



Use of Force Audit Report January 2025 (Final)

Report # UOF012025

(Data Sample – July 2024 – December 2024)

Submitted by PSAB: February 10, 2025

Response from FOB: February 12, 2025

Final Report Submitted: February 24, 2025

Previous Audit Published: August 30, 2024

Audit Team

This audit was managed and conducted by the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau

Executive Summary

The Audit and Review Unit (ARU) of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau (PSAB) initiated a Use of Force Audit in January 2025. The audit universe covered the period from July 1 to December 31, 2024. This audit is conducted to ensure that New Orleans Police Department (NOPD) officers' "Use of Force" and follow-up investigations are conducted in accordance with the rights secured or protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States. NOPD agrees to ensure that audits are conducted professionally and effectively, to elicit accurate and reliable information.

This process is regulated by Consent Decree (CD) paragraphs 54, 56, 67, 78, 79, 81, 86, 87, and 88. Also, Chapter 1.3.6 Reporting Use of Force, Chapter 1.7.1 Conducted Energy Weapon (CEW), Chapter 41.3.8 In Car Camera, Chapter 41.3.10 BWC.

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

- Level 1-4 Use of Force. The L1-L4 audit addresses twenty-eight (28) checklist questions.
- Unreported Use of Force. The Unreported Use of Force addresses four (4) checklist questions.

For report clarity, the levels of reported use of force as defined in Chapter 1.3.6, paragraph 10, are listed on page 7 of report.

Number of non-compliant L1-L4 Checklist Questions (6):

- Q9:** CEW was Reviewed by Investigating Supervisor, if Activated (L2-L4) - **(92%)**
- Q19:** Supervisor's UoF Investigation Submitted within 72 hrs. or Extension Requested (L1-L4) – **(91%)**
- Q20:** Supervisor's UoF Extension Request Sent to Division Captain (L1-L4) – **(88%)**
- Q21:** Supervisor's approved use of force report submitted to FIT within the required 21 Days from Incident Date– **(57%)**
- Q22:** Reasonableness of Force was Documented (L1-L4) – **(94%)**
- Q32:** Officer Force Statement(s) Submitted by ETOD (L1-L4) – **(90%)**

Number of non-compliant L4 – OIS (Officer Involved Shooting) or ASI (Administrative Shooting Investigation) Checklist Questions: (None audited this period)

Number of Non-Compliant Unreported Use of Force Questions: None (0)

Universe Used to Create L1-L2 Sample **(151)**

Universe Used to Create L3 Sample **(3)**

Universe Used to Create L4 Sample **(6)**

Universe Used to Create Unreported Use of Force Sample **(369)**

L1-L4 (Non-OIS/ASI) Sample Target to Audit (52):

The sample target represented 25% of available L1-L2 entries (43)

The sample target represented 50% of available L3 entries (3)

The sample target represented 100% of available L4 entries (6)

Unreported Use of Force Sample Target to Audit (340):

The sample target represented 92% of available Unreported Use of Force entries.

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

The overall score of the Use of Force L1-L4 Audit is as follows: Overall – **96%**

The overall score of the Unreported Use of Force Audit is as follows: Overall – **100%**

The overall score of the Use of Force Review Board (UFRB) meeting reviews: Overall – **100%**

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

Table of Contents (Phase I)

Executive Summary	2
Introduction	5
Initiating and Conducting the Use of Force Audit	7
List of Case Files Reviewed by Auditor	8
Use of Force Scorecard Table 1 (L1-4).....	9
Use of Force Scorecard Table 2 (L4 ASI-Shooting)	11
Unreported Use of Force Scorecard Table 3	12
Case File Reviews – Table 1 Checklist (L1-4)	13
Case File Reviews – Table 2 Checklist (L4 ASI).....	16
Unreported Use of Force – Results	17
Use of Force Review Board (UFRB) Checklist	19
Compliance Score	19
<i>Final Results</i>	<i>19</i>
Conclusions (Final).....	19
Recommendations.....	21
Use of Force Responses & PSAB Notes:	22
Appendix C – Report Distribution	28

Introduction

The Auditing and Review Unit (ARU) of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted an audit of Use of Force Level 1 to 4 incidents. The time span to conduct the audit was from January 7, 2025, to January 31, 2024. Audits, which involve reviews of the Use of Force Review Board (UOFRB) meetings and subsequent follow-up, are conducted after each scheduled meeting, and will be reported in a separate report at year-end.

Purpose

The Use of Force audit is conducted to verify departmental compliance with the Consent Decree and NOPD Operations Manual as it pertains to “Use of Force” and the subsequent investigations.

Consent Decree (CD) paragraphs include 54, 56, 67, 78, 79, 81, 86, 87, and 88. The following are the NOPD Policy Chapters involved:

Chapter 1.3.6 Reporting Use of Force

Chapter 1.7.1 Conducted Energy Weapon (CEW)

Chapter 41.3.8 In Car Camera

Chapter 41.3.10 BWC

Scope

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

- Whether involved officers appropriately complied with pre-use-of-force requirements (e.g., de-escalation, warnings)
- Whether audited uses of force are consistent with policy and law
- Whether involved officers appropriately complied with post-use-of-force requirements (e.g., immediate notifications, provision of medical aid)
- Whether the involved officers and witness officers completed required reports
- Whether supervisors responded to the scene of uses of force, when required
- Whether supervisors appropriately investigated uses of force, including reviews of available recordings
- Whether supervisors appropriately reviewed use-of-force reports
- Whether the chain of command appropriately reviewed use-of-force reports
- Whether potentially out-of-policy uses of force resulted in referral to Public Integrity Bureau
- Whether the Use of Force Review Board appropriately evaluated serious use of force incidents.

Methodology

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

Sample size – 25% of Level 1 and 2, 50% of Level 3 incidents, 100% of Level 4 incidents.

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

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

Testing Instrument(s) – New Orleans Police Department Operations Manual Chapters and thirty-two (32) L1-L4 Checklist questions and twenty-six (26) L4 Shooting (ASI) Checklist questions.

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

Data

The audit range can be set quarterly (3 months) or semi-annually (6 months). This review encompassed a period of six (6) months. The FIT IAPro system file dump provides the ARU team with all item numbers that were investigated and completed during that audit period. ARU then takes those item numbers and enters them into the EXCEL’s randomizer generator for items to be selected for review. ARU then reviews 25% of the L1-L2 items, 50% of the L3 items and all L4 (if any exist), within the audit range.

The use of force audit’s sample size consisted of **43** randomly selected L1-L2 case files, **3** L-3 case file, **6** L-4 case files, for a total of **54** auditable incidents. In addition, **369** report files were selected to be audited for potential unreported use of force. The use of force sample is derived using EXCEL’s “RAND” function and using a weighted count from each district to parse the sample equitably. The raw data for both samples used was for the period of July to December of 2024.

The unreported use of force data is comprised of **4** separate data dumps from the EPR (Electronic Police Reports) data system.

- EPR dump of reports where an **officer was injured** for the audit range selected for review.
- EPR dump of reports where a **suspect was injured** for the same audit range.
- EPR dump of reports where **injury in custody** is reported for the same audit range.
- EPR dump reports of **resisting arrest** for the same audit range.

Each report from the dumps is reviewed for information where an action might have led to a use of force. The auditor will first check the Blue Team/IAPro system to see if the report had a reported use of force. Also, if the auditor determines there might be an unreportable use of force, the video is then reviewed as well. Any potential use of force identified as unreported will be noted in the report and sent to the district for further review and if necessary, will proceed with a formal disciplinary investigation.

Initiating and Conducting the Use of Force Audit

The initial raw data was downloaded from the IAPro system on January 6, 2025, to prep the sample distribution file that would be utilized by ARU, for the current audit.

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

Each item case file was then systematically reviewed via “double-blind” audit process by the Auditing and Review Unit, based on each case file’s compliance with the New Orleans Police Department Operations Manual Chapters, as it relates to “Use of Force” investigations. To facilitate this process, the team used the twenty-eight (28) point Use of Force audit checklist from the protocol document, as the tool to review and analyze the content of every case file.

Levels of Reported Use of Force Definitions:

- Level-1 uses of force include pointing a firearm at a person and hand control or escort techniques (e.g., elbow grip, wrist grip, or shoulder grip) applied as pressure point compliance techniques that are not reasonably expected to cause injury; takedowns that do not result in actual injury or complaint of injury; and use of an impact weapon for non-striking purposes (e.g., prying limbs, and moving or controlling a person) that does not result in actual injury or complaint of injury. It does not include escorting, touching, or handcuffing a person with minimal or no resistance.
- Level-2 uses of force include use of a CEW (including where a CEW is fired at a person but misses); the use of “flash bangs” and “aerial flash bangs” to compel compliance from an unwilling subject (see paragraph 71(c)); a canine deployment resulting in an apprehension without contact and force that causes or could reasonably be expected to cause an injury greater than transitory pain but does not rise to a Level 3 use of force.
- Level-3 uses of force include any strike to the head (except for a strike with an impact weapon); use of impact weapons when contact is made (except to the head), regardless of injury; a canine deployment resulting in an apprehension contact or that is not a bite or the destruction of an animal.
- Level-4 uses of force include all ‘serious uses of force’ including: (a) All uses of lethal force by an NOPD officer; (b) All critical firearm discharges by an NOPD officer. (c) All uses of force by an NOPD officer resulting in serious physical injury or requiring hospitalization. (d) All neck holds; (e) All uses of force by an NOPD officer resulting in a loss of consciousness. (f) All canine bites; (g) More than two applications of a CEW on an individual during a single interaction, regardless of the mode or duration of the application, and whether the applications are by the same or different officers, or CEW application for 15 seconds or longer, continuous, or consecutive. (h) Any strike, blow, kick, CEW application, or similar use of force against a handcuffed subject; and (i) Any vehicle pursuit resulting in death, serious physical injury, or injuries requiring hospitalization. (j) Any use of specialized weapons, such as gas dispersants, the use of “flash bangs” and “aerial flash bangs” or impact rounds for the purposes of crowd control (See Chapter 46.2.1 – Response to First Amendment Assemblies, Mass Demonstrations, and Civil Disturbances), including the munitions listed Chapter 46.2.1) app E.

Number Case Files Reviewed

The following is a breakdown of the case files reviewed during “double-blind” review:

L1-L3 (Table 1) - Total: (46) L1–L3 Case Files

L4 – (Table 1 (Non-ASI) - Total: (6) L4 Case Files

Use of Force Scorecard Table 1 (L1-4)

The following checklist below was used by the auditing team to review each L1-L3 case file.

Use of Force Level 1 - 4 Checklist Audit (Table 1)

Report Period: January, 2025

ARU percentages for Consent Decree requirements for Use of Force Level 1-4 Checklist Audit for data reviewed between July-Dec 2024.

Check-List Questions	Score	Y	N	U	NA	NA Explanations	Consent Decree #	NOPD Policy Chapters
USE OF FORCE REPORTING								
1 Supervisor Responded to the Incident (L2-L4)	100%	26	0	0	26	26 were N/A (not applicable) where supervisors are not required to make scene for L-1 events.	84, 86(a)	Ch 1.3.6 p25, Ch. 1.7.1 p77, p80, p90
2 BWC was Activated Per Policy (L1-L4)	96%	44	2	0	6	6 were N/A (not applicable). 2 N/As were paid detail (no BWC worn); 1 NA was accidental K9 bite (Officer not on a crime scene) 1 BCW is not assigned to the detective, 2 Off Duty Officer.	Ch 41.3.10	Ch 41.3.10 p11
3 BWC was Reviewed by Investigating Supervisor (L2-L4)	100%	43	0	0	9	9 were N/A (not applicable). 2 NAs were off duty officers (no BWC worn); 1 NA was accidental K9 bite No BWC. (Officer not on a crime scene, BWC not on). 1 NA a detective as involved and they are not assigned body worn cameras. 5 NA Not L2-L4	86(d)	Ch 1.3.6 p33, Ch. 41.3.10 p35
4 BWC's Complete (BWCs Found/BWCs Expected)	97%	120	4				Ch 41.3.11	Ch 41.3.10 p12
5 Dash Cam (In Car Camera) was Activated Per Policy (L1-L4)	96%	23	1	0	28	28 were N/A (not applicable). 28 - NA dashcams not relevant to the viewing of the use of force; not in sight of incident.	Ch 41.3.8	Ch 41.3.8 p14
6 Dash Cam (In Car Camera) was Reviewed by Supervisor (L2-L4)	100%	20	0	0	32	32 were N/A (not applicable) 32 -NA Not L2/L3 Not required.	86(d)	Ch 1.3.6 p33
7 BWC's Labelled Correctly	98%	45	1	0	6	6 were N/A (not applicable) no footage.	86(d)	Ch 1.3.6 p33
8 If CEW was Activated, it was within Policy (L2-L4)	100%	12	0	0	40	40 were N/A (not applicable) 40 NA- Not a CEW related incident.	54	Ch 1.3.6 p28, p33
9 CEW was Reviewed by Investigating Supervisor, if Activated (L2-L4)	92%	11	1	0	40	40 NA - Non-CEW related.	67	Ch 1.3.6 p33, Ch. 1.7.1 p 91, p104, p106, p113
10 Officer was Checked For Injuries (L2-L4)	100%	22	0	0	30	30 were N/A (not applicable). 21 NA Not L2-L4; 1 NA subject did not come in contact with the officer; 8 NAs the officer was not injured.	86(d)	Ch 1.3.6 p28, p33
11 Photograph(s) taken of Officer Injuries, if applicable (L2-L4)	100%	12	0	0	40	40 were N/A (not applicable) 40 NA - No officer injuries.	86(d)	Ch 1.3.6 p33, Ch. 1.7.1 p107(c), p79, p80
12 Subject of Force was Checked For Injuries (L2-L4)	97%	29	1	0	22	22 were N/A (not applicable) 18 NA Not L2-L4; 4 NA Subject not injured.	86(a)	Ch 1.3.6 p24, Ch. 1.7.1, p74, p78, p84
13 Photograph(s) taken of Subject of Force Injuries, if applicable (L1-L4)	100%	22	0	0	30	30 were N/A (not applicable). 30 NA - No injuries of subject. t	86(d)	Ch 1.3.6 p33, Ch. 1.7.1 p107(c), p79, p80
14 Subject of Force Interviewed (L2-L4)	100%	22	0	0	30	30 were N/A (not applicable). 30 NA L1 only (2 other L1, subjects interviewed)	86(a)	Ch 1.3.6 p28
15 Subject of Force Interview Exists (Recorded) (L2-L4)	96%	22	1	0	29	29 were N/A (not applicable). 29 NA L1 only	86(a)	Ch 1.3.6 p28
16 Supervisor Avoided Leading Questions (L2-L4)	100%	21	0	0	31	31 were N/A (not applicable) due to supervisor interview unavailable due to no recording of interview/interview not required for L1	86(f)	Ch 1.3.6 p24
17 Canvass for Civilian Witness(es) was Made (L2-L4)	100%	17	0	0	35	35 were N/A (not applicable). Of the total number of NA's, 35 were Not L2-L4	86(e)	Ch 1.3.6 p24, Ch. 1.7.1 p. 82
18 Supervisor GIST Submitted by ETOD (L1-L4)	96%	50	2	0	0	NA	87	Ch 1.3.6 p28, Ch. 1.3 p21(e), Ch. 1.7.1 p45
19 Supervisor's UoF Investigation Submitted within 72 hrs or Extension Requested (L1-L4)	91%	42	4	0	6	NA - Investigated by FTT directly.	88	Ch 1.3.6 p32
20 Supervisor's UoF Extension Request Sent to Division Captain (L1-L4)	88%	36	5	0	11	11 were N/A (not applicable) due to no extension request being made for the use of force report	88	Ch 1.3.6 p32
21 Supervisor's approved use of force report submitted to FTT within the required 21 Days from Incident Date:	57%	26	20	0	6	6 was N/A (not applicable) due to the use of force being considered a Level 4 and the incident was handled by FTT.	89	Ch 1.3.6 p32
22 Reasonableness of Force was Documented (L1-L4)	94%	48	3	0	1	1 NA Accidental Canine Bite involved.	88(a)	Ch 1.3.6 p31, Ch. 1.7.1 p5, p46
23 Equip, Training or Policy Issues were Addressed by Supervisor (L1-L4)	100%	52	0	0	0	NA	86(c), 88(a,d,e)	Ch 1.3.6 p28, p33
FORCE STATEMENTS								
24 Force Statement(s) Found (L1-L4)	100%	52	0	0	0		78, 81	Ch 1.3.6 p16, p18
25 Reason(s) for Encounter Documented in Force Statement(s) (L1-L4)	100%	52	0	0	0	NA	78	Ch 1.3.6 p16, Ch. 1.7.1, p36
26 Force Details Documented (L1-L4)	98%	51	1	0	0	NA	78	Ch 1.3.6 p16, Ch. 1.7.1, p36
27 Report established officer had reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop subject:	98%	49	1	0	2	1 NA no crime occurred accidental K9 bite; 1 N/A (officer entered into the wrong residence)	122/123	Ch 1.2.4.1 p12
28 CEW force statements consistent w/videos (L2-L4)	100%	12	0	0	40	40 were N/A. 40 NA - Non-CEW related	67	Ch 1.3.6 p33, Ch. 1.7.1 p 91, p104, p106, p113
29 Each CEW cycle was Justified within Policy, if Activated (L2-L4)	100%	12	0	0	40	40 were N/A. 40 NA - Non-CEW related.	56	Ch 1.3.6 p31, Ch. 1.7.1, p.53, p57
30 # CEW cycles explained in force statement / Total # CEW cycles	100%	25	0				57	Ch 1.3.6 p31, Ch. 1.7.1, p.53, p57
31 Boilerplate Language was avoided in Force Statement(s) (L1-L4)	100%	52	0	0	0	NA	79	Ch 1.3.6 p17
32 Officer Force Statement(s) Submitted by ETOD (L1-L4)	90%	47	5	0	0	NA	78	Ch 1.3.6 p6, p19
Total	96%	1,117	52	-	540			

General Comments

ARU audited the Use of Force Level 1-4 sample list case files for the defined period, for completeness and accuracy as required by the Consent Decree.

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

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

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

Scores below 95% are highlighted in red.

Use of Force Level 1-4 Checklist Audit By District

Report Period: January 2025

ARU percentages for Consent Decree requirements for Use of Force Level 1-4 Checklist Audit for data reviewed between July - Dec 2024.

		District/Unit												
Check-List Questions		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	SOD	FIT	ISB	Overall Score	
Use of Force Reporting														
1	Supervisor Responded to the Incident (I.2-I.4)	100%	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
2	BWC was Activated Per Policy (L1-L4)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	83%	89%	100%	100%	100%	100%	96%	
3	BWC was Reviewed by Investigating Supervisor (I.2-I.4)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
4	BWC's Complete (BWCs Found/BWCs Expected)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	89%	93%	96%	100%	100%	100%	97%	
5	Dash Cam (In Car Camera) was Activated Per Policy (L1-L4)	-	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	83%	100%	100%	100%	-	96%	
6	Dash Cam (In Car Camera) was Reviewed by Investigating Supervisor (I.2-I.4)	-	100%	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	-	100%	
7	BWC's Labelled Correctly	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	88%	100%	100%	100%	98%	
8	If CEW was Activated, it was within Policy (I.2-I.4)	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
9	CEW was Reviewed by Investigating Supervisor, if Activated (I.2-I.4)	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	50%	100%	92%	
10	Officer was Checked For Injuries (I.2-I.4)	100%	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
11	Photograph(s) taken of Officer Injuries, if applicable (I.2-I.4)	-	-	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	
12	Subject of Force was Checked For Injuries (I.2-I.4)	100%	100%	100%	100%	67%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	97%	
13	Photograph(s) taken of Subject of Force Injuries, if applicable (L1-L4)	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
14	Subject of Force Interviewed (I.2-I.4)	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
15	Subject of Force Interview Exists (Recorded) (I.2-I.4)	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	75%	100%	96%	
16	Supervisor Avoided Leading Questions (I.2-I.4)	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	
17	Canvass for Civilian Witness(es) was Made (I.2-I.4)	100%	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	
18	Supervisor GIST Submitted by ETOD (L1-L4)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	83%	89%	100%	100%	100%	100%	96%	
19	Supervisor's UoF Investigation Submitted within 72 hrs or Extension Requested(L1-L4)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	83%	78%	100%	100%	-	75%	91%	
20	Supervisor's UoF Extension Request Sent to Division Captain (L1-L4)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	67%	83%	100%	83%	-	75%	88%	
21	Supervisor's approved use of force report submitted to FIT within the required 21 Days from Incident Date:	100%	0%	100%	33%	33%	50%	67%	75%	83%	-	0%	57%	
22	Reasonableness of Force was Documented (L1-L4)	100%	100%	100%	33%	100%	100%	89%	100%	100%	100%	100%	94%	
23	Equip, Training or Policy Issues were Addressed by Supervisor (L1-L4)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Force Statements														
24	Force Statement(s) Found (L1-L4)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
25	Reason(s) for Encounter Documented in Force Statement(s) (L1-L4)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
26	Force Details Documented (L1-L4)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	83%	100%	98%	
27	Report established officer had reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop subject:	100%	67%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%	
28	CEW force statements consistent w/videos (I.2-I.4)	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
29	Each CEW cycle was Justified within Policy, if Activated (I.2-I.4)	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
30	# CEW cycles explained in force statement / Total # CEW cycles	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
31	Boilerplate Language was avoided in Force Statement(s) (L1-L4)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
32	Officer Force Statement(s) Submitted by ETOD (L1-L4)	100%	100%	50%	100%	100%	83%	89%	100%	100%	100%	50%	90%	
Total		100%	92%	97%	94%	96%	95%	95%	99%	98%	98%	91%	96%	

General Comments

ARU audited the Use of Force Level 1-4 sample list case files for the defined period, for completeness and accuracy as required by the Consent Decree.

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

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

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

Scores below 95% are highlighted in red.

Use of Force Scorecard Table 2 (L4 ASI-Shooting)

The Audit and Review team audited no L4 shootings during this audit period.

Unreported Use of Force Scorecard Table 3

The following checklist below was used by the auditing team to review each unreported use of force case file. Scorecard details are on page 9. Of the 369 items in the universe, 340 required further review and none were determined to be un-reported uses of force, 23 were deemed reportable use of force with associated FTNs, 313 were deemed no use of force, and 4 were outside agency involved.

Use of Force - Un-Reported

Report Period: January 2025

ARU percentages for Consent Decree requirements for Un-Reported Use of Force Checklist Audit.

Sample Period: July - Dec 2024

Check-List Questions			Score	Y	N	U	NA
1	BWC Located for Incident	100%	23				317
4	BWC Reflected a Use of Force	100%	23	-	-		317
5	Use of Force Reported	100%	23	-	-		317
6	EPR reflected a Use of Force	100%	23	-	-		317
Total			92	-	-		1,268

General Comments:

ARU assessed the Unreported use of force for items for the defined period, for completeness and accuracy as required by the Consent Decree.

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

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

Data was retrieved from the following EPR categories: Injuries in Custody, Resisting Arrest, Police Injured, Suspect Injured.

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

Worksheet (July - Dec 2024)

Types of Injuries Audited	Universe	# Cross-Referenced to UoF Tracker	# Reviewed by Auditors	# Reviewed that Showed No UoF	# Reviewed UoF (Was Reported per IAPro)	# Reviewed Unreported UoF	# Non-NOPD UoF	Comments
Injuries In Custody - EPR	17	6	11	10	1	0	0	
Resisting Arrest - EPR	11	0	11	9	2	0	0	
Police Injured - EPR	22	7	15	14	1	0	0	
Suspect Injured - EPR	319	16	303	280	19	0	4	SUNO, State Trooper, FBI
Total	369	29	340	313	23	0	4	

Case File Reviews – Table 1 Checklist (L1-4)

The below-listed information reveals the outcome of the Audit Team's table 1 checklist reviews.

1. **Did the supervisor respond to the incident, if required?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 26 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 26 were N/A (not applicable) where supervisors are not required to make scene for L-1 events.
2. **Was the BWC activated per policy?** The overall score for this category was **96%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 44 were audited as positive, 2 were negative, and 6 were N/A (not applicable). 2 N/As were paid detail (no BWC worn); 1 NA was accidental K9 bite (Officer not on a crime scene) 1 BCW is not assigned to the detective, 2 Off Duty Officer.
3. **Was the BWC reviewed by supervisor as required?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 43 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 9 were N/A (not applicable). 2 NAs were off duty officers (no BWC worn); 1 NA was accidental K9 bite No BWC. (Officer not on a crime scene, BWC not on). 1 NA a detective as involved, and they are not assigned body worn cameras. 5 NA Not L2 –L4
4. **BWCs Complete: BWCs Found: / BWCs Expected:** The overall score for this category was **97%**. Of the 124 BWC's expected, 120 were audited as positive (BWC's found), 4 were negative (BWC's missing). None were N/A (not applicable).
5. **Was the Dash Cam activated per policy?** The overall score for this category was revised to **96%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 23 were audited as positive, 1 negative, and 28 were N/A (not applicable). 28 - NA dashcams not relevant to the viewing of the use of force; not in sight of incident.
6. **Was the dash cam reviewed by supervisor?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 20 were audited as positive, and 32 were N/A (not applicable) 32 -NA Not L2/L3 Not required.
7. **Were the BWCs labelled correctly?** The overall score for this category was **98%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 45 were audited as positive, 1 was negative, and 6 were N/A (not applicable) no footage.
8. **If CEW was activated, was it within policy?** The overall score for this category was **100%** Of the 52 cases reviewed, 12 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 40 were N/A (not applicable) 40 NA- Not a CEW related incident.
9. **Was CEW reviewed by supervisor, if activated?** The overall score for this category was **92%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 11 were audited positive, 1 was negative and 40 were N/A. 40 NA - Non-CEW related.
10. **Was the officer checked for injuries (L2-L4)?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 22 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 30 were N/A (not applicable). 21 NA Not L2-L4; 1 NA subject did not encounter the officer; 7 NAs the officer was not injured.

11. **Was photograph(s) taken of officer injuries, if occurred?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 12 were audited as positive, none were negative and 40 were N/A (not applicable) 40 NA - No officer injuries.
12. **Was the subject of force checked for injuries?** The overall score for this category was **97%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 29 were audited as positive, 1 was negative, and 22 were N/A (not applicable) 18 NA Not L2-L4; 4 NA Subject not injured.
13. **Was photograph(s) taken of subject of force injuries, if occurred?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 22 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 30 were N/A (not applicable). 30 NA - No injuries of subject.
14. **Was the subject of Force Interviewed?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 22 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 30 were N/A (not applicable). 30 NA L1 only (2 other L1, subjects interviewed).
15. **Does the subject of force interview exist?** The overall score for this category was **96%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 22 were audited as positive, 1 was negative, and 29 were N/A (not applicable). 29 NA L1 only
16. **Did the supervisor avoid leading questions (L1-L4)?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 21 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 31 were N/A (not applicable) due to supervisor interview unavailable due to no recording of interview/interview not required for L1.
17. **A canvass for civilian witness(es) was conducted, if applicable (L1-L4)?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 17 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 35 were N/A (not applicable). Of the total number of NA's, 35 were Not L2-L4.
18. **Was the supervisor GIST submitted by end of the tour of duty (ETOD)?** The overall score for this category was **96%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 50 were audited as positive, 2 were negative.
19. **Was the supervisor's UoF investigation submitted within 72 hrs. of incident (L1-L4)?** The overall score for this category was **91%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 42 were audited as positive, and 4 were negative, 6 were N/A (not applicable) PIB took over.
20. **Was the supervisor's UoF investigation extension request sent to division captain (L1-L4)?** The overall score for this category was **88%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 36 were audited as positive, 5 were negative, and 11 were N/A (not applicable) due to no extension request being made for the use of force.
21. **Was the supervisor's UoF report submitted to FIT within the required 21 days from Incident Date?** The overall score for this category was **57%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 26 were audited as positive, 20 was negative, and 6 was N/A (not applicable) due to the use of force being considered a Level 4 and the incident was handled by FIT.
22. **Was the reasonableness of force documented (L1-L4)?** The overall score for this category was **94%**.

Of the 52 cases reviewed, 48 were audited as positive, 3 were negative, and 1 was N/A (not applicable). 1 NA Accidental Canine Bite involved.

23. **Were Equip, Training or Policy Issues addressed by supervisor (L1-L4)?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 52 were audited as positive, none were negative, none were N/A.
24. **Were the required force statement(s) found?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, all 52 were audited as positive, none were negative, and none were N/A (not applicable).
25. **Were the reason(s) for encounter documented in force statement(s)?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 52 were audited as positive, none were negative, and none were N/A (not applicable).
26. **Were the force details documented in the statement(s)?** The overall score for this category was **98%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 51 were audited as positive, 1 was audited as negative, and none were N/A (not applicable).
27. **Did the report establish that the officer had reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop the subject?** The overall score for this category was **98%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, all 49 were audited as positive, 1 was negative, and 2 were N/A (1 NA no crime occurred accidental K9 bite); 1 N/A (officer entered the wrong residence).
28. **Were the CEW force statements consistent with the videos?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 12 were audited positive, none were negative and 40 were N/A. 40 NA - Non-CEW related
29. **Was each CEW cycle justified within policy, if discharged?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 12 were audited positive, none were negative, and 40 were N/A. 40 NA - Non-CEW related.
30. **CEW Cycles Explained: Number of CEW cycles explained in force statement / Total number of CEW cycles:** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, there were 25 explained cycles.
31. **Was boilerplate language avoided in force statement(s)?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 52 were audited as positive, none were audited as negative and none were N/A (not applicable).
32. **Were officers force statement(s) submitted by ETOD?** The overall score for this category was **90%**. Of the 52 cases reviewed, 47 were audited as positive, 5 were negative, and none were N/A (not applicable).

Case File Reviews – Table 2 Checklist (L4 ASI)

The below listed information reveals the outcome of the Audit Team's table 2 checklist reviews. This table is primarily intended to cover police shootings, and not non-shooting events. However, for purposes of the audit, it was decided to review all L4 using the checklist. Most will be non-applicable if not related to a shooting. Per FIT, all L4 non-shooting events can be audited using the L1-L4 checklist, with FIT as the investigator, not the district.

Please note: There were no Level 4 Police Shootings audited during this period.

Unreported Use of Force – Results

The below listed information reveals the outcome of the Audit Team's table 3 checklist reviews.

This audit was conducted using the three Use of Force randomized lists from the Use of Force Protocol for the audit period selected:

- List of EPR reports where an officer was identified as injured.
- List of EPR reports where a suspect was identified as injured.
- List of EPR reports where suspect injured in custody.
- List of EPR reports of where a subject was identified as resisting arrest.

Number of Reports Where an Officer was Injured – 22 (universe)

- Number of Reports where an officer was injured which did not have an associated FTN – Fifteen **(15)**
- Of the 15 Officer remaining injured reports none **(0)** were determined to be Unreported; one **(1)** were cross-referenced with a Reported (FTN), none **(0)** were determined to be outside agency involved, fourteen **(14)** were determined to have no use of force involved

Number of Reports Resisting Arrest – 11 (universe)

- Number of Reports where resisting arrests which did not have an associated FTN – eleven (11)
- Of the eleven **(11)** remaining Resisting Arrests reports none **(0)** were determined to be Unreported; two **(2)** was cross-referenced with a Reported (FTN), nine **(9)** were determined to have no use of force involved, none **(0)** were determined to be outside agency involved.

Number of Reports of Injuries in Custody – 17 (universe)

- Number of Reports where a suspect was injured and in custody which did not have an associated FTN – eleven **(11)**
- Of the eleven **(11)** remaining Injuries in Custody reports none **(0)** were determined to be Unreported; one **(1)** were cross-referenced with a Reported (FTN), ten **(10)** were determined to have no use of force involved.

Number of Reports of Suspect Injured – 319 (universe)

- Number of Reports where a suspect was injured which did not have an associated FTN – three-hundred and three **(303)**
- Of the three-hundred and three **(303)** remaining Suspect Injured reports none **(0)** were determined to be Unreported; nineteen **(19)** were cross-referenced with a Reported (FTN), two-hundred and eighty **(280)** were determined to have no use of force involved, four **(4)** to be outside agency involved.

Scores of 95% or higher are considered substantial compliance. Supervisors should address any noted deficiencies with specific training through In-service Training classes or Daily Training Bulletins (DTBs). This training should be reinforced by close and effective supervision in addition to Supervisor Feedback Logs entries. The overall score of the unreported Use of Force Audit is as follows: Overall – **100%**.

Use of Force Review Board Checklist – Jan 2024 – Dec 2024

Use of Force Review Board Meeting Assessment

ARU percentages for Consent Decree requirements for Use of Force Checklist Audit.

Review Period: Jan 2025

Sample Period: Jan 2024 - Dec 2024

Check-List Questions		Score	Y	N	U	NA
1	Voting Members Were Present As Required.	100%	9	-	-	-
2	Non-Voting Members Were Present As Required (or appointed stand-in as needed).	100%	9	-	-	-
3	Secretary of Board Was Present (or appointed stand-in as needed).	100%	9	-	-	-
4	Secretary of Board Reported Out Any Pending Action(s) from Previous Board Meeting, if applicable.	100%	6	-	-	3
5	This UOFRB Meeting Convened within 30 Days of the Last Meeting (note any exceptions), Meeting Commenced every 30-days	100%	9	-	-	-
6	The Secretary of Board Conducted a Roll Call of all Present for Meeting.	100%	9	-	-	-
7	The Board Meeting convened no longer than 30 days from receipt of a completed FIT Investigation (unless documented exceptions via the Supt of Police)	100%	9	-	-	-
8	UOFRB Heard the Case Presentation From FIT Investigator.	100%	9	-	-	-
9	Affirm or Reject Investigative Recommendations. (Auditor confirmed whether Voting Members agreed or disagreed with the FIT outcome).	100%	9	-	-	-
10	Policy Violation(s) to be Referred to PIB for Disciplinary Action as agreed among Voting Members, if applicable.	100%	5	-	-	4
11	Policy Violation(s) Referred from Last UOFRB Meeting were presented by Board Secretary, if applicable.	100%	6	-	-	3
12	UOFRB Reviewed Incident to determine whether it raised policy, training, equipment, or tactical concerns.	100%	9	-	-	-
13	Non-Disciplinary Corrective Action(s) were Recommended, if applicable.	100%	9	-	-	-
14	Findings and Recommendations in a report (The Meeting Minutes) were sent to UOFRB from FIT within 15-days of the conclusion of the Last Hearing	100%	5	-	-	4
15	The Hearing was recorded as required for UOFRB Audio-Taped Hearings	100%	9	-	-	-
16	Auditor(s) Assessed Force Investigation Team Week Spreadsheet and ensured required incidents brought to the Board for a Hearing	100%	9	-	-	-
Total		100%	130	-	-	14

General Comments

ARU assessed the UOFRB Meetings for the defined period, for completeness and accuracy as required by the Consent Decree.

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

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

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

Scores below 95% are highlighted in red.

Recommendations

It is determined by the Auditing and Review Unit that there are no deficiencies in the UOFRB process currently.

Compliance Score

L1-L4 Checklist- Based on the combined total of one thousand six hundred sixty-four **(1,664)** checklist items rated, from the sample size of fifty-two **(52)** case files audited; the **“score”** of this Use of Force case file checklist audit conducted by the Auditing and Review Unit was **95%**.

L4 ASI Shooting Checklist- **There were no Level 4 shootings audited during this period.**

Unreported Use of Force- Based on the combined total of one thousand, three hundred sixty **(1,360)** checklist items rated, from the sample size of **(340)** case files audited; the **“score”** of this Use of Force case file checklist audit conducted by the Auditing and Review Unit was **100%**.

Use of Force Review Board (UFRB) Meeting assessment - **100%**.

Results

- The Unreported Use of Force overall results of January 2025 Use of Force audit have revealed that **all** checklist questions had compliance threshold scores **above 95%**.
- The L1-L4 overall results of the January Use of Force audit have revealed that **4** of the **32** checklist questions had compliance threshold scores **below 95% but over 90%**:

See L1-L4 details below:

1. **(Q9) CEW was Reviewed by Investigating Supervisor, if Activated (L2-L4)** The overall score for this category was **92%**.
2. **(Q19) Supervisor's UoF Investigation Submitted within 72 hrs. or Extension Requested (L1-L4)** The overall score for this category was **91%**.
3. **(Q22) Reasonableness of Force was Documented (L1-L4).** The overall score for this category was **94%**.
4. **(Q32) Officer Force Statement(s) Submitted by ETOD (L1-L4).** The overall score for this category was **90%**.

Conclusions (Final)

The results of this audit were verified through a double-blind review. Once this process concluded, the districts/units had an opportunity to review all the audit results and scorecards. District audit re-evaluations were reviewed by PSAB, and the responses are documented in the Use of Force Response and PSAB Notes section.

The following findings are as follows for those area(s) where compliance was **below 90%**:

1. **Supervisor's UoF Investigation Submitted within 72 hrs. or Extension Requested (L1-L4)** The overall score for this category was **88%**.
2. **Supervisor's approved use of force report submitted to FIT within the required 21 Days from Incident Date.** The overall score for this category was **57%**.

The following recommendations will focus on solutions to mitigate the low scores in the future.

Recommendations

Following the Use of Force audit which covered July 2024 – December 2024, “opportunities for improvement” continue to be documented by the PSAB Audit and Review Unit (ARU). As previously identified by the Public Integrity Bureau (PIB), Force Investigation Team (FIT) for the Department to maintain or achieve 95% or better compliance rate, the following areas for improvement were communicated to the various Districts and Bureaus and are as follows:

1. Initial Blue Team entry **shall** be completed by **ETOD** of the supervisors next tour of duty. This **shall** include the involved officer’s and civilian's information and the types of force used by each.
2. Use of Force reports and documents **shall** be sent over to FIT within 21 days.
3. While all supervisor reports which were submitted beyond the required date, there are several in which the extension appeared to be submitted AFTER the 3-day window for such requests. It is imperative that supervisors ask for an extension BEFORE the 3-day window expires.

Continuing to take this action will ensure that all Use of Force case files are compliant and within policy guidelines.

Use of Force Responses & PSAB Notes:

Second District Responses

District: Question 2- Was the BWC activated per policy? (75%): Item is a 6th district item. 6th district officers were working in the 2nd district when they initiated the item.

PSAB Response: This item has been moved to the 6th District.

District: Question 4- BWCs complete: BWCs found/BWCs expected (83%): Item correlates with question 2 and should be assigned to the 6th district.

PSAB Response: This item has been moved to the 6th district.

District: Question 10- Was the officer checked for injuries (L2-L4)? (0%): Item is an 8th district item and should not be assigned to the 2nd district.

PSAB Response: This is an L4 item assigned to FIT.

District: Question 19- Was the supervisor's UoF investigation submitted within 72 hours of incident (L2-L4)? (80%): Item was a level 4 UoF that was handled by PIB and should not go against the 2nd district.

PSAB Response: This item L4 item has been reassigned to FIT.

District: Question 21- Was the supervisor's UoF report submitted to FIT within the required 21 days from incident date? (0%):

Item was sent to PIB on 10-13-24 (10 days),

PSAB Response: When conducting the UOF audit this is calculated by the blue teams routing report. Per this report, this item was not submitted within the time allotted. If the district has evidence to support their claims of it being submitted on time it should have been submitted within their response.

District: Item was sent to PIB on 11-15-24 (4 days)

PSAB Response: When conducting the UOF audit this is calculated by the blue teams routing report. Per this report, this item was not submitted within the time allotted. If the district has evidence to support their claims of it being submitted on time it should have been submitted within their response.

District: Item was sent to PIB on 10-23-24 (8 days). This was verified by Lt. of PIB.

PSAB Response: When conducting the UOF audit this is calculated by the blue teams routing report. Per this report, this item was not submitted within the time allotted. If the district has evidence to support their claims of it being submitted on time it should have been submitted within their response.

District: Item is a 6th district item. 6th district officers were working in the 2nd district when they initiated the item.

PSAB Response: This item has been moved to the 6th District.

District: Item was a level 4 UoF that was handled by PIB and should not go against the 2nd district.

PSAB Response: This item has been moved to PIB/FIT.

Question 22- Was the reasonableness of force documented (L2-L4) (80%):

District: Item was a level 4 UoF which was handled by PIB and not by the 2nd district.

PSAB Response: This item has been moved to PIB/FIT.

Question 26- Were the force details documented in the statement(s)?

District: Item is a 4th district item and not 2nd district.

PSAB Response: This item has been moved to the 4th District.

Question 27- Did the report establish that the officer had reasonable suspicion or probable cause to stop the subject? I do not agree with the reviewer. If the officer did not have R.S. or P.C. to stop the subject, the supervisor and PIB would have not signed off on the UoF. Additionally, an SFL would have been attached to the UoF.

PSAB Response: Per the reviewer "Probable Cause—The facts and circumstances, known to the officer at the time, which would justify a reasonable person in believing that the suspect committed or was committing an offense.

---- The subject, who officers stopped, was not the intended suspect. The subject was inside his residence with the door partially open. The subject stated once he saw Officers with their flashlight, he grabbed his firearm for protection because he did not know who was at his door. Due to the officers being at the wrong location and a misidentification of the subject there was no RS or PC." The officer did not confirm that they were at the correct address prior to acting and aiming a firearm at a citizen. There isn't a justification for this action taken. No change made by PSAB.

Third District Responses

District: Question 18 (Supervisor Gist submitted by ETOD). This question was given a negative score inadvertently because the item in question had a supporting Gist provided by the Supervisor, which you and I were able to confirm during our discussion. We respectfully request that the score for this question be reevaluated.

PSAB Response: Answer has been updated to a "YES".

District: Regarding question #32 (Officer Force statement submitted by ETOD), the Third District received a score of 50 percent. This issue was involving the date on the Officer's Force Statement. The date on Officer's Force Statement and the Supervisor's signature date reflected 3/9/2024, and the force incident occurred on 7/1/2024. The Officer used a prepopulated form and did not change the date to reflect the proper date. This was an oversight by the Officer, as well as the supervisor. The Lieutenant addressed this issue by verbally counseling the Sergeant on reviewing documents and an email was sent to all platoon rank for roll call training. This email was sent on 2/12/2025 once the error was discovered. We concede to the score based on the date error.

PSAB: No Change, we thank you for your response and the corrective actions taken by your district.

Fourth District Responses

District: Question 21 - UOF submitted late due to corrections. SFL completed and email sent to all supervisors regarding submitting a quality complete report.

PSAB: No Change, we thank you for your response and the corrective actions taken by your district.

District: Question 22- this was said to be deficient "Reasonableness of Force". A PTTR and SFL addressing this was completed and attached prior to the audit. An email was also sent to the officer's supervisor advising of the incident. See attached supporting document, which was initially sent on December 4, 2024.

PSAB: No change, we thank you for your response and the corrective actions taken by your district. Although the SFL was done before the audit was completed, in our review we must notate that the force was unreasonable by the officer(s) in question.

District: Question 23 this was said to be deficient "Equipment, Policy, Training". However, the supervisor used EPIC/ABLE to defuse the situation on scene. A SFL and training was also done to address the officer's action on scene "de-escalation". The auditor advised "de-escalation technique was the issue". See attached SFL authored on 8/6/24.

PSAB Response: Item number has been updated to a "yes", reflecting positive on the scorecard.

Eighth District Responses

Response: The new CEW that were issued in 2024 do not have cameras attached to them. Also, this UOF was classified as a level 4 CEW Deployment and was handled by Sgt. Thaddeus Williams of the FIT team. Any discrepancies should not be counted against the 8th District since the UOF was handled by the FIT team. (Was CEW reviewed by supervisor, if activated?)

PSAB: This item has been moved from the 8th District to FIT.

Response: This use of force was classified as a LVL 4 and handled by the FIT team. If no interview was conducted with the arrested subject that should count against PIB and not the 8th District. The FIT team was responsible for the Use of Force investigation. (Does the subject of force interview exist?)

PSAB: This item has been moved from the 8th District to FIT.

Response: This was a level 4 use of force investigated by FIT. The force was determined to be justified after the fit investigation. If FIT determined the Use of force justified it shouldn't be changed to non-justified in an audit. Was each CEW cycle justified within policy, if discharged?

PSAB: This item has been updated to a "yes", reflecting positive on the scorecard, however this item was moved to FIT.

SOD District Responses

1.

a. Audit Results

- Supervisor failed to request extension within 72 hours.
- Dashcam review by Supervisor

b. Response

- Extension request was requested by Supervisor on July 11, 2024, at 8:16 pm
- Use of Force occurred on July 11, 2024, at 7:15 pm.
- This was a High-Risk warrant which turned into a SWAT Roll. No need to review ICC for a SWAT Roll, Use of Force was on BWC footage.

PSAB Response: Changes made, thank you for emailing evidence to support the extension request. However, with this update the question that follows it now becomes a “No” which is; did the district Captain approve in 72 hours. Please send supporting documentation for this as well. Dashcam review has been changed to a “N/A”.

2.

a. Audit results

- Supervisor failed to request extension within 72 hours.
- Supervisors force Gist submission by ETOD

b. Response

- Information received from Lieutenant of PIB/FIT
- Supervisor did not request and Extension Until October 18, 2204
- Incident occurred on October 15, 2024
- Investigating Supervisor did not enter initial entry unto October 18, 2024

PSAB Response: Changes made, thank you for emailing evidence to support the extension request. No changes made for the Gist submission; this must occur by the ETOD on the date of occurrence.

3.

a. Audit Results

- Supervisor’s approved Report was not submitted to FIT within the required 21 days

b. Response

- The investigating supervisors is not assigned to SOD
- Investigating supervisor is assigned to ISB/VCAIT
- The incident occurred August 9, 2024

- Submitted to SOD for approval on September 6, 2024, and sent to FIT on September 11, 2024
- The extension request for this force investigation was approved by ISB Rank on August 12, 2204

PSAB: This item has been moved to ISB, please note the correct item number for this audit is another item.

4.

a. Audit Results

- Supervisor failed to request extension within 72 hours
- Supervisors force Gist submission by ETOD
- Officers Force Statement not submitted by ETOD

b. Response

- According to Lieutenant of FIT/PIB
- The investigating Supervisor is not assigned to SOD
- The investigating supervisor is assigned to ISB/VCAIT
- This case was completely routed through ISB not SOD
- The force happened on September 4, 2024, and the supervisor entered the initial entry on September 23, 2204.

PSAB: This item has been moved to ISB.

PIB District Responses

PIB/FIT Response- Issues noted: (10) Officer not checked for injuries - The Blue Team report documents under the "Involved Officers / employees" section that neither officer had noted or visible injuries; (19) No extension request filed by investigator – not being contested; (21) Report not submitted to FIT within 21 days – should be N/A as FIT was the initial investigating unit; (22) Reasonableness of force not documented – There is an FDI linked to this Blue Team report which deals with this topic. This is mentioned towards the bottom of the Blue Team's report narrative.

PSAB Response: Changes made to the officer being checked for injuries, is now a "N/A". 21 Day submission has now been changed to "N/A". Reasonableness has not been changed to a "Yes".

PIB/FIT Response - Issues noted: (15) – Subject of force interview does not exist – The interview is documented under the Sergeant's BWC; (29) Each CEW cycle not justified within policy - There is an FDI linked to this Blue Team report which deals with this topic. This is mentioned towards the bottom of the Blue Team's report narrative.

PSAB Response: Cycle justification is now a "Yes". Subject of force interview is now a "Yes".

Attachments: Excel Raw Data Spreadsheets July 2024-December 2024.

Timothy A. Lindsey

**Innovation Manager, Auditing
Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau**

Bianca L. Harris

**Auditor
Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau**

Appendix C – Report Distribution

NOPD Superintendent

Deputy Supt. PSAB Bureau

Captain PSAB Bureau

Deputy Supt. PIB Bureau

Deputy Sup. FOB Bureau

Deputy Sup. ISB Bureau