



Search Warrant Audit – July 2025

(NOPD) - Final

Report# SW072025

Submitted by PSAB: August 1, 2025
Response from FOB/ISB: August 15, 2025
Final Report: August 18, 2025

Previous Audit Conducted: July 2024

Audit Team

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

Executive Summary

The Audit and Review Section (ARS) of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau (PSAB) conducted an audit of Search Warrants (SW) related to search warrants created between July 2024 and June 2025. The audit is designed to measure compliance with New Orleans Police Department (NOPD) policies and the Consent Decree (CD), thereby ensuring that all search warrants are created and executed consistently with those policies and constitutional law. The audit also ensures all search warrants are documented appropriately, and the documentation is complete and accurate.

Search Warrant – Audit

Search Warrants - Scorecard has an overall score of **99%**. The previous audit score was 99%. The primary deficiency is regarding search warrants with “Logged” (Entered into the NOPD logbooks). The current score for this category question was **88%** versus the previous audit score of 95%. Note that there were only 3 “Higher/Moderate Risk” search warrants and none were missing the report. Training with In-service Training classes or Daily Training Bulletins (DTBs) are to be utilized to reinforce close and effective oversight. Of the eighty-eight (**88**) audit items reviewed, eleven (**11**) items were identified as “non-compliant” as they were not entered nor referenced in any of the Search Warrant Logbooks.

Count of Item numbers not initially logged by District/Unit:

1st (2); 6th (1); 7th (3); 8th (1); SID (1); SVS (3)

- Of the Eleven (11) missing search warrant log entries, **seven (7)** were from the **Field Operations Bureau (FOB)**.
- Search Warrant Risk Assessments were conducted for items considered high risk along with their corresponding operations plans. The audit team identified three: (1) high risk warrant, along with two (2) moderate risk warrants. Out of the three (3) search warrants identified as high or moderate risk all were residence, structure, home or building related. PSAB determined that all were appropriately assessed.
- Sixty-two (62) entries are listed as NA for BWC recordings (2 Structure, 3 Auto, 56 Records/Data, 1 Personal Property).
- Twenty-five (25) entries had NOPD BWC recordings that were reviewed (22 No Risk; 2 Moderate, 1 High).

PSAB shall advise both the Field Operations Bureau (FOB) and Investigation Services Bureau (ISB) that all missing search warrant log entries should have corresponding entries in the Supervisor Feedback Log (SFL). PSAB recommends the involved Bureaus take corrective action and at a minimum, note all missing BWC recordings for warrant execution in the SFL involving auto, persons or structures. PSAB recommends that both FOB and ISB continue to log all search warrants into the Department logbook system to ensure compliance with the CD mandate.

Table of Contents

- Executive Summary..... 2

- Introduction 4
 - Purpose 4
 - Objectives..... 4
 - Background 4
 - Methodology..... 4

- Initiating and Conducting the SW Audit 6

- Scorecards..... 7

- Conclusion..... 9

- Appendix A – SW Audit Forms 12

- Appendix B – Report Distribution 18

Introduction

The Audit and Review Section (ARS) of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted an audit of Search Warrants (SW) related to warrants created between July 2024 and June 2025. This audit is designed to ensure that all search warrants are conducted and executed consistently with NOPD policy and constitutional law, are documented appropriately, that the documentation is complete and accurate, and that search warrants carried out are done so with fairness and limited scope as needed.

Purpose

The Search Warrants Audit is completed to ensure requests, approvals, and execution are constitutional and are within policy. Search Warrants 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, 41.3.10 Body Worn Camera.

Objectives

This audit is designed to ensure that all Search Warrants comply with NOPD policy and constitutional law. Also, to ensure all of them are documented appropriately, and the documentation is complete and accurate. This audit procedure entails the review of search warrants as codified in the Search Warrants protocol.

Background

This comprehensive Search Warrant (SW) Audit utilizing the standard protocol has now been further enhanced to ensure all relevant issues regarding the last audit have been addressed. In July of 2021 the initial Search Warrant Audit was conducted by OCDM. The auditing process this review followed is based on the previous design and with the added double-blind audit process. This resulting audit was more detailed, and a deeper diving review of the search warrant process was undertaken by officers.

Methodology

Auditors qualitatively assessed each warrant using the SW form outlined in the attachments to ensure each search warrant is compliant with legal requirements and NOPD policy. Auditors watched videos and read search warrant applications, supporting affidavits or declarations, search warrants, warrant log entries, and evidence documents, and risk assessment/threat analysis forms to ensure officers had a valid legal basis to execute a search warrant, ensure that documentation was complete and accurate, and that sufficient planning took place to reduce risk of warrant service.

All documents and related items that are in the sample and were not audited because there is 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 search warrant sampled. This involved:

1. Reading the police reports.
2. Reviewing video; Evidence.com

3. Reviewing CloudGavel (Warrants Management System) for documents and other associated information.

If video is available for the warrant execution, auditors will watch as needed. Auditors also watched videos recorded by other officers on scene to observe all interactions.

Auditors read the guidance in the audit forms on a regular basis. Changes to audit forms were clearly communicated to auditors by the audit supervisor. Auditors re-read policies when guidance in audit forms recommended, they do so or when the policy requirements were 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 of the result for the audit criteria in question. For example, if an auditor scored "Reports and Videos Consistent" with a "No" indicating non-compliance, they explained how the video shows something that is not consistent with the report.

Drawing on their knowledge of NOPD policies, auditors noted any policy violations they observed that were not specifically addressed in the SW Audit tools in the "Notify PSS" section of the form.

Initiating and Conducting the SW Audit

The final **SW** sample size for this audit was determined to be **88** items due to stratification and rounding.

1. The universe of Search Warrants was exported into an excel spreadsheet. This included data from CloudGavel (3rd Party warrant management system), Electronic Police Reports (EPR) and Warrant Log data from the MS Access Logbooks file. The three (3) individual data tabs were then assigned a unique reference code using the item number and ID. The unique reference codes were then assigned a random number using Excel's random number function (RAND).
2. Documents were sampled starting from the smallest random number assigned and continuing from smallest to largest until the required sample size was reached.
3. Sample sizes were representative of the Department, not each district/division, when reporting publicly. For reference, during July 2024-June 2025, NOPD's Search Warrants universe amounted to 5,916 search warrants after removing all duplications. Per the sample size calculator provided to NOPD by the Los Angeles Police Department Auditing Unit, a sample size of about 88 Search warrants was representative of this population size when doing a one-tailed test, with a 95% degree of confidence, and a 4% error rate.
4. When reporting publicly, audit results were stratified by division/district; the number of audit results per division/district were proportionate to the actual activity by the division/district. The results included at least one item from each division/district with activity during the reporting time-period to ensure all districts/divisions with activity were included in public reports.
5. Randomly sampled documents that do not document a search warrant by NOPD were deselected. When a document was deselected, the auditor continued to the document with the next lowest random number to replace it.

Scorecards: Search Warrant Summary Detail Table

Search Warrant Audit Form Table - (Sample Range- July, 2024 -June, 2025)					Reporting Period: July 2025			
Audit Form #	CD ¶	Metric	Compliance Rate	Y	N	N/A	U	Total Reviewed
1	140	Logged <i>(Entered into Logbooks)</i>	88%	77	11	0	0	88
2	136	Reviewed Before Filing	100%	88	0	0	0	88
3	140	Log Includes Officer <i>(credit CloudGavel entry)</i>	100%	88	0	0	0	88
4	140	Log Includes Supervisor <i>(credit CloudGavel entry)</i>	100%	88	0	0	0	88
5	140	Log Includes Item Number <i>(credit CloudGavel entry)</i>	100%	88	0	0	0	88
6	140	Warrant Includes Application/Affidavit	100%	88	0	0	0	88
7	135	Application/Affidavit has Probable Cause	100%	88	0	0	0	88
8	135	Probable Cause in Application/Affidavit Consistent with Reports	100%	85	0	0	0	85
9	135	Application/Affidavit Specifies Place or Thing	100%	88	0	0	0	88
10	135	Application/Affidavit Specifies Target Items	100%	88	0	0	0	88
11	135	No Avoidable Mistakes in Application/Affidavit	98%	58	1	29	0	88
12	136	No Boilerplate in Application/Affidavit	100%	88	0	0	0	88
14	Ch 1.2.4.2	No Knock Requested		0	39	49	0	88
15	Ch 1.2.4.2 p. 3-4	No Knock Needed Per Policy	-	0	0	88	0	88
17	Ch 1.2.4.2 p. 3-4	No Knock Granted by Judge	-	0	0	88	0	88
18	Ch 1.2.4.2 p38	Risk Assessment Appropriate	100%	75	0	13	0	88
19a		Appropriate Risk Level Count	High = 1	Moderate = 2	No Risk = 81	Not Executed = 4	0	88
21	138	Operational Plan Exists	100%	3	0	85	0	88
22	138	Operational Plan Prepared in Advance, if exists	100%	3	0	85	0	88
23	138	Supervisor Assisted with Operational Plan, if exists	100%	3	0	85	0	88
24	Ch 1.2.4.2	Operational Plan Covers Appendix A, if exists	100%	3	0	85	0	88
25	Ch 1.2.4.2	Operational Plan Sufficient, if exists	100%	3	0	85	0	88
27		BWC Complete Numerator and Denominator		Num	Demon			
28	Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 25	BWC Complete	93%	53	57			
29		BWC Complete Comments						
30	123, 136	Reports and Videos Consistent	96%	25	1	62	0	88
31		Reports and Videos Consistent Comments						
32	Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 20	Knock Announce Wait	100%	6	0	82	0	88
33	Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 21	No Knock On Scene Reassessment Documented in EPR	-	0	0	88	0	88
34	Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 24	No Knock Authority Announced After Entry	-	0	0	88	0	88
35	Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 23ai	Unplanned No Knock Changed Circumstances Documented	-	0	0	88	0	88
36	Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 23aii	Unplanned No Knock Facts Preventing Judge Approval Documented	-	0	0	88	0	88
37	Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 23aiii	Unplanned No Knock Facts Preventing Command Approval Documented	-	0	0	88	0	88
38	Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 23b	Unplanned No Knock Reviewed and Approved by Deputy Chief	-	0	0	88	0	88
39	Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 23c	Unplanned No Knock Facts Given to Judge	-	0	0	88	0	88
45	150	Evidence Documented SW	100%	23	0	65	0	88
46	150	Evidence Submitted Immediately SW	100%	23	0	65	0	88
47	150	Evidence Description Matches Video SW	95%	19	1	68	0	88
40	138	Supervisor Present for Execution	100%	18	0	70	0	88
41		Non-Occupants Detained	-	4	6	78	0	88
43	139, Ch. 1.2.4.2 P26	Non-Occupants Detained No Longer than Necessary	100%	4	0	84	0	88
44	Ch. 1.2.4.2 P27	Reasonable Suspicion for Detaining Non-Occupants	100%	1	0	87	0	88
48	138	After Action Report Exists	100%	3	0	85	0	88
49	138	After Action Report Documented by Supervisor, if exists	100%	3	0	85	0	88
50	138	After Action Report w/in 24 Hrs., if exists	100%	3	0	85	0	88
51	Ch 1.2.4.2 p 43	After Action Report Contains Required Elements, if exists	100%	3	0	85	0	88
52	Ch 1.2.4.2 p 43	After Action Report Sufficient, if exists	100%	3	0	85	0	88
		Compliance Score	99%	1289	18	2091	0	

Search Warrant – Audit Detail by District Table

Search Warrant Audit Form Table - (Sample Range- July, 2024 -June, 2025)													Reporting Period: July 2025				
Audit Form #	CD #	Metric	District/Unit										FOB		Overall Compliance		
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	SOD	Homicide	SVS	SID		Other	
1	140	Logged <i>(Entered into Logbooks)</i>	33%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	89%	63%	86%	100%	100%	70%	0%	100%	88%
2	136	Reviewed Before Filing	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
3	140	Log Includes Officer <i>(credit CloudGavel entry)</i>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
4	140	Log Includes Supervisor <i>(credit CloudGavel entry)</i>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
5	140	Log Includes Item Number <i>(credit CloudGavel entry)</i>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
6	140	Warrant Includes Application/Affidavit	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
7	135	Application/Affidavit has Probable Cause	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
8	135	Probable Cause in Application/Affidavit Consistent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
9	135	Application/Affidavit Specifies Place or Thing	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
10	135	Application/Affidavit Specifies Target Items	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
11	135	No Avoidable Mistakes in Application/Affidavit	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	91%	100%	-	100%	98%
12	136	No Boilerplate in Application/Affidavit	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
14	Ch 1.2.4.2 p. 3-4	No Knock Requested	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	Ch 1.2.4.2 p. 3-4	No Knock Needed Per Policy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	Ch 1.2.4.2 p. 3-4	No Knock Granted by Judge	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	Ch 1.2.4.2 p38	Risk Assessment Appropriate	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%
19a	"	Appropriate Risk Level Count -High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
19b	"	Appropriate Risk Level Count -Moderate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
19c	"	Appropriate Risk Level Count -None	3	5	3	3	5	9	8	7	7	22	10	1	2	2	85
19c	"	Appropriate Risk Level Count -Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21	138	Operational Plan Exists	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	100%	100%
22	138	Operational Plan Prepared in Advance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	100%	100%
23	138	Supervisor Assisted with Operational Plan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	100%	100%
24	Ch 1.2.4.2	Operational Plan Covers Appendix A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	100%	100%
25	Ch 1.2.4.2	Operational Plan Sufficient	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	100%	100%
27		BWC Complete Numerator and Denominator															
28	Ch 1.2.4.2 p 25	BWC Complete	-	100%	100%	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	75%	93%	93%
30	123, 136	Reports and Videos Consistent	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	50%	96%	96%
32	Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 20	Knock Announce Wait	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	100%	-	-	100%	100%	100%
33	Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 21	No Knock On Scene Reassessment Documented in EPR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
34	Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 24	No Knock Authority Announced After Entry	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
35	Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 23ai	Unplanned No Knock Changed Circumstances Documented	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
36	Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 23aii	Unplanned No Knock Facts Preventing Judge Approval Documented	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
37	Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 23aiii	Unplanned No Knock Facts Preventing Command Approval Documented	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
38	Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 23b	Unplanned No Knock Reviewed and Approved by Deputy Chief	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
39	Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 23c	Unplanned No Knock Facts Given to Judge	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
45	150	Evidence Documented SW	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%
46	150	Evidence Submitted Immediately SW	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%
47	150	Evidence Description Matches Video SW	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	95%	95%
40	138	Suppe Present for Execution	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	-	-	100%	100%	100%
41		Non-Occupants Detained (incident count)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	4
43	139, Ch. 1.2.4.2 P26	Non-Occupants Detained No Longer than Necessary	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	100%	100%
44	139, Ch. 1.2.4.2 P27	Reasonable Suspicion for Detaining Non-Occupants	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	100%
48	138	After Action Report Exists	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	100%	100%
49	138	After Action Report Documented by Supervisor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	100%	100%
50	138	After Action Report w/in 24 Hrs.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	100%	100%
51	Ch 1.2.4.2 p 43	After Action Report Contains Required Elements	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	100%	100%
52	Ch 1.2.4.2 p 43	After Action Report Sufficient	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	100%	100%
		Compliance Score	94%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	97%	98%	100%	100%	98%	91%	99%	99%	99%

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 warrant and completed the initial SW Audit form entries. The two auditors then discussed and resolved any discrepancies between the two sets of results. Any discrepancy that could not 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, and members of the Office of the Consent Decree Monitor.

During the Audit Supervisor review, an 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 deviation from compliance under **90%** was identified in the SW Audit results:

Districts should have logged search warrants in the NOPD Logbooks: "Logged". The current score for this category question was **88%** versus the previous audit score of 95%. The following districts were missing entries in the logbooks. 1st (2); 6th (1); 7th (3); 8th (1); SID (1); SVS (3).

Only material policy violations 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. None were forwarded for this audit.

All auditing non-compliance identified in the review process was documented in the PSAB report 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 are included in the "District Re-Evaluation Results" section.

Recommendations

1. Continue to work with the Bureaus to provide additional training on the following:
 - a. Using the Logbooks database ensuring the warrants are properly logged.
 - b. Utilizing BWC's specifically when searching structures, vehicles, or persons.
 - c. Ensuring all Moderate and High-Risk warrants have risk assessments, operational plans and after-action reports.
2. Continue to work with Policy Standards Section to develop DTB's to address deficiencies.

District Re-Evaluation Results

3rd District Review and Request

- Records/Data warrant authored by the detective assigned to Child Abuse.
- Search Warrant for 814 Canal Street related to narcotics investigation.

Summary of Findings: After reviewing the Search Warrant Audit the 8th District was listed as having two search warrants not entered in the log. Neither of these warrants were handled by 8th District personnel and should be changed to the appropriate unit that handled the search warrant

See auditor comments below:

- Signal: 81 INDECENT BEHAVIOR WITH A JUVENILE; Occurrence Date/Time: 3/16/2025 6:15 PM; Summary: ON SUNDAY, MARCH 17, 2025, AT ABOUT 8:11 PM; DETECTIVE, ASSIGNED TO THE NEW ORLEANS POLICE DEPARTMENT CHILD ABUSE UNIT
- This search warrant was handled by SID HIDTA and did not involve any 8th District personnel.

PSAB Response – PSAB agrees with the district and will transfer the items to the correct assigned units. (Child Abuse and HIDTA)

2nd District Review and Request

- This was a data warrant for a cell phone and was added to the warrant log on January 4, 2025.

PSAB Response: This was found in the S&A Log and **corrected to say it was logged:** Note that our log for distribution only ran from July 1, 2024, so missed the log entry).

- An arrest warrant was issued under this item and was logged on October 11, 2024. Two additional items were associated with this item. An arrest warrant was authorized and logged, also on October 11, 2024. An arrest warrant and search warrant were authorized and was logged on October 14, 2024.

PSAB Response: The EPR referenced the item where the search warrant was issued.

See EPR Narrative under I-22051-24:

“DETECTIVE STRONGLY BELIEVED SUBJECT WAS THE SUSPECT IN THE BURGLARIES THAT BEGAN ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2024, AND AFTER CONCLUDING THE INVESTIGATION INTO THE STATE STREET BURGLARY, A SEARCH WARRANT WAS OBTAINED FOR HIS RESIDENCE, APARTMENT B. THE DETECTIVE, WHO WAS MANNING UNIT 1227, AUTHORED THE WARRANT, WHICH WAS ULTIMATELY APPROVED BY MAGISTRATE COMMISSIONER. THAT SEARCH WARRANT WAS OBTAINED UNDER NOPD ITEM. THE ENTIRETY OF THE WARRANT’S EXECUTION WAS CAPTURED BY A BODY-WORN CAMERA WORN BY THE DETECTIVE.”

There was only the reference to an arrest warrant under the EPR:

“A WARRANT FOR SUBJECT’S ARREST WAS OBTAINED FOR SIMPLE BURGLARY OF AN INHABITED DWELLING, AS DEFINED BY LOUISIANA REVISED STATUTE 14, ARTICLE 62.2, ON OCTOBER 11, 2024. THAT WARRANT WAS APPROVED BY MAGISTRATE COMMISSIONER. AFTER LEARNING SUBJECT WAS SENTENCED TO A 24-YEAR PRISON SENTENCE IN 1995, AFTER A CONVICTION FOR SIMPLE BURGLARY OF AN INHABITED DWELLING. HE WAS RELEASED IN 2017 AND PLACED ON PAROLE, WHICH WAS TERMINATED ON APRIL 30, 2018. BECAUSE 10 YEARS HAD NOT PASSED SINCE THE TERMINATION OF HIS PAROLE, HE WAS

INELIGIBLE TO POSSESS, OR OWN, A FIREARM. ON MONDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2024, A SEPARATE WARRANT WAS PREPARED BY THE DETECTIVE FOR FELON IN POSSESSION OF A FIREARM, AS DEFINED BY LOUISIANA REVISED STATUTE 14, ARTICLE 95.1. THAT WARRANT WAS APPROVED BY MAGISTRATE COMMISSIONER.”

Finally, a search warrant was in the NOPD Logbooks and “Cloud Gavel”. **PSAB will credit the audit with having the search warrant logged** but note that the EPR was incorrect in referencing the wrong item to the search warrant.

- Item was for the 1st District and not associated with the 2nd District in any way. **PSAB Response:** Note that “Cloud Gavel” links the warrant to the 2nd District.
- The search of NOPD Rosters notes that the Detective is in the 1st: **PSAB will move the item to the 1st District as requested.**

8th District Review and Request

- Records/Data warrant authored by the detective assigned to Child Abuse. See auditor comments below: (Auditor: LL, Signal: 81 INDECENT BEHAVIOR WITH A JUVENILE, Occurrence Date/Time: 3/16/2025 6:15 PM, Summary: ON SUNDAY, MARCH 17, 2025, AT ABOUT 8:11 PM, DETECTIVE, ASSIGNED TO THE NEW ORLEANS POLICE DEPARTMENT CHILD ABUSE UNIT. **PSAB Response: PSAB will move the item to Child Abuse Unit as requested confirming officer was a CA detective.**
- Search Warrant for Canal Street related to narcotics investigation. This search warrant was handled by SID HIDTA and did not involve any 8th District personnel. **PSAB Response: PSAB will move the item to SID as requested.**

1st District Review and Request

- The detective is not assigned to First District; he is assigned to Sex Crimes unit. The DNA swab test was done at the first district however this is not first district personnel.

PSAB Response: PSAB will move the item to Sex Crimes Unit as requested after confirming officer was a SC detective.

- Unit is an officer who is assigned to the 8th District Bourbon Promenade unit. - There was no BWC footage, however this officer was not assigned to the First District.

PSAB Response: PSAB will move the item to 8th District as requested after confirming officer was an 8th District officer.

Timothy A. Lindsey

Innovation Manager, Auditing

Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau

Appendix A – Search Audit Form

Audit Form Attachment:

Search Warrant Audit Form - Input New

Back

Submit

Identifying Info

Reviewer

Find items

Item Number

Enter the Item number from the sampling spreadsheet.

Related Item Numbers including Other Identifying Info

Please attempt to find all related Item numbers and list them here, as well as other pertinent identifying information.

District/Division

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

Reporting Month

Reporting Year

Find items

Find items

Find items

Warrant Info

CD 127: If you suspect an officer relied on information he or she knew to be materially false or incorrect to apply for the search warrant, contact your supervisor. CD 127 reads: NOPD officers shall not use race, color, ethnicity, national origin, religion, gender, disability, sexual orientation, or gender identity in exercising discretion to ... seek a search warrant, except as part of an actual and apparently credible description of a specific suspect or suspects in any criminal investigation.

Search Warrant Type

What type of search warrant or search warrant application is this? You can pick more than one. If this search warrant or search warrant application is for a body cavity search, you must also complete the SSA Incident, SSA Subject, and Strip/Cavity audit forms.

Logged

Was this search warrant or search warrant application logged?

Reviewed Before Filing

Was the search warrant or search warrant application reviewed by the supervisor before the officer filed the search warrant affidavit/application?

- If the search warrant processed through CloudGavel, choose "Yes"
- If paper and a log entry exists, and the Date of Review is the same date or earlier than the Warrant Date, select "Yes"
- If paper and no log entry exists, select "No Log Entry". CD 136

Find items

Find items

Find items

Does the search warrant include a copy of the search warrant application or affidavit? CD 135

App has PC

Does the search warrant application/affidavit include a clear description of the reason(s) [legal basis, probable cause] for the request to search? CD 135

PC in App Consistent with Reports

Is the Probable Cause description in the search warrant application/affidavit generally consistent with the police report(s)?

App Specifies Place or Thing

Is the search warrant application/affidavit specific about the items or possible evidence that are the purpose/target of the search? See search warrant lesson plan for guidance on "specificity." And discuss with experienced officers. CD 135

App Specifies Target Items

Is the search warrant application/affidavit specific about the items or possible evidence that are the purpose/target of the search? See search warrant lesson plan for guidance on "specificity." And discuss with experienced officers. CD 135

No Avoidable Mistakes in App

Compare the return of search to the application/affidavit. Does it appear there were no avoidable mistakes in the application/affidavit? An incorrect address in the application/affidavit is an example of an avoidable mistake. CD 135

No Boilerplate in App

Does the search warrant application/affidavit avoid the use of boilerplate language?

- Yes - No Boilerplate Language.
- No - Boilerplate Language Used.

CD 136

No Boilerplate in App Comments

No Knock Requested

Did the officer seek a no knock warrant?

No Knock Needed Per Policy

If the officer sought a no knock warrant, did the officer have reasonable suspicion that the potentially lethal risks of entering unannounced are outweighed by the risk of not entering? E.g. were there clear facts and circumstances establishing that the officers or another person would be harmed unless they made immediate, unannounced entry, and that risk of harm outweighed the potentially lethal risks of entering unannounced? Ch 1.2.4.2 paras. 3-4

No Knock Needed Comments

No Knock Granted by Judge

If the officer requested a no knock warrant, did the judge grant it?

Find items ▼

Risk Assessment

Risk Assessment Appropriate

Based on all information available to you, is the risk assessment appropriate? See Ch 1.2.4.2 p38, risk assessment form, and other documentation. The No-risk section of the Warrant Log is all that is required for no-risk warrants. Risk assessment forms are required for moderate and high-risk warrants. If a risk assessment does not exist and the search warrant was not executed, choose "Not Executed."

Find items 

Appropriate Risk Level

Based on all the information available to you, including the the risk assessment form, policy, and guidance, what risk level is appropriate? The risk assessment form, the log, and policy define the risk levels.

Find items 

Risk Assessment Appropriate Comments

Operational Plan

Op Plan Exists

If the search warrant was executed, is there an operational plan for this search warrant? If this is a no-risk search warrant, choose "No-Risk." If this is a moderate-risk search warrant and the SOD did not execute the warrant, use the information in the log to verify that the operational plan exists. If SOD executed the warrant, look for a corresponding SOD SWAT report. CD 138

Find items 

Op Plan Prepared in Advance

If the search warrant was executed, does documentation show the operational plan occurred before the search warrant was executed? If executed by SOD, does the SWAT Report show the Planning Details: Briefing Date/Time is before the Entry Details: Execution Date/Time? If this is a no-risk search warrant, choose "No-Risk." CD 138

Find items 

Supervisor Assisted with Op Plan

If the search warrant was executed, does documentation show a supervisor assisted with creating the operational plan? If executed by SOD, does the SWAT Report document the supervisor that assisted with the operational plan? (Planning Details: Planning Supervisor is not blank) If this is a no-risk search warrant, choose "No-Risk." CD 138

Find items 

Op Plan Covers Appendix A

If an operational plan exists, does it cover the risk and planning factors in Appendix A of Ch 1.2.4.2? Check all that are covered.

Find items 

Op Plan Sufficient

If an operational plan exists, is it sufficient? I.E. did it sufficiently cover all the relevant topics in Appendix A of Ch 1.2.4.2?

Find items 

Op Plan Comments

Video/BWC Info

BWC Complete Num

Document the number of officers participating in the execution of the search warrant who had complete video in the numerator.

BWC Complete Denom

Document the number of officers participating in the execution of the search warrant in the denominator. If the search warrant was not executed, enter 0/0. Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 25

BWC Complete Comments

Reports and Videos Consistent

Are the reports and videos significantly consistent? CD 123, 136

Reports and Videos Consistent Comments

Execution Info

Knock Announce Wait

Did the officer(s) knock and announce their presence and wait for a reasonable time for the occupants to answer the door when executing the search warrant? Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 20

No Knock On Scene Reassessment Documented in EPR

If the officer requested no knock entry in the search warrant application and the judge granted it, does the EPR document that the officer affirmatively assessed whether a no-knock entry remained necessary at the time of warrant service? Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 21

No Knock Authority Announced After Entry

If this was a no-knock entry, did the officers announce their authority loudly and clearly once they made entry? Ch. 1.2.4.2. p 24

Unplanned No Knock Changed Circumstances Documented

If this was an unplanned no knock entry, did the officer document the changed circumstances that constituted exigent circumstances and necessitated the unannounced entry? Ch 1.2.4.2 p 23 a i

Unplanned No Knock Facts Preventing Judge Approval Documented

If this was an unplanned no knock entry, did the officer document the facts that prevented seeking judicial approval? Ch. 1.2.4.2. p 23 a ii

Unplanned No Knock Facts Preventing Command Approval Documented

If this was an unplanned no knock entry, did the officers document the facts that prevented seeking command level approval, if applicable? Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 23 a iii

Unplanned No Knock Reviewed and Approved by Deputy Chief

If this was an unplanned no knock entry, did the relevant deputy chief review and approve documentation of the changed circumstances and supervisory approval or the reasons no approval was sought? Ch. 1.2.4.2 p 23 b

Unplanned No Knock Facts Given to Judge

If this was an unplanned no knock entry, was documentation of the changed circumstances and the reasons it was not practical to seek judicial authorization in advance provided to the judge? Ch. 1.2.4.2 p

Supervisor Present for Execution

Does video show a supervisor was present for the execution of the search warrant? CD 138

Non-Occupants Detained

Does video or documentation show any nonoccupants detained during the execution of the search warrant?

Non-Occupants Detained Details

Non-Occupants Detained No Longer than Necessary

If so, does video show they were detained for only the amount of time necessary to secure the area or to determine whether they were occupants of the premises being searched? CD 139, Ch. 1.2.4.2 P26

RS for Detaining Non-Occupants

If video shows non-occupants were detained for longer than reasonably necessary to secure the area or to determine if they were occupants, does the EPR document reasonable suspicion that the person was involved in criminal activity or posed a danger to officer safety? CD 139, Ch. 1.2.4.2 P27

Evidence Info

Evidence Documented SW

If evidence was seized, was it documented to CE+P receipt? A CE+P receipt should be attached to an EPR. They can also be in DTS. CD 150

Evidence Submitted Immediately SW

If evidence was seized, was it submitted to CE+P before ETOD? Review the Chain of Custody History report in BEAST and the units CAD activity. The date/time the item was "submitted into property" must be before ETOD. CD 150

Evidence Description Matches Video SW

If evidence was seized, does the description on the receipt match the evidence as seen on video? CD 123

Evidence Description Matches Video SW

If evidence was seized, and there is a CE+P receipt, does the description on the receipt match the evidence as seen on video? CD 123

After Action Info

After Action Report Exists

Does an after action report exist for this search warrant? After action reports are required for moderate and high-risk warrants. They are not required for no-risk warrants. If the search warrant was executed by SOD, the SOD Tactical Report for the search warrant includes the after action report. CD 138

After Action Report Documented by Supervisor

Does the log/SWAT Report show the After Action Report was documented by a Supervisor? CD 138

After Action Report w/in 24 Hrs

Was the warrant log entry submitted, including a complete After Action Report Section, within 24 hours after the search warrant was executed? CD 138

Supervisory Info

Non-Compliance Should Have Been Addressed SW

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

 

Supervisor Aware Non-Compliance

Did the supervisor know or should have known about the non-compliance?

 

SFLIDs-CNTRL Nos SW

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

Non-Compliance Addressed by Supervisor

Did a supervisor address all the non-compliance you found above? CD 137, 144, 146, 151

 

After Action Report Contains Required Elements

Does the after-action report cover the relevant assessment topics? Check all that are covered.
Ch 1.2.4.2 p 43

 

After Action Report Sufficient

Does the after-action report sufficiently address the execution of the search warrant?

 

After Action Report Comments

Supervisory Info

Supervisory Review Comments SW

Auditor Comments SW

Reviewer Comments SW

Appendix B – Report Distribution

Superintendent

Chief Deputy Superintendent Field Operations Bureau

Deputy Superintendent Investigation Services Bureau

Deputy Superintendent Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau

Assistant City Attorney