the following: “Officer had RS/PC for Stop”, “Officer Adequately Documented RS/PC to Stop”, “Reason for Handcuffs Documented in Report” and “Handcuffing within Policy”. The “Reason for handcuffs documented in the report” scored 100% in this audit. The previous score was also 100%. Reasonable Suspicion/Probable Cause for Stop and documentation both scored 94%. The previous audit scores were 100%.
 - Compliant CD paragraphs include 122, 123, 126, 149, and 150 (sub-paragraph-

- Documentation).
 - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage – None.
 - Note: Handcuffing is NOT audited as a CD paragraph, but as NOPD Policy.
- **SSA Searches – Consent to Search** - Scorecard has an overall compliance score of **97%**. The previous audit score was 100%. The categories include the following: “Officer Had Valid Legal Basis to Search Subject” and “Officer Adequately Documented Legal Basis to Search”. The score for “Officers adequately documenting a legal basis to search” was **95%**. The previous audit was 100%.
 - Compliant CD paragraphs include 123, 130, 149, and 150 (documentation).
 - CD paragraphs below target compliance – None.
- **SSA Arrests – Consent to Search** - scorecard has an overall compliance score of **100%**. The previous audit score was also 100%. The categories include the following: “Supervisor Approved Gist Prior to Booking”, “Officer had Probable Cause to Arrest Subject”, “Officer Adequately Documented PC to Arrest”, and “Miranda Given, if required”. The “Miranda Given, if required” metric scored **100%** versus the previous audit score of 100%. Probable cause, approved arrest summaries (Gist’s), and documentation policies continue to be adhered to in a consistent, and timely manner.
 - Compliant CD paragraphs include 141, 144, and 145.
 - CD paragraphs below target compliance percentage – None.
 - Note: Miranda is NOT audited as a CD paragraph, but as NOPD Policy.
- **Consent to Search Audit** – Subject scorecard has an overall compliance score of **26%**. The previous audit score was 23%. Four (4) of the sixteen (16) incidents audited did involve consent to search. The twelve (12) “not consent to search” incidents were mislabeled in the FIC. Of the 4 incidents identified as consent to search in the sample, two (2) were for courtesy rides (**K-01853-24, J-10327-24**). Documentation errors should continue to be addressed during the SSA Inspections or the FIC review process.

Stops, Searches and Arrests – Strip & Cavity Sub-audit.

The Audit and Review Section of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted this sub-audit of Stops, Searches and Arrests (SSA) related specifically to incidents where the FIC or EPR indicated that a strip or cavity search occurred. The sample was derived using this data. This audit was conducted as part of the overall SSA audit and encompassed incidents which also occurred between June 2024 and May of 2025. There were “**NO**” strip searches conducted by NOPD during this audit period and “**NO**” cavity searches during the same audit period. A review of 91 potential incidents determined that of all the strip/cavity searches conducted, all were done by outside entities. 1 done by hospital, 1 by St. Bernard Sheriff Office, and 1 by Orleans Parish Sheriff Office.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Introduction	9
<i>Purpose</i>	9
<i>Objectives</i>	9
<i>Background</i>.....	9
<i>Methodology</i>.....	9
Initiating and Conducting the SSA Audit.....	12
Initiating and Conducting the Sub-audit (Consent to Search)	13
Initiating and Conducting the Sub-audit (Strip & Cavity Search).....	14
Initiating and Conducting the Sub-audit (Probation & Parole)	15
Reviews - Scorecards	16
Stops, Search, Arrests (SSA) Audit Summary Table	16
SSA – Consent to Search Audit Summary Table	18
Consent to Search Audit Summary Table	18
Conclusion.....	25
Appendix A – SSAPJ Audit Forms	37
Appendix B – Report Distribution	67

Introduction

The Audit and Review Section of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted an audit of Stops, Searches and Arrests (SSA) related to incidents which occurred between June 2024 and May 2025. In addition, three (3) sub-audits, Probation and Parole, Consent to Search and Strip/Cavity, are conducted as part of the overall SSA audit and encompasses incidents which occurred during the same period. This audit is designed to ensure that all stops, searches, and arrests are conducted and executed consistently with NOPD policy and constitutional law, are documented appropriately, that the documentation is complete and accurate, and that stops, searches, and arrests are carried out with fairness and respect. NOPD Field Operations Bureau (FOB) continues to adhere to its corrective action plan which was implemented following the May 2021 SSA audit.

Purpose

The Stops, Searches, and Arrests audits are completed to ensure stops, searches, and arrests are constitutional and are within policy. Stops, Searches, and Arrests are regulated by, but not limited to, the following Chapters: 1.2.4 – Search and Seizure; 1.2.4.1 – Stops/Terry Stops; 1.2.4.2 – Search Warrant Content, Forms and Reviews; 1.3.1.1 – Handcuffing and Restraint Devices; 1.9 – Arrests; 35.1.7 Non-Disciplinary Responses to Minor Violations; 41.3.10 Body Worn Camera; 41.12– Field Interview Cards; 41.13 Bias-Free Policing; 52.1.1 – Misconduct Intake and Complaint Investigation.

Objectives

This audit is designed to ensure that all Stops, Searches, and Arrests are consistent with NOPD policy and constitutional law. Also, to ensure all is documented appropriately, the documentation is complete and accurate, and that stops, searches, and arrests are carried out with fairness and respect. This audit procedure entails the review of stops, searches, and arrests. Consent searches, strip and cavity searches, search warrants, and performance evaluations are covered in separate audits.

Background

This comprehensive Stops, Searches and Arrest Procedural Justice (SSAPJ) Audit utilizing the standard protocol has now been further enhanced to ensure all relevant issues regarding the last audit have been addressed. Originally, Stops, Searches and Arrests were each audited independently. In December of 2019, Stop, Search and Arrest audits were redesigned and consolidated into one audit. Then, following the 2021 audit, further enhancements were made relative to the corrective actions implemented, as well as additional audit questions being added. The resulting audit was more detailed and involved a deeper dive review of the most fundamental actions taken by officers and supervisors.

Methodology

Auditors qualitatively assessed each incident using the SSA forms listed below to ensure each stop, search, and arrest is compliant with legal requirements and NOPD policy. Auditors analyzed reports, field interview cards, body-worn cameras and in-car cameras to ensure officers had a valid legal basis to conduct a stop, search, or arrest, that officers documented such basis, and that

documentation was complete and accurate.

The following SSA forms document the audit criteria:

1. SSA Subject Audit Form
2. SSA Incident Audit Form
3. Consent to Search Form
4. Strip/Cavity Search Form

Each stop, search, or arrest incident reviewed required one completed SSA Incident audit form and one completed SSA subject audit form for each person suspected of a crime during the incident. For the purposes of this audit, every person, an officer identified, who was not a victim or witness, is a subject, requires the auditor to complete a SSA subject form. For example, consider an incident involving an officer stopping a vehicle because he/she believed the driver matched a description of a wanted person. He/she identified the driver and the front passenger in the vehicle and none of the rear passengers. For this incident, an SSA subject form was required for the driver (suspected of being wanted) and for the front passenger (identified by the officer). Although the officer was required to document approximate demographics for the rear passengers in a FIC, SSA subject forms were not needed for them.

Each Consent to Search (FIC or EPR) incident in the sample required the auditor to complete one SSA Incident form, one SSA subject form for each person suspected of a crime during the incident, and one Consent to Search form. For the purposes of this sub-audit, the process is the same as the SSA process. The consent to search sample is reported separately from the SSA sample.

Each Strip/Cavity Search (FIC or EPR) Incident in the sample required the auditor to complete one SSA Incident form, one SSA subject form for each person suspected of a crime during the incident, and one Strip/Cavity Search form. For the purposes of this sub-audit, the process is the same as the SSA process. The strip/cavity search sample is reported separately from the SSA sample.

Each Probation and Parole (FIC or EPR) Incident in the sample required the auditor to complete one SSA Incident form and one SSA subject form for each person suspected of a crime during the incident. For the purposes of this sub-audit, the process is the same as the SSA process. The probation and parole sample are reported separately from the SSA sample.

All documents and related incidents that are in the sample, and were not audited because there was no stop, search or arrest, were to be deselected. All deselections were recorded in the Deselection Log.

Auditors searched for and reviewed all documentation related to the incident sampled. This involved:

1. Reading the documents sampled to determine which officers were on scene and when.
2. Searching Evidence.com by officer and time and by using multi-camera option to find related videos that were labelled differently.
3. Reviewing the prior and proceeding CAD activity for the officers on scene.

4. Searching for FICs and EPRs using subject names and the date of the incident as documented on video or in reports.
5. Searching for FICs and EPRs using officer information and the date of the incident as documented on video or in reports.
6. Reviewing the related item numbers as documented in FICs and EPRs.

If video is available for the incident, auditors watched all interactions between officers and non-members. Auditors skipped through sections of video that did not involve interactions between officers and non-members. Auditors watched videos recorded by other officers on scene to observe all interactions. Auditors also watched the beginning and end of each officer's BWC video to determine whether the officer activated and deactivated their BWC as required by policy.

Auditors will refer to the SSA protocol and other written guidance prior to conducting any audit review. All changes to audit forms are clearly communicated to auditors by the audit supervisor prior to each audit. Auditors may refer to policies when form guidance is not clear enough to the auditor to allow them to confidently score an audit criterion.

When audit results required comments, auditors thoroughly explained the evidence that they observed that led to their response to the result for the audit criteria in question. For example, if an auditor scored "Videos and Reports as Significantly Consistent" with a "No" indicating non-compliance, they explained how the video shows something that is not consistent with the report. Such a comment might read like the following: "The FIC documents a pat down, however the BWC shows a search incident to arrest."

Drawing on their knowledge of NOPD policies, auditors noted any policy violations they observed that were not specifically addressed in the SSA audit tools in the "Notify PSS (Performance Standards Section)" section of the audit form.

Initiating and Conducting the SSA Audit

The final **SSA** sample size for this audit was determined to be **95** incidents due to stratification and rounding.

1. The universe of Stops, Searches, and Arrests are exported into an excel spreadsheet. Stops, searches and arrests are sorted based on the date the digital document is created. Incidents are assigned a random number using Excel's random number function (RAND).
2. Documents are sampled starting from the smallest random number assigned and continuing from smallest to largest until the required sample size is reached.
3. Sample sizes are representative of the Department, not each District/Division, when reporting publicly. For reference, during June 2024 - May 2025, NOPD's Stops, Searches, and Arrests universe amounted to 35,994 incidents. Per the sample size calculator given to NOPD by the Los Angeles Police Department Auditing Section, a sample size of about 95 incidents is representative of a population of 35,994 when doing a one- tailed test, with a 95% degree of confidence, and a 4% error rate.
4. When reporting, the audit results are stratified by District/Division; the number of audit results per Division/District are proportional to the actual activity by the Division/District. The results include at least one incident from each Division/District with activity during the reporting period to ensure all Districts/Divisions with activity are included in public reports.
5. Randomly sampled documents (CAD, FIC, or EPR) that do not document a stop, search, or arrest by NOPD will be deselected. For the purposes of this audit, anyone who is identified by an officer and who is not a witness or victim, is considered stopped. If the document is part of the arrest universe and an auditor determines the related incident does not include an arrest by NOPD, but does include a stop or search by NOPD, the document and related incident will be audited focusing on the stop and search. When a document is deselected, the auditor will continue to the document with the next lowest random number.

Initiating and Conducting the Sub-audit (Consent to Search)

The **Consent to Search SSA** audit contained the entire known universe of incidents (16) in which consent to search was flagged on an FIC/EPR or determined to have been conducted during the audit period of June 2024 to May 2025. This audit follows the SSA guidelines for auditing. ARS took the following steps to identify consent searches:

1. The universe of Consent to Search is exported into an excel spreadsheet. No randomization takes place.
2. The incidents are then reviewed prior to auditing to determine if consent to search is indicated on the reports. Any incidents where the word “consent” is used in the narrative are verified for the purpose of removing those incidents where consent is mentioned in other contexts outside of the consent to search meaning.
3. Final sample sizes were the totality of all incidents which indicated a legal basis of “consent to search” or the narrative described a consent to search action or was otherwise noted.
4. When reporting publicly, audit results are not stratified by any Division/District; the results include all incidents where consent to search activity was involved, during the reporting period to ensure all activity is included in public reports.
5. Sampled documents (CAD, FIC, or EPR) that do not document a “consent to search” by NOPD will be deselected. When a document is deselected, there is no replacement as the list is all inclusive.

Initiating and Conducting the Sub-audit (Strip & Cavity Search)

The final **Strip/Cavity SSA** universe for this audit was determined to be “**NO**” incidents in which either a strip or cavity search was to have been conducted during the audit period of June 2024 through May of 2025. This sub-audit follows the SSA guidelines for auditing:

1. The universe of Strip and Cavity are exported into an excel spreadsheet. No randomization takes place.
2. The incidents are then reviewed prior to auditing to determine if Strip or Cavity is indicated on the reports. Any incidents where the words “Strip” or “Cavity” was used in the narrative are verified for the purpose of removing those incidents where “Strip” or “Cavity” is mentioned in other contexts outside of a stop, search or arrest.
3. Final sample sizes were the totality of all incidents which indicated a “Strip” or “Cavity” search, or the narrative described such an action or is otherwise noted.
4. When reporting publicly, audit results are not stratified by any Division/District; the results include all incidents with consent to search for activity during the reporting period to ensure all activity is included in public reports.
5. Sampled documents (CAD, FIC, or EPR) that do not document a “strip” or “cavity” search by NOPD will be deselected. When a document is deselected, there is no replacement as the list is all inclusive.
6. A total of **91** potential incidents were reviewed and none of the 3 reported were performed by NOPD. The other 88 were not strip or cavity searches.

Initiating and Conducting the Sub-audit (Probation & Parole)

The final **Probation and Parole SSA** universe size for this sub-audit was determined to be **20** incidents in which an individual was determined to have been on probation and/or parole when a stop, search and arrest was conducted during the audit period of June 2024 to May 2025. This sub-audit follows the SSA guidelines for auditing. ARS determined the universe of probation and parole steps by using the following steps:

1. The universe of “Probation & Parole” (P&P) data is exported into an excel spreadsheet. The list is derived by cross-referencing the document from the Probation & Parole Office with the NOPD data. No randomization took place.
2. The incidents are then reviewed prior to auditing to determine if individuals listed in NOPD data are still actively on probation or parole. This is determined by a review from the probation and parole office and then indicated in the reports. Any incidents where it is confirmed a person is still actively on probation or parole are included in the sample.
3. Final sample sizes are the totality of all incidents which indicate a person was actively on probation or parole at the time of a stop, search or arrest.
4. When reporting publicly, audit results are not stratified by any Division/District; the results include all stop, search and arrest incidents where people are on probation or parole, during the reporting period to ensure all activity is included in public reports.
5. Sampled documents that do not document the stop of a person on probation or parole by NOPD will be deselected. When a document is deselected, there is no replacement as the list is all inclusive.

Reviews - Scorecards

Stops, Search, Arrests (SSA) Audit Summary Table

Stops Searches and Arrests Sample - June, 2025

Audit Form #	CD #/Chapt	Form	Field Name	Field Text	Score	Y	N	Compliance Threshold Met (≥95%)	NA	Total Reviews	NA Comments
2	CD 126, 149, 150	Incident	FIC Exists If Required	If required, does an FIC exist for this stop?	100%	65	0	Yes	30	95	30 NA (EPRs, no FIC required)
3	CD 150	Incident	FIC Submitted By ETOD	Did the officer submit the FIC to his/her supervisor by the end of the shift?	86%	56	9	No	30	95	30 NA (EPRs, no FIC required)
4	CD 150	Incident	FIC Reviewed in 72Hrs	Did the supervisor review the FIC within 72 hours?	83%	54	11	No	30	95	30 NA (EPRs, no FIC required)
5	CD 123, 136, 145,	Incident	No Boilerplate	In the reports, did the officer(s) use specific descriptive language when articulating reasonable suspicion and/or probable cause for any stop, detention, search, or arrest?	100%	95	0	Yes	0	95	None
6	CD 123	Incident	Videos and Reports Are Consistent	Are the video(s) and reports significantly consistent?	88%	78	11	No	6	95	6 NA no video available/incomplete video
7	Ch 1.9 p27-29	Incident	Arrest in Residence Circumstances	If yes [video or reports show the officer entered a residence to make the arrest], which of the following apply? Options: (Consent, Exigent Circumstances, Warrant, None of the above (Not Compliant))	100%	3	0	Yes	92	95	92 NA no arrests or none in residence.
8C (8A,8B)	CD 133, 143	Incident	Video Shows Supv Made Scene	If the supervisor is required to make scene, does video show the supervisor made the scene?	100%	16	0	Yes	79	95	79 NA incidents which did not require Supervision on scene.
9	CD 80, Ch 1,3	Incident	Use of Force Observed	Did any officer use reportable force during this officer-civilian interaction? (Informational Only)		6	83		6	95	6 NA no video available/incomplete video
10, 11	CD 80, Ch 1,3	Incident	Use of Force Reported	If Force Observed, is there a corresponding Blue Team Report? (No could indicate it is unreported) 11. Provide Video Documentation.	100%	6	0	Yes	89	95	6 NA (incomplete/no video available); 83 NA (no force observed)
12	CD 132, 133, 134	Incident	Strip Cavity Search Occurred	Does the incident involve a strip or cavity search? (Informational Only)		0	95		0	95	95 NA (No strip/cavity occurred)
13	CD 132, 133, 134	Incident	Strip Cavity Search Documented	If Strip/Cavity search is observed(yes), is the strip or cavity search documented in the FIC or EPR?		0	0	Yes	95	95	95 NA (No strip/cavity occurred)
14	CD 131, 149	Incident	Consent to Search Occurred	Does the incident involve a consent to search search? (Informational Only)		0	95		0	95	95 NA (No Cts occurred)
15	CD 131, 149	Incident	Consent to Search Documented	If yes, is the consent to search documented in the FIC or EPR?		0	0	Yes	95	95	95 NA (No Cts occurred)
16	CD 150	Incident	Evidence Documented	If evidence was seized, is there a CE+P receipt?	100%	13	0	Yes	82	95	79 NA (no evidence seized); 1 NA (Crime lab seized); 2 NA (no EPR)
17	CD 150	Incident	Evidence Submitted Immediately	If evidence was seized, was it submitted to CE+P before next Code1 call or ETOD, whichever is first?	100%	13	0	Yes	82	95	79 NA (no evidence seized); 1 NA (Crime lab seized); 2 NA (no EPR)
18	CD 123, 149, 150	Incident	Evidence Description Matches Video	If evidence was seized, and there is a CE+P receipt, does the description on the receipt match the evidence as seen on video?	100%	13	0	Yes	82	95	79 NA (no evidence seized); 1 NA (Crime lab seized); 2 NA (no EPR)
27	CD 181	Incident	Reasonably Courteous	Does video show the officer was reasonably professional and courteous when interacting with the subject or other civilians during the stop?	99%	88	1	Yes	6	95	6 NA no video available/incomplete video
28	CD 181	Incident	Identified	If reasonably possible, does video show the officer verbally identify him/herself as a soon a practical?	85%	76	13	No	6	95	6 NA no video available/incomplete video
29	CD 181	Incident	Explained	If reasonably possible, does video show the officer explain the reason for the stop/interaction as soon as practical?	100%	89	0	Yes	6	95	6 NA no video available/incomplete video
30	Ch 41.13 P9E	Incident	Subject Could Explain	Does video show the officer allowed the subject an opportunity to explain his/her situation, ask questions, or voice concerns?	100%	89	0	Yes	6	95	6 NA no video available/incomplete video
31	Ch 41.13 P9E	Incident	Responded to Subjects Qs	If the subject was allowed to ask questions, and if the subject had reasonable questions or concerns, does video show the officer respond to them?	100%	76	0	Yes	19	95	6 NA no video available/incomplete video/13 NA no questions asked
32	Ch 1.2.4.1 P18	Incident	Conclusion	Does video show the officer communicate the result of the stop/interaction to the subject (arrest, ticket, etc.)?	100%	89	0	Yes	6	95	6 NA no video available/incomplete video
33	139, 181	Incident	Stop No Longer than Necessary	Does video show the stop was no longer than necessary to take appropriate action?	100%	89	0	Yes	6	95	6 NA no video available/incomplete video
36	Ch 41.3.10 P11	Incident	Complete Vid Num and Complete Vid Denom	Did each officer who conducted a stop, search, or arrest and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required? And did each supervisor who made the scene and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required?	98%	220	5	Yes		225	None

1A	CD 122	Subject	RS/PC to Stop	Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop this subject?	95%	104	6	Yes	3	113	3 NA (Police did not ID subject)
2A	CD 122, 123, 126, 149, 150	Subject	RS/PC to Stop in Report	Does the report clearly articulate reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop this subject?	95%	104	6	Yes	3	113	3 NA (Police did not ID subject)
3A	Ch. 1.3.1.1 P25	Subject	Reason for Handcuffs Documented	If the officer put the subject in handcuffs, did the officer document a reason to handcuff in the FIC?	98%	49	1	Yes	63	113	44 NA (No Handcuffs applied) 19 NA (FIC document Not required)
3B	Ch. 1.3.1.1	Subject	Discretionary Handcuffs Within Policy	If this subject was handcuffed, does the evidence available to you show the handcuffing was within policy?	100%	30	0	Yes	83	113	83 NA (Discretionary handcuffing not applied)
3B	Ch. 1.3.1.1	Subject	Mandatory Handcuffs Within Policy	If this subject was handcuffed, does the evidence available to you show the handcuffing was within policy?	100%	63	0	Yes	50	113	50 NA (No Mandatory handcuffing applied)
4	CD 149, 150, Ch. 1.2.4 P1	Subject	Search Legal Numerator and Search Legal Denominator	Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have a valid legal basis to search the subject?	96%	76	3	Yes	52	131	52 NA (No Search conducted)
5	CD 123, 149	Subject	Reason to Search in Report Numerator and Reason to Search in Report Denominator	Does the "Report" sufficiently document a valid legal basis for every search of this subject?	99%	75	1	Yes	52	128	52 NA (No Search conducted)
6	123, Ch 41.12 P12j	Subject	Pat Down Justification	If a pat down was correctly indicated, did the officer give specific details about the subject of the pat down that would lead a reasonable person to believe the subject was armed and dangerous in the justification for pat down text box? Informational Only. Included in Search Report Q5.		11	1		101	113	101 NA (No patdown involved)
7 & 4	CD 130	Subject	(7) Search Subject on Probation or Parole & (4) Search Legal Numerator, and Search Legal Denominator	(7) Was this subject on parole or probation? & (4) Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have a valid legal basis to search the subject?	100%	13	0	Yes	100	113	100 NA (No P&P subject involved)
8	CD 144	Subject	Supervisor Approved Gist Prior to Booking	Was the arrest gist for this subject approved by a supervisor before the subject was booked by the sheriff?	100%	22	0	Yes	91	113	30 NA (Existing Warrant/GIST not required); 61 NA (No Physical Arrest, i.e. Not taken to CLU)
9	CD 141	Subject	Officer Had PC to Arrest	Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer have probable cause to arrest this subject?	100%	52	0	Yes	61	113	61 NA (No Physical Arrest, i.e. Not taken to CLU)
10	CD 141, 145, Ch 1.9 P14, Ch 82.1 P4, Ch 41.12 P15	Subject	PC Clearly Articulated	Did the officer clearly document the probable cause in the report (FIC or EPR)?	100%	52	0	Yes	61	113	61 NA (No Physical Arrest, i.e. Not taken to CLU)
11		Subject	Stop Result	What was result of Stop? Multiple choice (Informational Only)		Physical Arrest 53	Citation Issued 17	Summons Issued 9	Verbal Warning 21	0	None
12		Subject	Break Given	Did the officer use their discretion to give the subject a break? (Informational Only)		13	74		26	113	None
15	Ch 1.9.1	Subject	Miranda Given	Did the officer give Miranda Rights, if required? Officers shall advise suspects of their Miranda Rights at the time of arrest or prior to any custodial interrogation. See Chapter: 1.9.1; Note: Miranda does not apply to roadside questioning of a stopped motorist or a person briefly detained on the street under a Terry stop.	94%	59	4	No	50	113	50 NA (Miranda not required)
13		Subject	ID Checked	Did the officer run the subject's ID?	100%	107	0	Yes	6	113	6 NA no video available/incomplete video
14	CD 189	Subject	LEP	Did the officer request translation services, if needed?	60%	3	2	No	108	113	108 NA (LEP not involved)
20	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Required to Exit Vehicle	Did an officer require this subject to exit a vehicle? (Informational Only)		15	37		61	113	61 - NA (No Vehicle involved) Note(1 was erroneously marked as not required to exit on FIC)
21	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Vehicle Exit Justification Documented	If you chose yes for "Required to Exit Vehicle", did an officer document the justification to require this subject to exit the vehicle in the FIC?	93%	13	1	No	99	113	1 - No (FIC erroneously stated no vehicle exit occurred); 1-NA (No FIC required).
22	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Vehicle Exit Justification Compliant	If you chose yes for Vehicle Exit Justification Documented, is the justification specific to this subject, and/or was a legal vehicle search conducted requiring all occupants to exit the vehicle?	100%	13	0	Yes	100	113	37 - NA (No vehicle exit); 61 - NA (No vehicle involved); 1 NA (No justification given because erroneously stated no vehicle exit); 1-NA (No FIC required).
23	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Vehicle Exit Justification Category	If this subject was required to exit a vehicle, pick the option below that best describes the justification: (Informational Only)		Driver arrested or not allowed to drive (9)	Subject suspected of an arrestable offense (1)	Vehicle Searched (1)		0	None
16	CD 189/CD125/183	Subject	Arrest Immigration Status	The subject was NOT arrested due to or in part due to the subject's immigration status?	100%	63	0	Yes	50	113	45 NA (Not arrested); 5 NA (No or incomplete video)
17	CD 183/CD125/183	Subject	Questioned Immigration Status	The subject WAS NOT questioned about their immigration status in a manner that was not relevant to the crime in question?	100%	107	0	Yes	6	113	6 NA (No video/incomplete video)
18	CD 185/cd125	Subject	Officer Comment LGBTQ	The officer DID NOT say something that is possibly offensive about/to LGBTQ individuals?	100%	107	0	Yes	6	113	6 NA (No video/incomplete video)
19	CD 185/Cd125	Subject	Officer Address LGBTQ	Did the officer address the subject by their chosen name, title, and pronoun?	100%	107	0	Yes	6	113	6 NA (No video/incomplete video)
STOPS, SEARCHES, ARRESTS & PROCEDURAL JUSTICE OVERALL COMPLIANCE SCORE					96%	2451	99		1963	4513	

SSA – Consent to Search Audit Summary Table

Consent to Search: Stops Searches and Arrests Sample - June, 2025

Audit Form #	CD #/Chapter	Form	Field Name	Field Text	Score	Y	N	Compliance Threshold Met (>=95%)	NA	Total Reviewed	NA Comments
2	CD 126, 149, 150	Incident	FIC Exists If Required	If required, does an FIC exist for this stop?	93%	13	1	No	2	16	2 NA (FIC Not Required)
3	CD 150	Incident	FIC Submitted By ETOD	Did the officer submit the FIC to his/her supervisor by the end of the shift?	85%	11	2	No	3	16	2 NA (FIC Not Required); 1 NA (FIC required but doesn't exist)
4	CD 150	Incident	FIC Reviewed in 72Hrs	Did the supervisor review the FIC within 72 hours?	75%	9	3	No	4	16	2 NA (FIC Not Required); 1 NA (FIC required but doesn't exist); 1 NA (FIC reviewed in 72 hours)
5	CD 123, 136, 145	Incident	No Boilerplate	In the reports, did the officer(s) use specific descriptive language when articulating reasonable suspicion and/or probable cause for any stop, detention, search, or arrest?	100%	16	0	Yes	0	16	None
6	CD 123	Incident	Videos and Reports Are Consistent	Are the video(s) and reports significantly consistent?	94%	15	1	No	0	16	None
7	Ch 1.9 p27-29	Incident	Arrest in Residence Circumstances	If yes [video or reports show the officer entered a residence to make the arrest], which of the following apply? Options: (Consent, Exigent Circumstances, Warrant, None of the above (Not Compliant))		0	0	Yes	16	16	11 NA (No Arrests took place); 5 NA (Arrest NOT in a residence.)
8C (8A,8B)	CD 133, 143	Incident	Video Shows Supervisor Made Scene	If the supervisor is required to make scene, does video show the supervisor made the scene?	100%	1	0	Yes	15	16	11 NA (No Arrests took place); 3 NA (Outstanding warrant); 1 NA
10, 11	CD 80, Ch 1,3	Incident	Use of Force Reported	If Force Observed, is there a corresponding Blue Team Report? (No could indicate it is unreported) 11. Provide Video Documentation.		0	0	Yes	16	16	16 NA (No force observed or documented)
13	CD 132, 133, 134	Incident	Strip Cavity Search Documented	If Strip/Cavity search is observed, is the strip or cavity search documented in the FIC or EPR?		0	0	Yes	16	16	16 NA (No Strip or Cavity searches occurred)
15	CD 131, 149	Incident	Consent to Search Documented	If Consent to Search observed, it is documented in the FIC or EPR?	67%	2	1	No	13	16	13 were not Consent to Search; FIC's were mis-stated.
16	CD 150	Incident	Evidence Documented	If evidence was seized, is there a CE+P receipt?	100%	2	0	Yes	14	16	14 NA (No evidence was seized)
17	CD 150	Incident	Evidence Submitted Immediately	If evidence was seized, was it submitted to CE+P before next Code 1 call or ETOD, whichever is first?	100%	2	0	Yes	14	16	14 NA (No evidence was seized)
18	CD 123, 149, 150	Incident	Evidence Description Matches Video	If evidence was seized, and there is a CE+P receipt, does the description on the receipt match the evidence as seen on video?	100%	2	0	Yes	14	16	14 NA (No evidence was seized)
27	CD 181	Incident	Reasonably Courteous	Does video show the officer was reasonably professional and courteous when interacting with the subject or other civilians during the stop?	100%	16	0	Yes	0	16	None
28	CD 181	Incident	Identified	If reasonably possible, does video show the officer verbally identify him/herself as a soon a practical?	100%	16	0	Yes	0	16	None
29	CD 181	Incident	Explained	If reasonably possible, does video show the officer explain the reason for the stop/interaction as soon as practical?	100%	16	0	Yes	0	16	None
30	Ch 41.13 P9E	Incident	Subject Could Explain	Does video show the officer allowed the subject an opportunity to explain his/her situation, ask questions, or voice concerns?	100%	16	0	Yes	0	16	None
31	Ch 41.13 P9E	Incident	Responded to Subjects Qs	If the subject was allowed to ask questions, and if the subject had reasonable questions or concerns, does video show the officer respond to them?	100%	15	0	Yes	1	16	1 NA (Subject had no questions.)
32	Ch 1.2.4.1 P18	Incident	Conclusion	Does video show the officer communicate the result of the stop/interaction to the subject (arrest, ticket, etc.)?	100%	16	0	Yes	0	16	None
33	139, 181	Incident	Stop No Longer than Necessary	Does video show the stop was no longer than necessary to take appropriate action?	100%	16	0	Yes	0	16	None
36	Ch 41.3.10 P11	Incident	Complete Vid (Numerator) and Complete Vid (Denominator)	Did each officer who conducted a stop, search, or arrest and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required? And did each supervisor who made the scene and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required?	97%	37	1	Yes		38	None

1A	CD 122	Subject	RS/PC to Stop	Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop this subject?	94%	16	1	No	1	18	None
2A	CD 122, 123, 126, 149, 150	Subject	RS/PC to Stop in Report	Does the report clearly articulate reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop this subject?	94%	16	1	No	1	18	None
3A	Ch. 1.3.1.1 P25	Subject	Reason for Handcuffs Documented	If the officer put the subject in handcuffs, did the officer document a reason to handcuff in the FIC?	100%	10	0	Yes	8	18	8 NA (No handcuffs deployed)
3B	Ch. 1.3.1.1	Subject	Discretionary Handcuffs Within Policy	If this subject was handcuffed, does the evidence available to you show the handcuffing was within policy?	100%	5	0	Yes	13	18	8 NA (No handcuffs deployed); 5 NA (None while investigation ongoing)
3B	Ch. 1.3.1.1	Subject	Mandatory Handcuffs Within Policy	If this subject was handcuffed, does the evidence available to you show the handcuffing was within policy?	100%	10	0	Yes	8	18	8 NA (No handcuffs deployed); Note 5 subjects released following investigation)
4	CD 149, 150, Ch. 1.2.4 P1	Subject	Search Legal Numerator and Search Legal Denominator	Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have a valid legal basis to search the subject?	100%	19	0	Yes	1	20	1 NA (No search occurred)
5	CD 123, 149	Subject	Reason to Search in Report Numerator and Reason to Search in Report Denominator	Does the "Report" sufficiently document a valid legal basis for every search of this subject?	95%	18	1	Yes	1	20	1 NA (No search occurred)
6	123, Ch 41.12 P12j	Subject	Pat Down Justification	If a pat down was correctly indicated, did the officer give specific details about the subject of the pat down that would lead a reasonable person to believe the subject was armed and dangerous in the justification for pat down text box? Informational Only. Included in Search Report QS.		3	0		15	18	15 NA (where no pat down involved.)
7 & 4	CD 130	Subject	(7) Search Subject on Probation or Parole & (4) Search Legal Numerator, and Search Legal Denominator	(7) Was this subject on parole or probation? & (4) Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have a valid legal basis to search the subject?	100%	3	0	Yes	15	18	15 NA (Not on parole/probation)
8	CD 144	Subject	Supervisor Approved Gist Prior to Booking	Was the arrest gist for this subject approved by a supervisor before the subject was booked by the sheriff?	100%	2	0	Yes	16	18	3 NA (Warrants - GIST not needed) 13 NA (No physical arrests)
9	CD 141	Subject	Officer Had PC to Arrest	Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer have probable cause to arrest this subject?	100%	7	0	Yes	11	18	11 NA (No arrest involved)
10	CD 141, 145, Ch 1.9 P14, Ch 82.1 P4, Ch 41.12 P15	Subject	PC Clearly Articulated	Did the officer clearly document the probable cause in the report (FIC or EPR)?	100%	7	0	Yes	11	18	11 NA (No arrest involved)
11		Subject	Stop Result	What was result of Stop? Multiple choice (Informational Only)	No Action Taken 10	Physical Arrest 5	Citation Issued 2	Summons Issued 0	Verbal Warning 1	18	
12		Subject	Break Given	Did the officer use their discretion to give the subject a break? (Informational Only)	No Break Given 15	0	Citation in Lieu of Arrest 2	0	No Action / Verbal Warning 1	18	
15	Ch 1.9.1	Subject	Miranda Given	Did the officer give Miranda Rights, if required? Officers shall advise suspects of their Miranda Rights at the time of arrest or prior to any custodial interrogation. See Chapter: 1.9.1; Note: Miranda does not apply to roadside questioning of a stopped motorist or a person briefly detained on the street under a Terry stop.	100%	12	0	Yes	6	18	6 NA (no miranda given and not involved in arrestable actions)
13		Subject	ID Checked	Did the officer run the subject's ID?	100%	18	0	Yes	0	18	None
14	CD 189	Subject	LEP	Did the officer request translation services, if needed?	NA	0	0	Yes	18	18	18 NA (Translation not needed)
20	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Required to Exit Vehicle	Did an officer require this subject to exit a vehicle? (Informational Only)	100%	4	0		14	18	14 NA (Not a vehicle occupant)
21	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Vehicle Exit Justification Documented	If you chose yes for "Required to Exit Vehicle", did an officer document the justification to require this subject to exit the vehicle in the FIC?	100%	4	0	Yes	14	18	14 NA (Not a vehicle occupant)
22	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Vehicle Exit Justification Compliant	If you chose yes for Vehicle Exit Justification Documented, is the justification specific to this subject, and/or was a legal vehicle search conducted requiring all occupants to exit the vehicle?	100%	4	0	Yes	14	18	14 NA (Not a vehicle occupant)
23	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Vehicle Exit Justification Category	If this subject was required to exit a vehicle, pick the option below that best describes the justification: (Informational Only)	Subject suspected of an arrestable offense (0)	Driver arrested or not allowed to drive (1)	Subject suspected of an arrestable offense (2)	Other (1)		4	
16	CD 189	Subject	Arrest Immigration Status	Was the subject arrested irrelevant to the subject's immigration status?	100%	5	0	Yes	13	18	13 NA (Not arrested)
17	CD 183	Subject	Questioned Immigration Status	Was the subject questioned about their immigration status in a manner that was not relevant to the crime in question?	100%	18	0	Yes	0	18	None
18	CD 185	Subject	Officer Comment LGBTQ	Did the officer say something that is possibly offensive about/to LGBTQ individuals?	100%	18	0	Yes	0	18	None
19	CD 185	Subject	Officer Address LGBTQ	Did the officer address the subject by their chosen name, title, and pronoun?	100%	18	0	Yes	0	18	None
CONSENT TO SEARCH: STOPS, SEARCHES, ARRESTS OVERALL COMPLIANCE SCORE					97%	431	12		279	722	

Consent to Search Audit Summary Table

Consent to Search Audit Table - June, 2025											
Audit Form #	CD #	Form	Field Name	Field Text	Score	Y	N	Compliance Threshold Met (>=95%)	NA	Total Reviewed	NA Comments
1	128	Incident	FIC Checked Accurately	1. In the FIC, did the officer accurately check the appropriate boxes to indicate a consent to search occurred? If a consent to search did not occur choose "No - Consent to Search Did Not Occur." If a consent to search occurred but the FIC was not completed correctly choose "No - Consent to Search Occurred, FIC Not Accurate." If a consent to search occurred but an FIC does not exist for the incident choose "No - Consent to Search Occurred, No FIC." NOPD FIC Policy Chapter 41.12 2(e) states that all searches conducted without a warrant, with some exceptions, requires an FIC be completed.	0%	0	16	No	0	16	
2	128	Consent to Search	Supervisor Notified Before Search Conducted	2. If a consent to search occurred, does video show the officer notified a supervisor before he/she conducted a search based on consent? Please provide timestamp of the video.	50%	2	2	No	12	16	
3	128	Consent to Search	Supervisor Approved Before Search Conducted	3. If a consent to search occurred, does video show the supervisor approved the consent to search before the search was conducted? Please provide timestamp of the video.	40%	2	3	No	11	16	
4	129	Consent to Search	Officer Informed Subject of His or Her Rights	4. If a consent to search occurred, does video show the officer informing the subject of his or her right to refuse and to revoke consent at any time?	60%	3	2	No	11	16	
5	129	Consent to Search	Form 146 Exists	5. If a consent to search occurred, does a Form 146 exist for the consent to search?	20%	1	4	No	11	16	
6	131	Consent to Search	Subject Signed Form 146	6. If a consent to search occurred, does form 146 include the signature of the person granting consent?	50%	1	1	No	14	16	
7	131	Consent to Search	Officer Signed Form 146	7. If a consent to search occurred, does form 146 include the signature of the officer requesting consent?	50%	1	1	No	14	16	
CONSENT TO SEARCH COMPLIANCE SCORE					26%	10	29		73	112	

SSA – Strip & Cavity Search Audit Summary Table

No scorecard this audit report as no strip or cavity search occurred during the audit period.

Strip & Cavity Search Audit Summary Table

No scorecard this audit report as no strip or cavity search occurred during the audit period.

SSA – Probation & Parole Audit Summary Table

Probation and Parole: Stops Searches and Arrests Sample - June, 2025											
Audit Form #	CD #/Chapter	Form	Field Name	Field Text	Score	Y	N	Compliance Threshold Met (≥95%)	NA	Total Reviewed	NA Comments
2	CD 126, 149, 150	Incident	FIC Exists If Required	If required, does an FIC exist for this stop?	100%	20	0	Yes	0	20	
3	CD 150	Incident	FIC Submitted By ETOD	Did the officer submit the FIC to his/her supervisor by the end of the shift?	60%	12	8	No	0	20	
4	CD 150	Incident	FIC Reviewed in 72Hrs	Did the supervisor review the FIC within 72 hours?	63%	12	7	No	1	20	1 NA (Kicked Back to Officer)
5	CD 123, 136, 145,	Incident	No Boilerplate	In the reports, did the officer(s) use specific descriptive language when articulating reasonable suspicion and/or probable cause for any stop, detention, search, or arrest?	100%	20	0	Yes	0	20	None
6	CD 123	Incident	Videos and Reports Are Consistent	Are the video(s) and reports significantly consistent?	90%	18	2	No	0	20	
7	Ch 1.9 p27-29	Incident	Arrest in Residence Circumstances	If yes [video or reports show the officer entered a residence to make the arrest], which of the following apply? Options: (Consent, Exigent Circumstances, Warrant, None of the above (Not Compliant))	100%	1	0	Yes	19	20	9 NA no arrests or none in residence.
8C (8A,8B)	CD 133, 143	Incident	Video Shows Supv Made Scene	If the supervisor is required to make scene, does video show the supervisor made the scene?	100%	7	0	Yes	13	20	7 NA incidents which did not require Supervision on scene.
9	CD 80, Ch 1.3	Incident	Use of Force Observed	Did any officer use reportable force during this officer-civilian interaction? (Informational Only)		1	19		0	20	
10, 11	CD 80, Ch 1.3	Incident	Use of Force Reported	If Force Observed, Is there a corresponding Blue Team Report? (No could indicate it is unreported) 11. Provide Video Documentation.	100%	1	0	Yes	19	20	19 NA (no force observed)
12	CD 132, 133, 134	Incident	Strip Cavity Search Occurred	Does the incident involve a strip or cavity search? (Informational Only)		0	20		0	20	
13	CD 132, 133, 134	Incident	Strip Cavity Search Documented	If Strip/Cavity search is observed(yes), is the strip or cavity search documented in the FIC or EPR?		0	0	Yes	20	20	20 NA (No strip/cavity occurred)
14	CD 131, 149	Incident	Consent to Search Occurred	Does the incident involve a consent to search search? (Informational Only)		0	20		0	20	
15	CD 131, 149	Incident	Consent to Search Documented	If yes, is the consent to search documented in the FIC or EPR?		0	0	Yes	20	20	20 NA (No Cts occurred)
16	CD 150	Incident	Evidence Documented	If evidence was seized, is there a CE+P receipt?	67%	4	2	No	14	20	15 NA (no evidence seized)
17	CD 150	Incident	Evidence Submitted Immediately	If evidence was seized, was it submitted to CE+P before next Code1 call or ETOD, whichever is first?	67%	4	2	No	14	20	14 NA (no evidence seized)
18	CD 123, 149, 150	Incident	Evidence Description Matches Video	If evidence was seized, and there is a CE+P receipt, does the description on the receipt match the evidence as seen on video?	100%	4	0	Yes	16	20	14 NA (no evidence seized); 2 NA (no EPR attachment)
27	CD 181	Incident	Reasonably Courteous	Does video show the officer was reasonably professional and courteous when interacting with the subject or other civilians during the stop?	100%	20	0	Yes	0	20	
28	CD 181	Incident	Identified	If reasonably possible, does video show the officer verbally identify him/herself as a soon a practical?	95%	19	1	Yes	0	20	
29	CD 181	Incident	Explained	If reasonably possible, does video show the officer explain the reason for the stop/interaction as soon as practical?	100%	20	0	Yes	0	20	
30	Ch 41.13 P9E	Incident	Subject Could Explain	Does video show the officer allowed the subject an opportunity to explain his/her situation, ask questions, or voice concerns?	100%	20	0	Yes	0	20	
31	Ch 41.13 P9E	Incident	Responded to Subjects Qs	If the subject was allowed to ask questions, and if the subject had reasonable questions or concerns, does video show the officer respond to them?	100%	16	0	Yes	4	20	4 NA no questions asked
32	Ch 1.2.4.1 P18	Incident	Conclusion	Does video show the officer communicate the result of the stop/interaction to the subject (arrest, ticket, etc.)?	100%	20	0	Yes	0	20	
33	139, 181	Incident	Stop No Longer than Necessary	Does video show the stop was no longer than necessary to take appropriate action?	100%	20	0	Yes	0	20	
36	Ch 41.3.10 P11	Incident	Complete Vid Num and Complete Vid Denom	Did each officer who conducted a stop, search, or arrest and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required? And did each supervisor who made the scene and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required?	92%	55	5	No		60	

1A	CD 122	Subject	RS/PC to Stop	Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop this subject?	100%	21	0	Yes	0	21	
2A	CD 122, 123, 126, 149, 150	Subject	RS/PC to Stop in Report	Does the report clearly articulate reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop this subject?	100%	21	0	Yes	0	21	
3A	Ch. 1.3.1.1 P25	Subject	Reason for Handcuffs Documented	If the officer put the subject in handcuffs, did the officer document a reason to handcuff in the FIC?	100%	21	0	Yes	0	21	
3B	Ch. 1.3.1.1	Subject	Discretionary Handcuffs Within Policy	If this subject was handcuffed, does the evidence available to you show the handcuffing was within policy?	100%	12	0	Yes	9	21	9 NA (Discretionary handcuffing not applied)
3B	Ch. 1.3.1.1	Subject	Mandatory Handcuffs Within Policy	If this subject was handcuffed, does the evidence available to you show the handcuffing was within policy?	100%	19	0	Yes	2	21	2 NA (No Mandatory handcuffing applied)
4	CD 149, 150, Ch. 1.2.4 P1	Subject	Search Legal Numerator and Search Legal Denominator	Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have a valid legal basis to search the subject?	97%	28	1	Yes	2	31	2 NA (No Search conducted)
5	CD 123, 149	Subject	Reason to Search in Report Numerator and Reason to Search in Report Denominator	Does the "Report" sufficiently document a valid legal basis for every search of this subject?	97%	28	1	Yes	2	31	2 NA (No Search conducted)
6	123, Ch 41.12 P12j	Subject	Pat Down Justification	If a pat down was correctly indicated, did the officer give specific details about the subject of the pat down that would lead a reasonable person to believe the subject was armed and dangerous in the justification for pat down text box? Informational Only. Included in Search Report Q5.		6	1		14	21	14 NA (No patdown involved)
7 & 4	CD 130	Subject	(7) Search Subject on Probation or Parole & (4) Search Legal Numerator, and Search Legal Denominator	(7) Was this subject on parole or probation? & (4) Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have a valid legal basis to search the subject?	95%	19	1	Yes	1	21	1 NA (No P&P subject involved)
8	CD 144	Subject	Supervisor Approved Gist Prior to Booking	Was the arrest gist for this subject approved by a supervisor before the subject was booked by the sheriff?	100%	7	0	Yes	14	21	NA (Existing Warrant/GIST not required); 14 NA (No Physical Arrest, i.e. Not taken to CLU)
9	CD 141	Subject	Officer Had PC to Arrest	Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer have probable cause to arrest this subject?	100%	14	0	Yes	7	21	7 NA (No Physical Arrest, i.e. Not taken to CLU)
10	CD 141, 145, Ch 1.9 P14, Ch 82.1 P4, Ch 41.12 P15	Subject	PC Clearly Articulated	Did the officer clearly document the probable cause in the report (FIC or EPR)?	100%	14	0	Yes	7	21	7 NA (No Physical Arrest, i.e. Not taken to CLU)
11		Subject	Stop Result	What was result of Stop? Multiple choice (Informational Only)	No Action Taken 6	Physical Arrest 14	Citation Issued 1	Summons Issued 0	Verbal Warning 1	0	Note: One incident had both Arrest and Citation given.
12		Subject	Break Given	Did the officer use their discretion to give the subject a break? (Informational Only)		2	14		5	21	5 NA - No Crime
15	Ch 1.9.1	Subject	Miranda Given	Did the officer give Miranda Rights, if required? Officers shall advise suspects of their Miranda Rights at the time of arrest or prior to any custodial interrogation. See Chapter: 1.9.1; Note: Miranda does not apply to roadside questioning of a stopped motorist or a person briefly detained on the street under a Terry stop.	93%	14	1	No	6	21	6 NA (Miranda not required)
13		Subject	ID Checked	Did the officer run the subject's ID?	100%	21	0	Yes	0	21	
14	CD 189	Subject	LEP	Did the officer request translation services, if needed?	100%	1	0	Yes	20	21	20 NA (LEP not involved)
20	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Required to Exit Vehicle	Did an officer require this subject to exit a vehicle? (Informational Only)		2	1		18	21	18 - NA (No Vehicle involved)
21	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Vehicle Exit Justification Documented	If you chose yes for "Required to Exit Vehicle", did an officer document the justification to require this subject to exit the vehicle in the FIC?	100%	2	0	Yes	19	21	18 - NA (No Vehicle involved) ; 1 not required to exit
22	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Vehicle Exit Justification Compliant	If you chose yes for Vehicle Exit Justification Documented, is the justification specific to this subject, and/or was a legal vehicle search conducted requiring all occupants to exit the vehicle?	100%	2	0	Yes	19	21	18 - NA (No Vehicle involved) ; 1 not required to exit
23	CD 149 (h) Ch 1.2.4.3 P19, Ch 41.12 P12(f)	Subject	Vehicle Exit Justification Category	If this subject was required to exit a vehicle, pick the option below that best describes the justification: (Informational Only)		Driver arrested or not allowed to drive (1)	Subject suspected of an arrestable offense (1)	Vehicle Searched (0)		0	None
16	CD 189/CD125/183	Subject	Arrest Immigration Status	The subject was NOT arrested due to or in part due to the subject's immigration status?	100%	14	0	Yes	7	21	7 NA no arrest
17	CD 183/CD125/183	Subject	Questioned Immigration Status	The subject WAS NOT questioned about their immigration status in a manner that was not relevant to the crime in question?	100%	21	0	Yes	0	21	
18	CD 185/cd125	Subject	Officer Comment LGBTQ	The officer DID NOT say something that is possibly offensive about/to LGBTQ individuals?	100%	21	0	Yes	0	21	
19	CD 185/Cd125	Subject	Officer Address LGBTQ	Did the officer address the subject by their chosen name, title, and pronoun?	100%	21	0	Yes	0	21	
PROBATION & PAROLE: STOPS, SEARCHES, ARRESTS & PROCEDURAL JUSTICE COMPLIANCE SCORE					94%	618	39		263	920	

Conclusion (Final)

Results

The results of this audit were verified through two processes:

1. Double-blind auditor peer review
2. Audit supervisor review

In the double-blind auditor peer review, two auditors independently assessed each incident and completed the initial SSA Incident and Subject form entries. The two auditors then discussed and resolved any discrepancies between the two sets of results. Any discrepancy that cannot be resolved was escalated to their supervisor who then resolved the discrepancy, and who may have also drawn on the expertise of others, including but not limited to the PSAB Deputy Superintendent, the PSAB Captain, other PSAB Innovation Managers, members of the Education and Training Division, members of the District Attorney's office, members of the Office of the Consent Decree Monitor, and members of the Department of Justice.

During the Audit Supervisor review, the Innovation Manager reviewed the resolved audit results for accuracy and completeness. Any issues were sent back to auditors for corrections, and the interaction is documented on the audit forms.

The following deviations from compliance were identified in the overall SSA audit results:

The FIC reviewed within 72 hours scored **83%**. The previous score was 91%.

Videos and reports consistent metric scored 78 of 89 (**88%**). The previous score was 96%. The discrepancies involve minor errors, such as typographical errors. Examples include incomplete or inadequate documentation.

If reasonably possible, officers should identify him/herself as soon as practical during an interaction. Auditors review if video shows that the officer verbally identified him/herself. This category was scored **90%**. The previous audit score was 94%.

"Vehicle Exit Justification Documented" determines if the officer properly documented the reason, they requested a subject to exit a vehicle during a stop. This metric was added to the previous audit review. The score for the category scored **93%**. The category was previously scored 100%.

With the ongoing FOB "Corrective Action Plan" currently being implemented, only material policy deficiencies identified in the review process were forwarded to the PSAB Captain via the "Notify PSS" protocol for follow-up, redirection, or disciplinary action if needed.

All auditing deficiencies identified in the review process were documented in the PSAB reports and scorecards and sent directly to the various Districts for review and action if needed. Note the

Districts which responded back to PSAB with their follow-up actions and re-evaluations.

Recommendations

1. Continue to work with Academy and the Field Operations Bureau to provide additional training on:
 - a. FIC/EPR documentation and timely submission and review by supervisors
 - b. BWC activation and de-activation
 - c. Search/Pat Down
2. Continue to work with Policy Standards Section to develop appropriate training, to include DTB's to address deficiencies.
3. Update FOB inspections to focus on challenges and reduce burdens on field supervisors regarding review of high performing areas.
4. Continue PSAB centralized FIC review of all incidents to improve FIC documentation and allow for early identification of trends.
5. Continue to work with Academy and its Instructors to ensure Consent to search issues are addressed in annual training for both supervisors and officers.

Supervisor Reevaluation Requests and PSAB Responses

SOD Review and Request

1. Case F-19296-24

Summary of Findings:

- Incident Detail: The officer inadvertently recorded that the subject did not exit his vehicle, even though, per the BWC (body-worn camera) footage at the end, the officer had indeed asked the subject to exit the vehicle for a Field Sobriety Test.
- **Human Error: The lieutenant missed this discrepancy during review.**
- FIC (Field Incident Report): Although the FIC was initially submitted late, the lieutenant conveyed the issue to the traffic rank. Importantly, the FIC was eventually approved within the required 72-hour policy deadline.

PSAB Response

- No action required

2. Case F-12209-24

Summary of Findings:

- Incident Detail: During the stop on four individuals on Thalia Street:
 - Officers observed behavior suggesting one subject was concealing a firearm.
 - When officers exited their vehicle, the subject suspected of carrying the firearm fled.
 - the suspect eventually discarded the handgun during the apprehension process.
- Apprehension & Detention: The two officers engaged in a pursuit, led to the subject's apprehension and recovery of the firearm. However, the three other individuals detained (standing near a white vehicle with the armed subject) were not handcuffed.
- Legal Justification: The detention of the three individuals was deemed legally acceptable as they provided identification, and the officers did not require probable cause to hold them during the investigation.
- Timeliness of FICs: The Field Interview Cards were completed without noted deficiencies.

Observations:

- Operational Effectiveness: The incident demonstrates that the officers responded appropriately by pursuing a fleeing suspect and securing a dangerous weapon quickly.
- Detention: The decision not to handcuff the additional subjects appears to be based on an evaluation of their non-threatening behavior and cooperation in providing identification.

PSAB Response

- No action required

3. Case I-30516-24

Summary of Findings:

- Incident Detail: A review of the body-worn camera footage (BWC) and the corresponding FIC revealed that:
 - the video and report were consistent.
 - There was no discrepancy found between the observable actions and the documented report.
- Technical Issue: The rank noted an issue with the Excel spreadsheet used for auditing, which prevented scrolling

to read the entire auditor's comment.

PSAB Response

- Videos and Reports are Consistent: No. Officer failed to document that a child was in rear of the vehicle. Officer failed to document that Subject was read his Miranda Rights. No change to case.

4. Case A-13349-25

Summary of Findings:

- Incident Detail: The review of the BWC footage and the FICs initially showed no observable inconsistencies.
- Auditor Comment: Despite the visual and narrative consistency, the auditor noted that the female subject, who was stopped, appeared to look younger than what her date of birth on the FIC would suggest.
- Verification Process: The officer had copied the date of birth directly from the driver's license, which poses a potential discrepancy when there's a noticeable mismatch with the subject's appearance.

PSAB Response

- Videos and Reports are Consistent: No. It is apparent from video that the subject was not in their seventies as based on the information from the license. No change to case.

5. Case G-22943-24

Summary of Findings:

- SPO Danatus King Failed to introduce himself on a Traffic Stop
- Documented in SFL 2025-030383

PSAB Response

- No action required

6. Case F-1580-25

Summary of Findings:

- Failed to Submit by ETOD
- Documented in SFL 2025-020300

7. Case K-24901-24

- The officer failed to submit FIC by ETOD
- The officer was counselled by his supervisor and advised he must submit FIC by ETOD

PSAB Response

- No action required

3rd District Review and Request

1. Case F-15277-24: Consent to Search Scorecard

Summary of Findings:

- The Third District is requesting a review of Item F-15277-24 (EPR ID 1205759). The Third District received 0% for "FIC Checked Accurately" stating there was no FIC in the RawData. Item F-15277-24 was dispatched as a Call for

Service. The Item was documented as an EPR and the Consent to Search Form was an attachment. It was a call for service and the Consent to Search was documented in an EPR; therefore, an FIC was not needed.

PSAB Response

- No action taken as an FIC is required when conducting a search without a warrant. The investigating officer of the primary unit on the scene **shall document the following occurrences in Departmental FIC whether a report, citation or summons is completed (Field Interviews 41.12 paragraph 2):**

(e) Any pat-down or **search conducted without a search warrant**, except documented searches incident to arrest and administrative/inventory searches

6th District Review and Request

1. Case Incidents Table: SSA Scorecard (FIC 72HRs)

Summary of Findings:

- On Tuesday, July 22, 2025, Sixth District DSA Sgt. reviewed the SSA audit scorecards for the Sixth District. In the Overall excel file, under the SSA Scorecard-Incidents "FIC Approved in 72 Hrs." category, the Sixth District received 80%. Under the Incidents Table tab, Sgt. Lewis discovered that all eight items listed had either a "Yes", "NA-FIC Kicked Back", or "NA-No FIC" listed under the "FIC Approved in 72 Hrs.". There were no highlighted areas nor any items that were listed as non-compliant for this section. Also, under the "Incidents" tab towards the end, where all non-compliance is listed for all categories, the only item number flagged for the 72hrs is H-25525-24. That item is listed as "NA-FIC Kicked Back" in the "Incidents Table" tab. Due to this new information, the Sixth District respectfully request our score be reevaluated.

PSAB Response

- FIC Approved in 72 Hrs.: H-25515-14 is listed as "No", not "NA". **The current score is correct and no change to case will be made.** See graph below:

Item Number	FIC ID	FIC Exists If Req	No Boilerplate	FIC Submitted By ETOD	FIC Approved in 72Hrs
C-02557-25	664579	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
H-25525-24	650346	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
A-20982-25	662215	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
J-16565-24	654419	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
A-08392-25		NA - FIC not req	Yes	NA - No FIC	NA - No FIC
E-08995-24		NA - FIC not req	Yes	NA - No FIC	NA - No FIC
G-24998-24	647747	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
I-07224-24		NA - FIC not req	Yes	NA - No FIC	NA - No FIC
Grand Total					

2. Case G-24998-24: SSA Scorecard (Incidents)

Summary of Findings:

- On Tuesday, July 22, 2025, Sixth District DSA Sgt. reviewed the SSA audit scorecards for the Sixth District. In the Overall excel file, under the SSA Scorecard-Incidents "Videos and Reports Are Consistent" category, the Sixth District received 75%. Under the Incidents Table tab, Sgt. discovered that item G-24998-24 was flagged. In the auditor’s explanation, they stated that the officer stated at 14:25mm he was going to perform a pat-down. Sgt. reviewed the BWC and observed that the officer never said that. Sgt. did observe that supporting officer did state at 14:27mm that they were going to search the subject. There was no mention of a pat down. The subject was also under arrest. The officer had already reviewed the previous EPR reports that alluded to the active

wanted status of the subject and another officer on scene confirmed that he had placed a warrant out for the same subject. This was all before the subject was handcuffed and searched. Due to this new information, the Sixth District respectfully request our score be reevaluated.

PSAB Response

- Videos and Reports Are Consistent: The FIC erroneously states that a pat-down was down. PSAB agrees with DSA above that a search was done on BWC, not a pat-down. Hence the FIC was inconsistent with the BWC. **The current score is correct and no change to case will be made.** See FIC below:

OFFICER INFO						
Event Date:*	Time:*	Location:*	District:*	Zone:*	Duration Of Stop:*	
7/26/2024	14:50	2100 BLOCK S CLAIBORNE	6	J	15	min
Officer 1:*	Agency:*	Badge #:*	Employee ID#:*	Agency ID#:		
MALI M CHESTER	NOPD	921	034464			
Officer 2:	Agency:	Badge #:	Employee ID#:	Agency ID#:		
	NOPD					
Event Type:*	No Car	Car #:*	Assignment:*	Item No.:*		
SUSPECT PERSON	<input type="checkbox"/>	613	6th District	G-24998-24		
Was a Pat-Down performed on subject? *						
(See Chapter 1.2.4 Search and Seizure for the definition and requirements)						
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No						
Justification for Pat Down: *						
SUBJECT WAS DETAINED DURING THE INVESTIGATION AND PAT-DOWN TO ENSURE THAT HE WAS UNARMED.						

3. Case G-19909-24: SSA Scorecard (Incidents – Consent to Search)

Summary of Findings:

- On Tuesday, July 22, 2025, Sixth District DSA Sgt., reviewed the SSA audit scorecards for the Sixth District. In the Consent to Search excel file, under the SSA Scorecard-Incidents, the "FIC Submitted By ETOD" and "FIC approved in 72Hrs" categories, the Sixth District received 50%. After reviewing the Incident Table tab, it was discovered that item G-19909-24 was authored by a detective. The detective is assigned to the 2nd District and has never worked in the 6th.

PSAB Response

- FIC Submitted by ETOD: The FIC states that the incident occurred in the 6th District and the officers who responded are from the 2nd District. PSAB agrees with DSA above that the incident is not a 6th District one. **The current score is incorrect and will be changed to reflect the revised district.**

4. Case A-22776-25: Consent to Search Scorecard

Summary of Findings:

- On Tuesday, July 22, 2025, Sixth District DSA Sgt reviewed the SSA audit scorecards for the Sixth District. Item

A-22776-25 involved three officers. All three officers are assigned to the 2nd District and not the 6th. This means two of the four items used were for the wrong District. Therefore, our score for "Form 146 Exists" is incorrect. Due to this new information, the Sixth District respectfully request our score be reevaluated.

PSAB Response

- FIC checked accurately and "Form 146 Exists: The FIC states that the incident occurred in the 6th District and the officers who responded are from the 2nd District. PSAB agrees with DSA above that the incident is not a 6th District one. **The current score is incorrect and will be changed to reflect the revised district.**

5. Case K-01853-24: SSA Stops Scorecard – Subjects (Consent to Search)

Summary of Findings:

- On Tuesday, July 22, 2025, Sixth District DSA Sgt. reviewed the SSA audit scorecards for the Sixth District. In the Consent to Search excel file, under the Stops Scorecard-Subjects, the "RS/PC to Stop" and "RS/PC to Stop in Report" categories, the Sixth District received 80%. After reviewing in the Stops Table tab, it was discovered that item K-01853-24 was a medical call for service. The officer took heroic action by transporting a bleeding civilian to the hospital when no EMS units were available. The officer was flagged down and did not conduct a stop. The officer completed an FIC since the civilian was transported in an NOPD unit. There was an error with form 146, but that is a different category. Due to this new information, the Sixth District respectfully request our score be reevaluated.

PSAB Response

- RS/PC to Stop and RS/PC to Stop in Report: This was a medical situation, but an FIC was still completed as required and subject was not suspected of a crime. **The current score is incorrect and will be changed to NA from No.**

6. Case A-22689-25: Probation & Parole: SSA-Incidents

Summary of Findings:

- On Tuesday, July 22, 2025, Sixth District DSA Sgt. reviewed the SSA audit scorecards for the Sixth District. In the Probation and Parole excel file, under the "P&P: SSA-Incidents" tab, the 6th District received a 63% for "FIC submitted by ETOD". It was discovered in the Incidents Table that one of the three flagged items, A-22689-25, was for an officer of the 2nd District. The FIC was eventually approved by 2nd District Lieutenant. Due to this new information, the Sixth District respectfully request our score be reevaluated.

PSAB Response

- FIC submitted by ETOD: Officer was assigned to the 2nd District, but FIC was still completed in the 6th District. **The current score is incorrect and will be changed to reflect the revised district.**

7. Case A-22689-25: Probation & Parole: SSA-Evidence

Summary of Findings:

- On Tuesday, July 22, 2025, Sixth District DSA Sgt reviewed the SSA audit scorecards for the Sixth District. In the Probation and Parole excel file, under the "P&P: SSA-Evidence" tab, the 6th District received a 75% for "Evidence Documented" and "Evidence Submitted Immediately". It was discovered in the Incident tab that only flagged item for both categories was A-22689-25. This was for an officer of the 2nd District, not the 6th District. Due to this new information, the Sixth District respectfully request our score be reevaluated.

PSAB Response

- Evidence Documented and Evidence Submitted Immediately: Officer was assigned to the 2nd District, but FIC was still completed in the 6th District. **The current score is incorrect and will be changed to reflect the revised district.**

8. Case A-12933-25: Probation & Parole: Searches Scorecard-Subjects

Summary of Findings:

- On Tuesday, July 22, 2025, Sixth District DSA Sgt. reviewed the SSA audit scorecards for the Sixth District. In the Probation and Parole excel file, under the "P&P: Searches Scorecard-Subjects" tab, the 6th District received a 93% for "Officer had Valid Legal Basis to Search Subject" and "Officer Adequately Documented Legal Basis to Search". It was discovered in the Incident tab that item A-12933-25 was flagged because of a pat-down. After reviewing the BWC from two officers on scene, it was determined that no pat down occurred. The subject was handcuffed, read his rights, given an explanation of his arrest, he was searched incident to arrest, then placed in the unit for transport. At no point did a "pat-down" occur. Due to this new information, the Sixth District respectfully request our score be reevaluated.

PSAB Response

- Officer had Valid Legal Basis to Search Subject" and "Officer Adequately Documented Legal Basis to Search. Officer completed the FIC selecting a pat down had occurred in the document. **The current score is correct, and no change will be made See FIC below.**

Was a Pat-Down performed on subject? *
(See Chapter 1.2.4 Search and Seizure for the definition and requirements)

Yes No

Justification for Pat Down: *

SUBJECT WAS PLACED UNDER ARREST/OFFICER SAFETY PAT DOWN WAS CONDUCTED

9. Case All 8 items- Miranda Given: Probation & Parole: Arrest Scorecard-Subjects

Summary of Findings:

- On Tuesday, July 22, 2025, Sixth District DSA Sgt. reviewed the SSA audit scorecards for the Sixth District. In the Probation and Parole excel file, under the "P&P: Arrests Scorecard-Subjects" tab, the 6th District received 88% for "Miranda Given, if required". It was discovered in the Arrest Table tab that all items were listed at "Yes" or "NA" in the Miranda Given, If Required column. Due to this new information, the Sixth District respectfully request our score be reevaluated.

PSAB Response

- Miranda Given. District had 7/8 which equates to 88%. **The current score is correct, and no change will be made See FIC below.**

District	6	SELECT YOUR DISTRICT HERE							
Platoon	(All)								
Sample Type	(All)								
Count of Item	Item Numbr	Subject First	Subject Last	Supervisor	Approved Gist Prior to Booking	Office/HadPctoArrest	PC Clearly Articulated	Miranda Given, If Required	Total
	L-25061-24	Wayne	Fountain	NA - Subject not Physically Arrested - Taken to CLU	NA - Subject Not Physically Arrested - Taken to CLU	NA - Not Physically Arrested - Taken to CLU	NA	NA	1
	A-22689-25	Jalen	Hamilton	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1
	C-26071-25	Warren	Jenks	NA - Existing Warrant	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1
	K-14374-24	CALVIN	ALEXANDER	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1
	A-12933-25	Lary	Cannon	NA - Existing Warrant	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1
	D-03738-25	CHARLES	RILEY	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1
	E-04430-25	Samuel	Tumbow	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1
	C-23803-25	Robert	Quinn	NA - Existing Warrant	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1
	C-23803-25	Sandra	Mire	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	1
	Grand Total								9

4th District Review and Request

1. Case I-15640-24: SSA Scorecard - Incidents

Summary of Findings:

- Officer/ Videos and Reports Are Consistent (Can some context be given on this/no notes to what was inconsistent) I looked at the video and reviewed the report.

PSAB Response

- The officer failed to mention in the report the following as was shown on BWC as noted by the auditor: “The EPR does not mention that the subject was transported to UMC hospital to treat a bee sting before being transported to central lock-up.” **The current score is correct and no change to case will be made.**

2. Case B-22375-25: SSA Scorecard - Incidents

Summary of Findings:

- Did supervisor make scene It was found that the sergeant did make the scene however his BWC did not activate while on scene. See attached. A SFL was entered for the sergeant's failure to activate his camera. However, he can be seen on all officers' video footage. SFL202501482.

PSAB Response

- The supervisor in this instance (warrant arrest) was not required to make the scene. However, it is confirmed that the supervisor did show up on scene. As far as the scoring goes, the 4th District Incidents improved to 96% from 92.0%. **The score is adjusted from No to NA, to show supervisor not required to make scene.** See Below

SSA Scorecard - Incidents Review Period: June 2025
Compliance percentages for Consent Decree requirements for stops, searches and arrests

District	# of Incidents	FIC Exists, If	FIC Submitted By	FIC Reviewed in 72 Hrs.	No Boilerplate	Videos and Reports Are Consistent	Arrested in Residence with Consent, Warrant, or Exigent Circumstances	Supervisor Made Scene, If Required	Overall
		Required	ETOD	in 72 Hrs.	Boilerplate	Consistent	Circumstances	Required	
1	8	100%	83%	50%	100%	100%	-	100%	89%
2	8	100%	80%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	97%
3	13	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	-	100%	98%
4	7	100%	100%	100%	100%	86%	100%	-	96%

3. Case B-22375-25: SSA Scorecard - Procedural Justice

Summary of Findings:

- This video was 1hour and 17 minutes from the Traffic stop (traffic arrest and warrant) to CLU. First contact was

made at 12:15am, made it to lock up from the WestBank at 1:27am. This was not long at all considering a warrant had to be verified via NCIC, ticket had to be completed, awaited back up.

PSAB Response

- There was an adjustment made during my reviews and all the PJ answers were corrected, including yours, which resulted in 100% compliance regarding the question. **The score is adjusted from No to Yes, to show stop didn't take longer than necessary.** See Below:

SSA Scorecard - Procedural Justice Review Period: June 2025
 Compliance percentages for Consent Decree requirements for stops, searches and arrests

District	# of Incidents	Officers Introduced Themselves	Officers Explained Reason for Stop	Officers Allowed Subject to Explain	Officers Responded to Subject's Reasonable Questions	Officers Communicated Result	Stop Took No Longer than Necessary	Officers Were Reasonably Courteous and Professional	Overall
1	8	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
2	8	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
3	13	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
4	7	71%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	96%

8th District Review and Request

1. Case F-15071-24: SSA Scorecard - Incidents

Summary of Findings:

- PSAB Auditor comments states: Item number: F-15071-24-Noncompliance-FIC Submitted By ETOD- Incident occurred on 6/15/2024. FIC was submitted on 6/25/2024-Are the videos and reports significantly consistent? The incident is documented under FIC Item number F-15071-24, however the EPR is documented under Item Number F-14527-24. The video for item number F-15071-24 is a separate incident. Non-compliance Evident in Approved Reports-Reports were approved with inconsistent times, dates, and item numbers. Audited by TAB
- In checking into Item F-15071-24 they have two FICs entered under the same item. One FIC from June 16th and one from June 25th. The FIC from June 25th if for item F-14527-24 and was entered under the wrong item. The audit was conducted on Item F-15071-24 which does have an FIC entered and an EPR that is consistent. The report was not approved with inconsistent dates and times as stated by the auditor. The FIC for item F-14527-24 has the incorrect item number. This item should be changed to yes

PSAB Response

- The SSAPJ Distribution had this item as a "SEARCH" category, and it picked the item with the FIC ID 645551 which is not the one entered on June 16th. This FIC was NOT consistent with the BWC as the Event Date listed on the FIC was incorrect and narrative was referencing June 16th as when the event took place. Unfortunately, while the EPR was correct, the FIC was not. The auditor's initial comments stand. **No Change will be made.**

2. Cases (C-14941-25, F-09281-24, E-00462-25, F-15071-24, G-25253-24): SSA Scorecard - Incidents

Summary of Findings:

- C-14941-25-Officer identifies himself when subjects open door 5:57min mark. Another officer introduces

himself 8:13mark. **This item should be changed to yes for identified**

- F-09281-24 Officer conducted a transport for Probations and Parole, subject was already handcuffed and in custody when he arrived. Officer Took custody of prisoner from Probation and Parole and didn't conduct the initial stop or detainment.
- E-00462-25- When the first officer with a BWC video arrives the subject is already in handcuffs. The stop was made by two plain clothes detectives who are not required to wear BWC's. The introduction wasn't made before the responding officers with BWC's arrived. **This item should be changed to yes for identified or N/A since the detectives do not have BWC.**
- F-15071-24 Officer introduces himself at the 1:27min mark right before arrested subject is advised of his Miranda Rights. The other two officers are still in the process of securing the handcuffs on the subject when this is done. **This item should be marked as yes for identified.**
- G-25253-24-FTO was training recruit and recruit didn't identify herself when approaching the vehicle and obtaining driver and vehicle information. The FTO Officer introduces himself at the 2:50min mark. **This item should be changed to yes for identified.**

PSAB Responses

- C-14941-25 was reviewed and confirmed the identification occurred as stated by the district. **PSAB Changed this to Yes.**
- E-00462-25 - Axon Body 4 Video 2025-05-02 1313 D01A59592 assigned to NOPD, SPPP10 (SPPP10) recorded on 5/2/2025 at 1:13pm at the 55 sec mark an officer makes contact. That officer is first on scene driving a cart yelled at the subject to get on ground and then detective shows up to put suspect on ground. Called in as unit 1815. Watch video of several officers showing up, and Detective identified himself at 2mm mark as scene was secured. **PSAB Changed this to Yes.**
- F-09281-24 – No attempt by officer to identify to the subject. **PSAB will leave score as No.**
- F-15071-24 (645551, EPR F-14527-24) was reviewed and officer Derek Rohr identified himself on officer Koen's BWC at the 5:10 minute mark. **PSAB Changed this to Yes.**
- G-25253-24 was reviewed and confirmed the identification occurred as stated by the district. **PSAB Changed this to Yes.**

3. Case L-02529-24: SSA Scorecard - Subjects

Summary of Findings:

Subject matched description of armed robbery suspect photo that just occurred. Subject was not physically arrested. This was Terry Stop no Miranda Required "Did the officer give Miranda Rights, if required? Officers shall advise suspects of their Miranda Rights at the time of arrest or prior to any custodial interrogation. See Chapter: 1.9.1; Note: Miranda does not apply to roadside questioning of a stopped motorist, or a person briefly detained on the street under a Terry stop." The above lines were copied from the Summary Table included with the SSA Scorecard. **This item should be changed to N/A since the video shows a terry stop was conducted and the subject wasn't arrested.**

PSAB Response

- L-02529-24 was reviewed and confirmed that no physical arrest was made. Miranda is not required. **PSAB Changed this to NA**

4. Case C-29321-25: SSA Scorecard - Subjects

Summary of Findings:

The auditor comments for RC/PC to stop No-ID'd and not a suspect and for RS/PC stop in report states no-ID'd and not a suspect. This was a dispatched call regarding a mental subject who was paranoid and delusional. The subject was transported to the hospital because he was a danger to himself and others. Below are the auditor's comments which clearly show that **this item should be changed to yes.**

PSAB Response

- C-29321-25 was reviewed and confirmed that no suspect was involved. Miranda is not required. **PSAB Changed this to Yes**

Timothy A. Lindsey

Innovation Manager, Auditing

Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau

Appendix A – SSAPJ Audit Forms

SSAPJ Audit Forms:



SSAPJ Incident Audit Form

Read Me	ID Info	1-6	7-8	9-11	12-15	16-18	19-22	23-29	Misc	Video	Review
---------	---------	-----	-----	------	-------	-------	-------	-------	------	-------	--------

1. Watch as much video as reasonably possible to ensure you have thoroughly reviewed the incident. You must watch video of all the interactions between an officer and a non-employee. You may skip through or fast forward through parts of the video that do not involve interactions with non-employees. If another officer interacts with a non-employee and you cannot see and hear the interaction in the video you are currently watching, you must watch the other officer's video, if it exists. Clearly document the video segments you watch under question 31 - Video Info of the SSA Incident form so that any reviewer knows exactly what video segments you watched and did not watch.

2. Notify your supervisor when:
- a. It appears officers rely on demographics to establish reasonable suspicion or probable cause for a stop, detention, search, or arrest.
 - b. It appears officers rely on information they know to be materially false to conduct a stop, detention, search, or arrest.
 - c. You observe policy violations that are not captured by your audit results
 - d. Officers' actions are egregious and therefore require prompt intervention

3. Do not discuss this incident with any auditor, peer, or supervisor, until you have thoroughly reviewed the incident.

4. If you do not think this incident involves a stop, search or arrest, please discuss the possible deselection with an auditor or the ARU supervisor. If you decide to deselect, close this form without saving and record the deselection in the deselection log.

Read Me	ID Info	1-6	7-8	9-11	12-15	16-18	19-22	23-29	Misc	Video	Review
---------	---------	-----	-----	------	-------	-------	-------	-------	------	-------	--------

Use?

If you do not think this incident involves a stop, search or arrest, please discuss the possible deselection with an auditor or the ARU supervisor. If you decide to deselect, close this form without saving and record the deselection in the deselection log.

Sample/Distribution Identifying Information

Field names (column names) are in grey text.

Pick your name below.	In which sample is this incident?	Enter the Item #	If an FIC exists, enter the FIC ID #	If an EPR exists, enter the EPR ID #
Created By	Sample Type	Item Number	FIC ID	EPR ID
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> Tim Lindsey Faith Thornton Charmel Peterson Betty Johnson Michael Sarver Matt Segreaves </div>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> Stop Search Arrest </div>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

What is the reporting year, month, week, district, and platoon?

Review Year	Review Month	Week	District	Platoon
2019	Jun	WK1	1	A
2020	Jul	WK2	2	B
2021	Aug	WK3	3	C
2022	Sep	WK4	4	GA
2023	Oct	WK5	5	Promenade
	Nov		6	Mounted
	Dec		8	DWI
	Jan		7	K9
	Feb		ISB	MC1 MC2
	Mar		MSB	VOWS

Known to Be Materially False

- CD 124: If you suspect an officer relied on information he or she knew to be materially false or incorrect to make a stop or detention, contact your supervisor. CD 124 reads: NOPD officers shall not use or rely on information known to be materially false or incorrect in effectuating an investigatory stop or detention. Materially false information could be planted evidence or results from running a different plate.

Stops Scorecard

2 If required, does an FIC exist for this stop?

CD 126, 139

See Ch. 41.12 FICs for guidance on when FICs are required.

FIC Exists If required

Yes
No
FIC Not Required

If the FIC is under a different item number than the CAD item number, please record the item number on the FIC.

FIC Item if Different than CAD

3 Did the officer submit the FIC to his/her supervisor by the end of the shift?

Review the BWC recording time and the FIC Submit Date. If a BWC does not exist, review the CAD times. For the purposes of this question, the end of the shift is when the officer left work.

[The FIC Submit date reflects the most recent submit date. When an FIC is kicked-back and an officer updates it and re-submits it, we lose the first submit date.]

CD 150, Ch. 41.12 P9

FIC Submitted By ETOD

Yes
No
No FIC

4 Did the supervisor review the FIC within 72 hours? For the purposes of this question use the Submit Date and the Approval Date.

If the FIC is currently disapproved, use the Supervisor Last Modified Date.

CD 150 [modified interpretation, CD amendment likely], Ch. 41.12 P15

FIC Approved in 72Hrs

Yes
No
No FIC

Boilerplate Language

5 In the reports, did the officer(s) use specific descriptive language when articulating reasonable suspicion and/or probable cause for any stop, detention, search, or arrest?

CD 123, 145; Ch. 41.12 P1, 1.2.4 P16, 1.9 P14

Officers cannot use "boilerplate" or "pat" language, such as "traffic violation" or "officer safety" when explaining their actions.

Choose "Yes" if the officer did NOT use any boilerplate language. Choose "No" if the officer used boilerplate language.

If you selected "No", please record the boilerplate language in the FIC:

Boilerplate Explanation

No Boilerplate

Yes
No
NA No FIC/EPR

6 Are the video(s) and reports significantly consistent?

If there is anything you see on video that proves an aspect of the report to be inaccurate, choose "No."

Use the Inconsistency Categories below like a checklist. Check that each category is reported accurately.

CD 123; Ch. 1.9 P14; Ch 1.2.4 P63,65; Ch 82.1 P7-8; Rule 2 P3B

If you chose "No," indicating something about the report is inaccurate, please explain below, including the relevant timestamp of the videos. Please list every inaccuracy.

Discrepancy Explanation

Please pick all the inconsistency categories that apply. These categories should match your discrepancy explanation above.

Inconsistency Categories

- Passenger Info
- Search Info
- Subject Info
- Exit Vehicle Info
- Result Info
- Reason for Stop Info
- Evidence Info
- Vehicle Description Info
- Consent to Search not Documented
- Other

Videos and Reports Are Consistent

Yes
No
NA No FIC/EPR
NA No Video

7 Do video or reports show the officer entered a residence to make the arrest?

See Chapter 1.9 paragraphs 27-29 for guidance.

Arrest in Residence

Yes
No
NA - No Arrest

If yes, which of the following apply?

Arrest in Residence Circumstances

Consent
Exigent Circumstances
Warrant
None of the above (Not Compliant)
NA - Not in Residence
NA - No Arrest

8 A Do video or reports suggest a supervisor required to make the scene?

CD 143; Ch. 1.9 P9, 12

If the incident met the narcotics arrests exception in Ch. 1.9, choose "No."

Narcotics arrest exception requirements:

- (a) The arrest only involved narcotics;
- (b) The suspect was relocated to the station to test the narcotics;
- (c) The supervisor was present at the station to review the arrest recommendation;
- (d) And there were no injuries involved.

Supervisor Required to Make Scene

Yes
No
No - Narcotics Exception
NA - No Arrest
Unknown/DV

8 B If the supervisor was required to make the scene, please pick the reason below.

Reason Supe required to make scene

One or more charges can be charged as a felony. Look up the charge and see if it includes "with hard labor" or "with or without hard labor"
An officer used L2 or L3 force
Custodial arrest for crossing or traversing a police cordon (Municipal Code §54-442) or resisting an officer (Municipal Code § 54-441)
Custodial arrest and the most serious violation is vehicle infraction or simple drug possession
Custodial arrest that is not in FQ or CBD & the charge is Disturbing the Peace, Criminal Trespass, Obstructing Public Passages, or Begging/Vagrancy
Unknown/DV

8 C If the supervisor is required to make scene, does video show the supervisor made the scene?

CD 143; Ch. 1.9 P9, 12

Video Shows Supe Made Scene

Yes
No
NA - Not Required
NA - No Arrest
NA - No Video
NA - Unknown/DV

We use these questions to ensure our universe of uses of force is complete. Reportable uses of force identified here will be included in the use of force audit.

9 Did any officer use reportable force during this officer-civilian interaction?

UseOfForce

Yes
No
No Video

10 Is there a corresponding Blue Team Report? There likely won't be an APPROVED Blue Team report. But there should be an incomplete one.

[Because IAPro and BlueTeam are down and MAX is down, check the FTN log to see if a corresponding use of force report has been initiated.]

If you chose "No," indicating you believe this incident involves unreported reportable force, notify your supervisor.

ForceReported

Yes
No
No Use of Force
No Video

11 If an officer used reportable force, give the video details including the min/sec mark of the force'

UoFVidDetails

--

We use these questions to ensure our universes of strip and cavity searches are complete. Such searches identified here will be included in the strip/cavity audit.

12 Does the incident involve a strip or cavity search?

Strip Cavity Search Occurred

Yes
No

13 If yes, is the strip or cavity search documented in the FIC or EPR?

If you chose "No," indicating this incident involved an undocumented strip or cavity search, notify your supervisor.

Strip Cavity Documented

Yes
No
NA-No Strip/Cavity

Consent to Search Scorecard

14 Did this incident involve a consent to search?

Sometimes officers will ask for consent when they do not need consent. If the officer had another valid legal basis to perform the search, it was not a search by consent.

Consent Search Occurred

Yes
No

15 If yes, is the consent to search documented in an FIC or EPR?

If you choose "No," indicating this incident involved an undocument consent to search, notify your supervisor.

Consent Search Documented

Yes
No
NA-No Consent Search

Evidence

<p>16 If evidence was seized, is there a CE+P receipt?</p> <p>A CE+P receipt should be attached to an EPR. They can also be in DTS.</p> <p>CD 150; Ch 84.1 P8, 24</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Evidence Documented</p> <div style="background-color: black; height: 15px; width: 100%;"></div> <p>Yes No No Evidence Seized No EPR</p>
<p>17 If evidence was seized, was it submitted to CE+P before the next Code 1 call the officer(s) handled or ETOD, whichever is first? Review the Chain of Custody History report in BEAST and the unit's CAD activity. The date/time the item was submitted into property must be before the unit's next Code 1 arrival time or ETOD, whichever is first.</p> <p>[Audit method incomplete for evidence placed in dropboxes.]</p> <p>CD 150</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Evidence Submitted Immediately</p> <div style="background-color: black; height: 15px; width: 100%;"></div> <p>Yes No No Evidence Seized</p>
<p>18 If evidence was seized, and there is a CE+P receipt, does the description on the receipt match the evidence as seen on video?</p> <p>CD 123; Ch 82.1 P7-8; RS 14-134.2, 14-130.1; Rule 2 P3B</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Evidence Description Matches Video</p> <div style="background-color: black; height: 15px; width: 100%;"></div> <p>Yes No No Evidence Seized CE+P Receipt Not Available</p>

Supervisory Review

Because this section pertains to the entire incident, complete the rest of this form and the subject forms prior to completing this section.

<p>19 Did you find any non-compliance related to this incident?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Non-Compliance Should Have Been Addressed</p> <div style="background-color: black; height: 15px; width: 100%;"></div> <p>Yes No</p>
<p>20 The following questions A-E determine whether a supervisor knew or should have known about the non-compliance:</p> <p>20 A Is there non-compliance because there is missing documentation (FIC, EPR, etc.)?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Missing Documentation</p> <div style="background-color: black; height: 15px; width: 100%;"></div> <p>Yes No NA-Full Compliance</p>
<p>20 B Is the non-compliance evident in the report(s) (FICs/EPRs) and the report(s) are approved?</p> <p>If a supervisor needed to watch video to know about the non-compliance, choose "No."</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Non-compliance Evident in Approved Reports</p> <div style="background-color: black; height: 15px; width: 100%;"></div> <p>Yes No NA-Full Compliance</p>
<p>20 C Did a supervisor make the scene and did the non-compliance occur while the supervisor was on scene?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Supervisor On Scene During Non-Compliance</p> <div style="background-color: black; height: 15px; width: 100%;"></div> <p>Yes No NA-Full Compliance</p>
<p>20 D Was a supervisor required to watch the video?</p> <p>Supervisors are required to watch videos if one or more of the following occurred: a use of force, someone was injured, a complaint was made or an officer told a supervisor that he/she thinks a complaint may be made, a vehicle pursuit, or an officer terminated his/her video early to protect the privacy of an individual.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Supervisor Required to Watch Video</p> <div style="background-color: black; height: 15px; width: 100%;"></div> <p>Yes No NA-Full Compliance</p>
<p>20 E Did the supervisor watch the video? Review the audit trail for the videos in Evidence.com.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Supervisor Reviewed Video</p> <div style="background-color: black; height: 15px; width: 100%;"></div> <p>Yes No NA-Full Compliance</p>

20 F Did a supervisor know or should have known about the non-compliance?	Supervisor Aware or Should Have Been Aware of Non-compliance
Choose "Yes" if any of A-E are "Yes."	<div style="background-color: black; height: 15px; width: 100%;"></div> Yes No NA-Full Compliance

21 Please list the SFLIDs for any corresponding SFLs or Control numbers for any corresponding FDIs?	SFLIDs-CNTRL Nos <input type="text"/>
---	--

22 Did a supervisor address all the non-compliance you found related to this incident?	Non-Compliance Addressed by Supervisor
CD 144, 146, 151; Ch 1.9 P16-17; Ch 41.12 P16-17; Ch 35.1.7 P9; Ch 11.0.1 P16C	<div style="background-color: black; height: 15px; width: 100%;"></div> Yes No NA - Full Compliance
If a corresponding SFL or FDI exists but does not cover all non-compliance, please explain:	

Supervisory Review Comments

Procedural Justice

23 Does video show the officer was reasonably professional and courteous when interacting with the subject or other civilians during the stop?	Reasonably Courteous
CD 181; Ch 41.13 P9A; Civil Service Rule 3?	<div style="background-color: black; height: 15px; width: 100%;"></div> Yes No NA - No Video
Enter "No," if the officer(s) should have been more professional or courteous.	
If you selected "No", please explain::	
NotCourteousEnoughExplanation	

24 If reasonably possible, does video show the officer verbally identify him/herself as a soon a practical?	Identified
CD 181; Ch 41.13 P9B	<div style="background-color: black; height: 15px; width: 100%;"></div> Yes No NA - No Video

<p>25 If reasonably possible, does video show the officer explain the reason for the stop/interaction as soon as practical?</p> <p>CD 181; Ch 41.13 P9B</p>	<p>Explained</p> <p>Yes No NA - No Video</p>
<p>26 Does video show the office allowed the subject an opportunity to explain his/her situation, ask questions, or voice concerns?</p>	<p>Subject Could Explain</p> <p>Yes No NA - No Video</p>
<p>27 If the subject was allowed to ask questions, and if the subject had reasonable questions or concerns, does video show the officer respond to them?</p> <p>Ch 41.13 P9E</p>	<p>Responded to Subjects Qs</p> <p>Yes No NA - No Video NA - No Qs</p>
<p>28 Does video show the officer communicate the result of the stop/interaction to the subject (arrest, ticket, etc.)?</p>	<p>Conclusion</p> <p>Yes No NA - No Video</p>
<p>29 Does video show the stop was no longer than necessary to take appropriate action?</p> <p>CD 181, Ch 1.2.4.1 P20, Ch 1.2.4.3 P8; ; Ch 41.13 P9C</p> <p>Constitutional law requires that stops are no longer than necessary to carry out the purpose of the stop. See <i>Rodriguez v. United States</i>, 575 U.S. 348, 135 S. Ct. 1609, 191 L. Ed. 2d 492 (2015) ("If an officer can complete traffic-based inquiries expeditiously, then that is the amount of 'time reasonably required to complete [the stop's] mission.' . . . [A] traffic stop 'prolonged beyond' that point is 'unlawful.'").</p>	<p>Stop No Longer than Necessary</p> <p>Yes No NA - No Video</p>

Flag for Academy Training

30 A Would this make a good training video?:

FlagforAcademy

Yes
No
No Video

30 B If you are flagging the video for the academy, please identify the exact portion of the video you think the academy should consider using.

FlagforAcademyBWCInfo

30 C If you want to flag this video for Academy, please select your reason(s):

FlagForAcademyReason

Video Shows Exemplary Police Actions
Video Shows Non-Exemplary Police Actions
Use of Force Tactics
Handcuffing
Arrest and Search
Other

EPIC

31 Does this incident involve an EPIC Moment; an officer confronting a peer about what they could do better? (Doing something encouraged by NOPD's EPIC program?)

EPICIncident

Yes
No
No Video

If yes please explain, including the video label and the minute of the example:

EPICExplain

Video Coverage

32 Did each officer who conducted a stop, search, or arrest and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required? And did each supervisor who made the scene and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required?

of such officers who had complete video (numerator)

CompleteVidNum

/

of such officers (denominator)

CompleteVidDenom

Ch 41.3.10 P11

List the officers you included in the denominator. And describe any incomplete or missing video.

CompleteVidExplain

Video Info

33 To help someone review your work, please record below the officer name and BWC ID (usually an Item #) for the best video coverage of the incident. Include minutes if the video is long and the important parts are hard to find. If L3 is critical, please include A# and starting time. If you did not watch all the videos, record the minutes of the videos you watched.

Video Info



SSAPJ Subject Audit Form

Instructions Identifying Info Subject Info Stop Searches Arrests Miscellaneous Immigration LGBTQ Review

1. Watch as much video as reasonably possible to ensure you have thoroughly reviewed the incident. You must watch video of all the interactions between an officer and a non-employee. You may skip through or fast forward through parts of the video that do not involve interactions with non-employees. If another officer interacts with a non-employee and you cannot see and hear the interaction in the video you are currently watching, you must watch the other officer's video, if it exists. Clearly document the video segments you watch under question 31 - Video Info of the SSA Incident form so that any reviewer knows exactly what video segments you watched and did not watch.

2. Notify your supervisor when:

- a. It appears officers rely on demographics to establish reasonable suspicion or probable cause for a stop, detention, search, or arrest.
- b. It appears officers rely on information they know to be materially false to conduct a stop, detention, search, or arrest.
- c. You observe policy violations that are not captured by your audit results
- d. Officers' actions are egregious and therefore require prompt intervention

3. Do not discuss this incident with any auditor, peer, or supervisor, until you have thoroughly reviewed the incident.

4. If you do not think this incident involves a stop, search or arrest, please discuss the possible deselection with an auditor or the ARU supervisor. If you decide to deselect, close this form without saving and record the deselection in the deselection log.

*** Complete this form for each subject stopped, searched, or arrested for every incident in the Stop, Search or Arrest sample. If the subject was not documented in the reports, complete the fields based on your observations.***

A stopped subject is:

- a suspect in an investigation with whom an officer is interacting in person
- someone an officer attempts to identify and who is not a victim or witness

Reviewing Auditor	In which sample is this incident?	Enter the Item #	Enter FIC ID	Enter the EPR ID #
Reviewing Auditor	Sample Type	Item Number	FIC ID	EPR ID
Tim Lindsey Faith Thornton Charmel Peterson Betty Johnson Michael Sarver Matt Seagraves	<input type="checkbox"/> Stop <input type="checkbox"/> Search <input type="checkbox"/> Arrest	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

What is the reporting year, month, week, district, platoon?

Review Year	Review Month	Week	District	Platoon
2019	Jun	WK1	1	A
2020	Jul	WK2	2	B
2021	Aug	WK3	3	C
2022	Sep	WK4	4	GA
2023	Oct	WK5	5	Promenade
	Nov		6	Mounted
	Dec		8	DWI
	Jan		7	K9
	Feb		ISB	MC1 MC2
	Mar		MSB	VOWS
	Apr		Other	TIGER
	May		SOD	GANG
				Other

Subject Info

If the subject was not documented in the reports, complete the fields based on your observations.

Subject First

Subject Last

Subject Sex

Male
Female
Unknown

Subject Race-Ethnicity

Black/African-American
White
Hispanic/Latino
Asian
Amer.Ind./Alaskan Nat.
Unknown

Subject DOB

-And-

Event Date

-Or-

Subject Age

Subject Stop

<p>1 A Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop this subject?</p> <p>Ch. 1.2.4.1, Ch 41.13 P10 and others</p> <p>Reasonable Suspicion (Definition)—Articulable facts that, within the totality of the circumstances, lead an officer to reasonably suspect that criminal activity has been or is about to be committed.. The standard for reasonable suspicion is less than probable cause but must be more than a hunch or a subjective feeling.</p> <p>Probable Cause (Definition)—The facts and circumstances known to the officer at the time that would justify a reasonable person in believing the suspect committed or was committing an offense.</p> <p>If this subject was ID'd and was not suspected of any crime (e.g., a passenger in a vehicle who was asked for ID without being suspected of a crime), choose "No-ID'd and NOT a Suspect."</p>	<p>RS/PC to Stop</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"><p>Yes - RS Yes - PC No No-ID'd and NOT a Suspect</p></div>
---	--

<p>1 B If you chose "No" for 1 A, therefore indicating there was no reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop the subject, please explain:</p> <p>No RS/PC to Stop Comments</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 30px; margin-top: 5px;"></div>	
---	--

<p>2 A Does the report clearly articulate reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop this subject?</p> <p>Refer to guidance in 1 A. Additionally, if the officer relied on boilerplate language, choose "No."</p> <p>CD 122, 123, 126, 149; Ch 41.13 P10; Ch 41.12 P12H, Ch 1.9 P14</p> <p>If this subject was ID'd and was not suspected of any crime (e.g., a passenger in a vehicle who was asked for ID without being suspected of a crime), choose "No-ID'd and NOT a Suspect."</p>	<p>RS/PC to Stop in Report</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"><p>Yes - RS Yes - PC No No-ID'd and NOT a Suspect No-No FIC/EPR</p></div>
---	--

<p>2 B If you chose "No" for 2 A, therefore indicating the officer did not document reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop this subject, please explain:</p> <p>No RS/PC to Stop in Report Comments</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 60px; margin-top: 5px;"></div>	
--	--

<p>3 A If the officer put the subject in handcuffs, did the officer document a reason to handcuff in the FIC?</p> <p>Ch. 1.3.1.1 P25</p> <p>If the FIC checkbox for "Arrest Made" under "Actions Taken" is checked and the video or FIC documents the subject was taken to lock-up, choose "Yes."</p> <p>If an FIC does not exist and one was required per Ch 41.12, choose "No-No FIC."</p> <p>If you chose "Yes," what was the reason for handcuffing documented in the FIC?</p> <p>Reason for Handcuffs Text</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 50px; margin-top: 5px;"></div>	<p>Reason for Handcuffs Documented</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"><p>Yes No No-No FIC NA-No Handcuffs NA-FIC Not Required</p></div>
--	--

3 B If this subject was handcuffed, does the evidence available to you show the handcuffing was within policy? Record compliance with discretionary and mandatory handcuffing requirements separately.

Ch. 1.3.1.1

See Ch. 1.3.1.1 P 12, 13, 22 for guidance. These paragraphs allow an officer to handcuff a subject if one of the following are true:

- the officer intended to book the subject (take to lock-up)
- the subject resisted detention
- the subject posed a safety concern
- the subject posed a flight concern, or
- the subject posed an interference concern.

However, also see P 30-41 for special circumstances under which subjects may not be handcuffed.

If based on your understanding of Ch 1.3.1.1 you think the subject was handcuffed in violation of policy, choose "No" and explain below. If you think the handcuffing was within policy, choose "Yes" and explain below.

Handcuffs Within Policy Comments

Discretionary Handcuffs Within Policy

Yes
No
No Handcuffs

Mandatory Handcuffs Within Policy

Yes
No
No Handcuffs

Subject Searches

- 4 Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer(s) have a valid legal basis to search the subject?

Ch. 1.2.4 P1

An officer must have a legal reason to stop a subject and a legal reason to search a subject in order to search a subject.

Refer to Ch. 1.2.4 Search and Seizure for more guidance. Discuss the search(es) with an officer if necessary.

If a search of a vehicle occurs, most of the time it will make the most sense to include the search on the driver's audit form. There may be scenarios in which it makes more sense to include the search on a passenger's audit form.

Please describe the searches conducted on this subject and this subject's property and explain any non-compliance. Hypothetical text: "Vehicle Exception/Pat Down/Consent to Search Person/Search Incident to Arrest. There does not appear to be probable cause to justify the vehicle exception to the warrant requirement."

Search Legal Comments

Enter the number of searches conducted on this subject and this subject's property that had a valid legal basis.

Search Legal Numerator

/

Enter the number searches conducted on this subject and this subject's property.

Search Legal Denominator

- 5 Does the report document a valid legal basis for every search of this subject?

CD 149; Ch 41.12 P12I-L; Ch 1.2.4 P62A; Ch 82.1 P4

If the FIC indicates a pat down occurred the justification for the pat down must give specific details about the subject of the pat down that would lead a reasonable person to believe the subject was armed and dangerous.

Refer to Ch. 1.2.4 Search and Seizure for more guidance. Discuss the search(es) with an officer if necessary.

See guidance above for vehicle searches.

Please describe the searches conducted on this subject and this subject's property and explain any non-compliance.

Reason to Search in Report Comments

Enter the number of searches conducted on the subject and this subject's property for which the FIC

Reason to Search in Report Numerator

/

Enter the number of searches conducted on the subject and this subject's property.

Reason to Search in Report Denominator

6 If a pat down was correctly indicated, did the officer give specific details about the subject of the pat down that would lead a reasonable person to believe the subject was armed and dangerous in the justification for pat down text box?

Ch 41.12 P12J

If one of the reasons the officer conducted the pat down was for contraband, choose "No."

If you chose "No" for "Justification Specifies Armed and Dangerous," please pick a noncompliant category. Leave blank if you chose "Yes."

PatDownJustification

Yes
No
NA-No Pat Down

PatDownNotCompliantCat

Justification Insufficient
For More Than Weapons
Justification Insufficient & For More than Weapons

7 Was this subject on parole or probation?

Use the spreadsheet provided by the corrections department. Search by subject name, demographics, and address.

Search Subject on Probation or Parole

Yes
No
Subject Not Searched

8 Was the arrest gist for this subject approved by a supervisor before the subject was booked by the sheriff?

[need to verify ability to audit]

CD 145; Ch 1.9 P13,49-50

Supervisor Approved Gist Prior to Booking

Yes
No
NA-Existing Warrant
Subject Not Arrested

9 Based on all the evidence available to you, did the officer have probable cause to arrest this subject?

CD 141; Ch 1.9 P1

Is at least one charge good? Do you believe:

- the officer had a legal reason to stop the subject,
- the officer had a legal reason to search the subject, if relevant to the charge,
- and the facts and circumstances known to the officer at the time would justify a reasonable person in believing the suspect committed or was committing an offense?

Please explain PC for the arrest or the lack thereof.

OfficerHadPctoArrest

Yes
No
Subject Not Arrested

OfficerHadPctoArrest Comments

10 Did the officer clearly document the probable cause in the report (FIC or EPR)? In other words, does the report give the facts and circumstances known to the officer at the time which would justify a reasonable person in believing the suspect committed or was committing an offense?

The report must also clearly articulate a legal reason to stop the subject, and a legal reason to search the subject, if a search was relevant to the arrest charge.

Ch 1.9 P14; Ch 82.1 P4; Ch 41.12 P15

Please explain PC for the arrest or the lack th as articulated in the report

PC Clearly Articulated

Yes
No
Subject Not Arrested

PC Clearly Articulated Comments

Subject Miscellaneous

- 11 Did the officer use their discretion to give the subject a break?

Just because an officer checks the verbal warning box in the stop result section of the FIC, doesn't mean a break was given. There must be an offense for which the officer chooses not to cite, summons, or arrest.

If the officer gave this subject a break, please explain what officer could have done but decided not to.

Break Given Explain

Break Given

Yes
No
No Video
NA-No Crime

- 12 Did the officer run the subject's ID?:

ID Check

Yes
No
No Video
The Officer did not have a chance to

- 13 Did the officer request translation services, if needed?

LEP

Yes
No
No Video
No Translation Needed
Flag

- 15 Did the officer give Miranda Rights, If required?

Officers shall advise suspects of their Miranda Rights at the time of arrest or prior to any custodial interrogation. See Chapter: 1.9.1;

Note: Miranda does not apply to roadside questioning of a stopped motorist or a person briefly detained on the street under a Terry stop.

Miranda Given, If Required

Yes
No
NA

[Previous Page](#)

[Next Page](#)

**SUBJECT
IMMIGRATION**

16 Was the subject arrested because of, or in part due to the subject's immigration status?

StopImmigrationStatus

Find items



17 Was the subject questioned about their immigration status in a manner that was not relevant to the crime in question?

QuestionedImmigrationStatus

Find items



ImmigrationComments

Subject LGBTQ

16 Did the officer say something that is possibly offensive about/to LGBTQ individuals?

OfficerCommentLGBTQ

Yes
No
No Video

17 Did the officer address the subject by their chosen name, title, and pronoun?

OfficerAddressLGBTQ

Yes
No
Gender Identity Unknown
No Video

LGBTQComments:

#Name?

SUBJECT EXIT VEHICLE

Did an officer require this subject to exit a vehicle?

Required to Exit Vehicle

Find items 

If you chose yes for "Required to Exit Vehicle", did an officer document the justification to require this subject to exit the vehicle in the FIC?

Vehicle Exit Justification Documented

Find items 

If you chose yes for Vehicle Exit Justification Documented, is the justification specific to this subject, and/or was a legal vehicle search conducted requiring all occupants to exit the vehicle?

Vehicle Exit Justification Compliant

Find items 

If this subject was required to exit a vehicle, pick the option below that best describes the justification:

Vehicle Exit Justification Category

Find items 

If you chose Other, please explain

Vehicle Exit Justification Category Other Explanation



Consent to Search Audit Form

Instructions	Identifying Info	Subject Info	Audit Criteria	Supervisory Review	Review
<p>1. In the FIC, did the officer accurately check the appropriate boxes to indicate a consent to search occurred?</p> <p>If a consent to search did not occur choose "No - Consent to Search Did Not Occur."</p> <p>If a consent to search occurred but the FIC was not completed correctly choose "No - Consent to Search Occurred, FIC Not Accurate."</p> <p>If a consent to search occurred but an FIC does not exist for the incident choose "No - Consent to Search Occurred, No FIC."</p>					<p>FIC Checked Accurately</p> <p>Yes No-Consent to Search Did Not Occur-FIC Not Accurate No-Consent to Search Occurred, FIC Not Accurate No-Consent to Search Occurred, No FIC</p>
<p>2. If a consent to search occurred, does video show the officer notified a supervisor before he/she conducted a search based on consent? Please provide timestamp of the video.</p> <p>CD 128</p>					<p>Supervisor Notified Before Search Conducted</p> <p>Yes No NA-No Video NA-Incomplete Video Consent to Search Did Not Occur</p>
<p>3. If a consent to search occurred, does video show the supervisor approved the consent to search before the search was conducted? Please provide timestamp of the video.</p> <p>CD 128</p>					<p>Supervisor Approved Before Search Conducted</p> <p>Yes No No-Approved After NA-No Video NA-Incomplete Video Consent to Search Did Not Occur</p>
<p>4. If a consent to search occurred, does video show the officer</p>					<p>Officer Informed Subject of His/Her Rights</p>
Submit Record		Enter Status <input type="text"/>		Return to M	
Record: 42 of 42 No Filter Search					



Consent to Search Audit Form

	<p>NA-Incomplete Video Consent to Search Did Not Occur</p>				
<p>4. If a consent to search occurred, does video show the officer informing the subject of his or her right to refuse and to revoke consent at any time?</p> <p>CD 129</p>	<p>Officer Informed Subject of His/Her Rights</p> <p>Yes No NA-No Video NA-Incomplete Video Consent to Search Did Not Occur</p>				
<p>5. If a consent to search occurred, does a Form 146 exist for the consent to search?</p> <p>CD 129</p>	<p>Form 146 Exists</p> <p>Yes No Consent to Search Did Not Occur</p>				
<p>If yes, please help the reviewer find the form by giving the item # of the EPR to which the form is attached, for example.</p>	<p>FindForm</p> <input type="text"/>				
<p>6. If a consent to search occurred, does form 146 include the signature of the person granting consent?</p> <p>CD 131</p>	<p>Subject Signed Form 146</p> <p>Yes No NA-No Form NA-Attachments Not Available NA-Consent to Search Did Not Occur</p>				
<p>7. If a consent to search occurred, does form 146 include the signature of the officer requesting consent?</p>	<p>Officer Signed Form 146</p>				
Submit Record		Enter Status <input type="text"/>		Return to Main	
Record: 42 of 42 No Filter Search					



Strip and Cavity Search Audit Form

Identifying Info **Subject Info** 1-4 Strip (5-14) Cavity (15-18) Supervisory Review (19-22) Review

Pick the auditor that is making this entry?

Created By

- Tim Lindsey
- Betty Johnson
- Chelsea Albritton
- Mekensie Maxwell
- Lanitra Lacey
- Reconciled (DB)
- Jessica Jones
- Bianca Harris

From which sample did this incident come from?

Sample Type

- Stop Search
- Arrest
- Consent Search
- Strip/Cavity
- Probation & Parole

Enter the item number from the sampling spreadsheet.

Item Number

Please attempt to find all related item numbers and list them here.

Related Item Numbers

Please enter the District or Division to which the primary officer is assigned.

District/Division

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 100

Submit Record

Enter Status



Return to Main

Please enter the reporting Month

Review Month

- Jan
- Feb
- Mar
- Apr
- May
- Jun
- Jul
- Aug
- Sep
- Oct
- Nov
- Dec

Please enter the reporting year.

Review Year

- 2020
- 2021
- 2022
- 2023
- 2024

Next Page

Subject Info

Subject First

Subject Last

Subject Sex

Male
Female
Unknown

Subject Race-Ethnicity

Black/African-American
White
Hispanic/Latino
Asian
Amer.Ind./Alaskan Nat.
Unknown

Subject DOB

-And-

Event Date

-Or-

Subject Age

1 What search type occurred during this incident?

"A strip search is defined as any search of a person that includes the removal or rearrangement of some or all clothing to permit visual inspection of the exterior of the suspect's groin/genital area, buttocks, female breasts, or undergarments covering these areas. A body cavity search is defined as any visual or physical inspection of a person's genital or anal cavities with or without any physical

Search Type

Strip
Cavity
Both

2 Complete Video Exists

Did each officer(s) who made the scene and who has been issued a BWC activate his/her BWC as required?

Ch. 41.4.1 P10

of Primary Officers with Complete Video

CompleteVidNum

/

of Primary Officers

CompleteVidDenom

Please list the officer you thought to be primary officers and give details on any missing or incomplete video.

CompleteVidExplain

If video exists, help the reviewer find the video of the strip or cavity search.

SearchVidDetails

If video exists, help the reviewer find the video of the strip or cavity search.

SearchVidDetails

3 Based on the evidence available to you, was there probable cause to conduct the strip or cavity search?

CD 132

PC for Search

Yes
No

4 In the FIC or EPR or Search Warrant, did the officer articulate probable cause that the subject was concealing a weapon or contraband?

CD 132

PC for Search in Report

Yes
No
No Report

[Previous Page](#)

[Next Page](#)

Strip Search

<p>5 If the incident involved a strip search in the field, does the FIC or EPR explain "exigent circumstances where the life of officers or others may be placed at risk"?</p> <p>CD 132</p>	<p>Strip Field EC</p> <p>[Redacted]</p> <p>Yes No No Report No Field Strip Search</p>
<p>6 If the incident involved a strip search, does video or the report show the officer received approval to conduct the strip search?</p> <p>CD 133</p>	<p>Strip Supervisor Approved</p> <p>[Redacted]</p> <p>Yes No No Strip Search</p>
<p>7 If the incident involved a strip search, did the officer receive written approval from a supervisor for the strip search?</p> <p>Ch. 1.2.4 P 47 A</p>	<p>Strip Supervisor Approved in Writing</p> <p>Yes No No Strip Search N/A</p>
<p>8 If the incident involved a strip search and the officer received approval from a supervisor, does video or the report show the supervisor make the scene?</p> <p>CD 133</p>	<p>Strip Supervisor Made Scene</p> <p>[Redacted]</p> <p>Yes No No Strip Search</p>

9 If the incident involved a strip search, do reports or video show the minimum number of officers necessary to conduct the strip search?

CD 133

How many officers were present during the strip search?

How many were not necessary? Enter 0 if all were necessary.

Strip Min Officers Necessary

Yes
 No
 No Reports or Video
 No Strip Search

Num Present During Strip

Num Not Necessary

10 If the incident involved a strip search, did the officer take the necessary steps to identify the subject's identified gender?

The officer should say something like "Our policy requires the officer conducting the strip search to be the same gender as the person being searched. To ensure compliance with that policy, should we have a policeman or policewoman conduct the search?"

CD 133

Strip Gender Identified

Yes
 No
 No Reports to Video
 No Strip Search

11 If the incident involved a strip search, do reports or video show the strip search was performed by officers of the same gender as the identified-gender of the subject?

This question corresponds to question 8 above. For example, if the subject informed the officer that a policeman should conduct the search, and all officers conducting the search were male, choose "Yes."

If "No " please explain:

Strip Officers Same Gender

Yes
 No
 Unclear
 No Reports or Video
 No Strip Search

12 If the incident involved a strip search, do reports or video show it was conducted under conditions that provided privacy from all but those authorized to conduct the search?

CD 132

Strip Privacy

Yes
No
No Reports or Video
No Strip Search

13 If the incident involved a strip search, does video show it was conducted in a professional manner?

CD 133

Strip Professional

Yes
No
No Strip Search

14 If the incident involved a strip search, does documentation include a list of the items, if any, recovered during the search and the location on the body where found?

Ch. 1.2.4 P49 H

Strip Location of Evidence Documented

Yes
No
No Video
No Strip Search

[Previous Page](#)

[Next Page](#)

Cavity Search

15 If the incident involved a cavity search, do reports show it was conducted by medical personnel?

CD 134

Cavity By Medical Personnel

Yes
No
No Reports
No Cavity Search

16 If the incident involved a cavity search, do reports show it was conducted by at a medical facility?

Ch. 1.2.4 P52

Cavity At Medical Facility

Yes
No
No Reports
No Cavity Search

17 If the incident involved a cavity search, reports show the officer got a search warrant?

CD 134

Cavity Warrant Issued

Yes
No
No Reports
No Cavity Search

18 If the incident involved a cavity search, does documentation include a list of the items, if any, recovered during the search and the location on or in the body where found?

Ch. 1.2.4 P55 H

Cavity Location of Evidence Documented

Yes
No
No Cavity Search

[Previous Page](#)

[Next Page](#)

Supervisory Review

19 Did you find any non-compliance related to this incident in the sections above?

Non-Compliance Should Have Been Addressed

Yes
No

20 The following questions A-E determine whether the supervisor knew or should have known about the non-compliance.

20 A Is there non-compliance because there is missing documentation (FIC, EPR, etc)?

Missing Documentation

Yes
No
NA-Full Compliance

20 B B. Is the non-compliance evident in the report(s) (FICs/EPRs) and the report(s) are approved?

Non-compliance Evident in Approved Reports

If a supervisor needed to watch video to know about the non-compliance, choose "No."

Yes
No
NA-Full Compliance

20 C C. Did a supervisor make the scene and did the non-compliance occur while the supervisor was on scene?

Supervisor On Scene During Non-compliance

[Redacted]

Yes
No
NA-Full Compliance

20 D D. Was a supervisor required to watch the video?

Supervisor Required to Watch Video

Supervisors are required to watch videos if one or more of the following occurred: a use of force, someone was injured, a complaint was made or an officer told a supervisor that he/she thinks a complaint may be made, a vehicle pursuit, or an officer terminated his/her video early to protect the privacy of an individual.

[Redacted]

Yes
No
NA-Full Compliance

20 E E. Did the supervisor watch the video?

Supervisor Reviewed Video

Review the audit trail for the videos in Evidence.com

[Redacted]

Yes
No

20 F F. Did a supervisor know or should have known about the non-compliance?

Supervisor Aware or Should Have Been Aware of Non-compliance

Choose "Yes" if any of A-E are "Yes."

[Redacted]

21 Please list the SFLIDs for any corresponding SFLs or Control numbers for any corresponding FDIs?

SFLIDs-CNTRL Nos

[Text Input Field]

22 Did a supervisor address all the non-compliance you found above?

Non-Compliance Addressed by Supervisor

CD 144, 146, 151

[Redacted]

Yes
No

If a corresponding SFL or FDI exists but does not cover all non-compliance, please explain:

Supervisory Review Comments

[Text Input Field]

Auditor Comments

Reviewer Comments

[Previous Page](#)

[First Page](#)

Appendix B – Report Distribution

Superintendent

Chief Deputy Superintendent Field Operations Bureau

Deputy Superintendent Investigative Services Bureau

Deputy Superintendent Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau

Deputy Superintendent Public Integrity Bureau

Deputy Superintendent Management Services Bureau

City Attorney's Office