



Auditing Review Section

Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau

Sex Crimes Section Audit Report October 2025 – Final

Report #: SC102025

Sample Period: January 1, 2025 – June 30, 2025

Submitted by PSAB: October 31, 2025

Response from Sex Crimes: November 3, 2025

Final Report: November 3, 2025

Audit Team

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

Executive Summary

The Audit and Review Section (ARS) of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted a Sex Crimes (SC) Checklist Audit in October 2025. Sex Crimes checklist audits ensure that the Sex Crimes Unit is operating in compliance with the most updated New Orleans Police Department (NOPD) policies covering Chapters 42.2 regarding “sexual assault” investigations. The Consent Decree mandates SVD detectives training in “sexual assault” specific matters. As a result, detectives will be able to respond timely to the investigations of sexual assault incidents, review all evidence and statements, and conduct effective victim-oriented case follow-ups as needed. The audit also focuses on ensuring that each detective works actively to engage the victims and provides guidance on how to get counseling, assistance, and support from available social services.

The October 2025 audit was completed utilizing the most recent Sex Assault Audit Protocol at the time of the audit. This audit consists of thirty-one (31) questions and additional follow-up requests, which cover paragraphs 195-206 of the Consent Decree (CD). Based on the combined total of “one thousand five hundred and fifty” (1550) checklist items rated from the sample size of fifty (50) case files audited, the “overall score” of this Sex Crimes case file audit conducted by the Audit and Review Section was 99.9%.

The scorecard for the Sex Crimes Checklist Audit includes explanations for “Not Applicable” scorings.

Supervisors should address deficiencies with specific training through specific In-service Training classes or Daily Training Bulletins (DTBs). Such training should be reinforced by close and efficient supervision in addition to Supervisor Feedback Logs entries.

Of the thirty-one (31) questions, thirty (31) scored as compliant.

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

Table of Contents

Audit Team	1
Executive Summary	2
Table of Contents	3
Introduction	4
Purpose	4
Scope	4
Methodology	4
Data.....	4
Initiating and Conducting the Sex Crimes Audit.....	5
Sex Crimes Unit Scorecards.....	6
Case File Review	8
Mandated Consent Decree Paragraph Responses	12
(CD #206-#211)	12
CD #206	12
CD #207	14
CD #208	16
CD #209	16
CD #210	17
CD #211	17
Overall Compliance Score (Final)	18
Conclusions (Final)	18
Results.....	18
Recommendations	18
Sex Crimes Unit Responses & PSAB Notes:	19
Appendix C – Report Distribution	20
Sex Crimes Unit Review Checklist Template	21

Introduction

The Audit and Review Section of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted a semi-annual audit of the Sex Crimes Section's investigation case files. This audit covered case files for the period of January 2025 to June 2025. The time allocated to conduct this audit was October 22, 2025, through October 29, 2025. The previous audit was conducted in April 2025.

Purpose

The Sex Crimes Section case file audit was conducted to verify Departmental compliance with the Consent Decree and with NOPD's Operations Manual, Chapter 42.2 "Sexual Assault" Investigations.

Scope

This audit will determine and document whether there was a proper response by investigators and supervisors of the New Orleans Police Department's Sex Crimes Section in conducting follow-up investigations. The auditors are responsible for verifying that each overall response was proactive, victim centered and professional. Once the review is completed, the audit manager will submit a report to the Captain of the Sex Crimes Section, and the Captain of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau (PSAB) pointing out any deficiencies or confirming a thorough investigation. These audit reports will help to maintain thorough and complete Sex Crimes Section investigations in the future. A "final report" will also be sent to the appropriate monitor from the OCDM.

Methodology

Population size – the Sex Crimes Section only.

Sample size – Fifty-two (50) case files were selected via EXCEL's "RAND" function, from the three hundred and forty-nine (349) cases taken in by the Sex Crimes Section for the first half of the 2025 calendar year.

Documentation to be reviewed – All documents and investigative material contained within each individual case file.

Testing Instrument(s) – New Orleans Police Department Operations Manual Chapter 42.2, "Sexual Assault Investigations" (Revised: 5/27/2018), and a thirty-one (31) point Sex Crimes Audit Checklist. Each individual case file was audited in its entirety via "double-blind" auditing process by two (2) members of the Audit and Review Section (ARS), to give a reliable and thorough review of each case file.

Data

The audit range is usually set for every six months (semi-annually). The Sex Crimes Section will give the Audit and Review Section all item numbers they were assigned during that audit date range. The Audit and Review Section will then take those item numbers and enter them into EXCEL's randomizer generator for cases to be selected for review. The Audit and Review Section will then review at least 15% of those cases within the audit range.

Initiating and Conducting the Sex Crimes Audit

The Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau contacted the Commander of the Special Victims Division (SVD), on October 7, 2025, to inform them of a scheduled Sex Crimes Section case file audit that would be initiated by the Auditing Review Section (ARS), during the week of October 15, 2025.

The SVD Commander was provided this advanced notice so that she could schedule a Sex Crimes Section supervisor to be on standby to provide the requested case files to the Auditing Review Section (ARS) upon demand. The SVD Commander was provided with the checklist that would be used, in addition to the audit protocol.

During this audit period, the ARS auditors requested and received a total of fifty (50) case files from the on-duty Sex Crimes sergeant for review. The auditors conducted a review of the case files at the office of the Audit and Review Section.

Each case file was then systematically reviewed via “double-blind” audit process by the ARS auditors, for a determination of each case file’s compliance with the New Orleans Police Department’s Operations Manual Chapter 42.2, as it relates to “Sexual Assault” Investigations. To facilitate this process, the auditors used the thirty-one (31) point Sexual Assault audit checklist as a gauge to review and analyze the content of every case file.

The breakdown of the case files that each auditor reviewed for the “double-blind” case file audit is as follows:

Auditor Team 1 (Reviewed 8 Cases)

Auditor Team 2 (Reviewed 7 Cases)

Auditor Team 3 (Reviewed 7 Cases)

Auditor Team 4 (Reviewed 7 Cases)

Auditor Team 5 (Reviewed 7 Cases)

Auditor Team 6 (Reviewed 10 Cases)

Auditor Team 7 (Reviewed 7 Cases)

Total: 50 Case Files

Sex Crimes Unit Scorecards



Sex Crimes Check-List Scorecard - (Double-blind)

Report Date: October 2025

ARS percentages for Consent Decree requirements for sex crimes check-list audit.

January 2025 - June 2025

Check-List Questions

Check-List Questions	Score	Y	N	NA	NA Explanations	CD¶
1 If there was BWC video applicable to this case, was it reviewed by the Investigator? Applicable BWC would be video from responding officer(s) to the crime scene.	100%	32	0	18	Of the 18 N/A Scorings: (12) Crime Reported Later (4) No BWC exists for the incident(1) Victim/Reporting Person Gone on Arrival (1) Case referred by NOJFC	196
2 Was there an on-scene response by SVS?	100%	16	0	34	Of the 34 N/A Scorings: (16) Victim relocated from the crime scene to the hospital or district station, (13) Due to the delayed crime reporting, there was no identifiable crime scene (2) Detective contacted the victim via phone (1) Victim refused to proceed with the investigation (1) Case unfounded (1) Crime occurred out of parish/state	195
3 Is there an Incident Report in the case file?	100%	50	0	0	None	196, 198
4 Is there a MORF in the case file?	100%	50	0	0	None	196, 198
5 Is there an Initial Investigator Supplemental Report?	100%	49	0	1	(1) No supplemental report necessary as all pertinent information gathered in the initial report.	196, 197, 198
6 Is there a Follow-up Investigator and Supplemental report	100%	22	0	28	Of the 28 N/A Scorings: (16) Case is Ongoing (5) Victim Uncooperative (2) Case Unfounded (2) Closed by Warrant (3) Case is Open and Inactive (1) Victim Unreachable	196, 197, 198
7 Is there a victim statement (video, audio, or transcribed)?	100%	42	0	8	Of the 8 N/A Scorings: (3) Victim Uncooperative (2) Victim Unreachable (1) Victim Gone on Arrival (1) Victim Unknown (1) Case Unfounded	196, 197
8 Is there evidence of attention to the victim's needs?	100%	45	0	5	Of the 5 N/A Scorings: (2) Victim Unreachable(1) Victim Gone on Arrival(1) Victim Unknown (1) Case Unfounded	197
9 Was there a follow-up interview after the initial on-scene investigation	100%	17	0	33	Of the 33 N/A Scorings: (17) Case is Ongoing (4) Victim Uncooperative (3) Victim not Located (2) Case Open and Inactive (2) Victim Unreachable (1) Close by Warrant (1) No follow-up necessary (1) Reporting Delayed (1) Case Unfounded (1) Crime Occurred out of Parish/State	196, 197, 198
10 Are there documented witness (video, audio, or transcribed) statement?	100%	16	0	34	Of the 34 N/A Scorings: (32) No Known Witnesses (1) Witness Gone on Arrival (1) Crime Occurred out of Parish/State	196, 198
11 Is there a communications log?	100%	50	0	0	None	196
12 Is there a documented 911 recording available?	100%	27	0	23	(23) No 911 call made	196
13 Were there crime scene photos taken when evidence could be captured?	100%	3	0	47	Of the 47 N/A Scorings: (43) No Crime Scene (1) Victim/Subject Gone on Arrival (1) Case Unfounded (1) Crime Occurred out of Parish/State (1) Reporting Delayed	196, 198
14 Is there documentation of CASTNET usage (criminal history check?)	98%	39	1	10	Of the 10 N/A Scorings: (4) No Known Suspect (3) Insufficient Suspect Information(1) Victim and Suspect Gone on Arrival (1) Case is Ongoing (1) Case Unfounded.	196, 198
15 If there is evidence of a drug-facilitated sexual assault with follow up according to policy?	100%	2	0	48	Of the 48 N/A Scorings: (45) No Drug-Facilitated Assault (1) Victim/Subject Gone on Arrival (1) Case Unfounded (1) Crime Occurred out of Parish/State	195, 198
16 Is there a medical and/or SANE report?	100%	10	0	40	Of the 40 N/A Scorings: (16) Victim Refused Medical Attention (14) No Sane or Medical Conducted (3) Reporting Delayed (2) Case Unfounded (1) Crime Occurred out of Parish/State (1) Victim Gone on Arrival (1) Closed by Warrant	196, 199
17 Does the EPR or Supplemental Report document the required referral to NOJFC?	100%	36	0	14	Of the 14 N/A Scorings: (4) Victim Uncooperative (3) No Known Victim (2) Victim Transported to Hospital (2) Victim Gone on Arrival (2) Crime Occurred out of Parish/State (1) Case Unfounded	196, 197, 216
18 Is there documentation of a CODIS hit notification in the file?	-	0	0	50	Of the 50 N/A Scorings: (32) No SANE Test Conducted (16) No CODIS Hit (2) Gone on Arrival	196, 198, 199
19 Is there arrest or search warrant documentation?	100%	10	0	40	Of the 40 N/A Scorings: (15) Suspect Unknown (10) No Arrest Made (6) Victim Uncooperative (2) Case Unfounded (3) Case is Ongoing (2) Crime Occurred out of State/Parish (1) No Crime Determined (1) Case Inactive	196
20 Is there a suspect statement (video, audio, or transcribed)?	100%	6	0	44	Of the 44 N/A Scorings: (18) Suspect not Known (13) Case is Ongoing (4) Case Unfounded (3) Closed by Warrant (3) Victim Uncooperative(1) Crime Occurred out of Parish/State (1) Suspect not Located (1) No Crime Determined	196, 198
21 Is evidence collection documented in a report?	100%	35	0	15	Of the 15 N/A Scorings: (9) Reporting Delayed (2) No Crime Scene (2) Victim Uncooperative (1) Case Unfounded (1) Crime Occurred out of Parish/State	196, 198, 199
22 Were the evidence and property receipts included within the Casefile for submitted evidence?	100%	44	0	6	(6) No Relevant Evidence Collected.	196, 198
23 If evidence was not submitted for testing, was the reason documented in a report?	100%	5	0	45	Of the 45 N/A Scorings: (21) No Crime Scene (14) No Scene Evidence (5) Evidence Submitted (3) Scene Evidence did not Require Testing (1) Case Unfounded (1) Crime Occurred out of Parish/State	196, 198
24 Are there crime lab reports?	100%	5	0	45	Of the 45 N/A Scorings: (24) No Crime Scene (19) No Scene Evidence Collected (1) Case Unfounded (1) Crime Occurred out of Parish/State	196
25 Is there documentation of a search of surveillance video?	100%	10	0	40	(40) No Video Noted	196, 198
26 Is there documented evidence of a witness canvas?	100%	8	0	42	Of the 42 N/A Scorings: (19) Reporting Delayed (19) No Crime Scene (2) Case Unfounded (1) Crime Occurred out of Parish/State (1) No Known Witness	196, 198
27 Are there composite sketches relative to the case?	-	0	0	50	Of the 50 N/A Scorings: (26) No Relevant Sketches Composed (12) Case is Ongoing (7) No Crime Identified (5) Victim Refused to Cooperate.	196, 198
28 Did the Detective complete (initial and date) the Case File Index as items were included in the case file?	100%	50	0	0	None	196
29 Was the incident appropriately classified?	100%	50	0	0	None	195
30 Was there documented authorization for a Signal change if required	100%	4	0	46	(46) No Signal Change Occurred.	201, 206
31 Is there documented supervisory review of reports and dispositions	100%	50	0	0	None	201, 206
Overall Score	99.9%	783	1	766		

Case File Review

The below-listed information reveals the outcome of each checklist review question.

1. **If there was BWC video applicable to this case, was it reviewed by the Investigator?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 32 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 18 were N/A (not applicable).
2. **Was there an on-scene response by SVD?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 16 were audited as positive, none were negative and 34 were N/A.
3. **Is there an Incident Report in the case file?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 50 were audited as positive, none were negative, and none were N/A (not applicable).
4. **Is there a MORF in the case file?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 50 were audited as positive, none were negative, and none were N/A (not applicable).
5. **Is there an Initial Investigator Supplemental Report?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 49 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 1 was N/A (not applicable).
6. **Is there a follow-up Investigator & Supplemental Report)?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 22 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 28 were N/A (not applicable).
7. **Is there a victim statement (video, audio, or transcribed)?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 42 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 8 were N/A (not applicable).
8. **Is there evidence of attention to the victim's needs? (i.e., Did the investigator demonstrate empathy, safety & medical needs of the victim, etc.)?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 45 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 5 were N/A (not applicable).
9. **Was there a follow-up interview after the initial on-scene investigation?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 17 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 33 were N/A (not applicable).
10. **Are there documented witness statements (video, audio, or transcribed)?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 16 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 34 were N/A (not applicable).

11. **Is there a communications log (incident recall)?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 50 were audited as positive, none were negative, and none were N/A (not applicable).
12. **Is there a documented 911 recording available?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 27 were audited as positive, none were negative and 23 were N/A (not applicable).
13. **Were there crime scene photos taken when evidence could be captured/recorded, as appropriate?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 3 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 47 were N/A (not applicable).
14. **Is there documentation of CASTNET usage (criminal history check)?** The overall score for this category was **98%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 39 were audited as positive, 1 was negative, and 10 were N/A (not applicable).
15. **If there is evidence of a drug- facilitated sexual assault with follow-up according to policy?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 2 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 48 were N/A (not applicable).
16. **Is there a medical and/or SANE report)?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 10 were audited as positive, none were negative and 40 were N/A (not applicable).
17. **Does the EPR or Supplemental Report document the required referral to NOFJC?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 36 were audited as positive, none were negative and 14 were N/A (not applicable).
18. **Is there documentation of a CODIS hit notification in the file?** The overall score for this category was **No Score**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, none were audited as positive, none were negative, and 50 were N/A (not applicable).
19. **Is there arrest or search warrant documentation?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 10 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 40 were N/A (not applicable).
20. **Is there a suspect statement (video, audio, or transcribed)?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 6 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 44 were N/A (not applicable).
21. **Is evidence collection documented in a report?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 35 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 15 were N/A (not applicable).

22. **Were the evidence & property receipts included within the Case File for submitted evidence?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 44 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 6 were N/A (not applicable).
23. **If evidence was not submitted for testing, was the reason documented in a report?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 5 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 45 were N/A (not applicable).
24. **Are there crime lab reports?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 5 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 45 were N/A (not applicable).
25. **Is there documentation of a search for surveillance video?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 10 were audited as positive, none were negative and 40 were N/A (not applicable).
26. **Is there documented evidence of a witness canvas?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 8 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 42 were N/A (not applicable).
27. **Are there composite sketches relative to the case?** The overall score for this category was **No Score**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, none were audited as positive, none were negative, and 50 were N/A (not applicable).
28. **Did the Detective complete (initial and date) the Case File Index as items were entered in the Case File?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 50 were audited as positive, none were negative, and none were N/A (not applicable).
29. **Was the incident appropriately classified?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 50 were audited as positive, none were negative, and none were N/A (not applicable).
30. **Was there documented authorization for a signal change if required?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 4 were audited as positive, none were negative, and 46 were N/A (not applicable).
31. **Are there supervisory reviews of reports and dispositions documented?** The overall score for this category was **100%**. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 50 were audited as positive, none were negative, and none were N/A (not applicable).

Mandated Consent Decree Paragraph Responses (CD #206-#211)

During the audit, ARS auditors corroborated to ascertain and verify the below listed information to address Consent Decree paragraphs #206 through #211 pertaining to the Sex Crimes Section:

CD #206

During the first year of this Agreement, neither patrol officers nor detectives shall code reported sexual assaults in a miscellaneous or non-criminal category without the express written approval of the Investigations & Support Bureau Special Victim Division Commander and the Investigations & Support Bureau Criminal Investigations Division Commander. Following this period, patrol officers shall not code reported sexual assaults in a miscellaneous or non-criminal category without their immediate supervisor first approving. Any decision by a detective to do so shall receive close secondary review and shall be approved in writing by an immediate Sex Crimes Section supervisor and the Division command.

As per Consent Decree paragraphs #206 and #207, the Auditing Review Section retrieved the CAD data regarding sexual assault cases matching the stated criteria from the NOPD SQL Database.

During the Sex Crimes audit, the Audit and Review Section reviewed the sexual assault cases handled by the Sex Crimes Section for the 1st half of 2025 (January-June). The review revealed a total of cases were initially called in as a sex crime, with twenty-three (23) cases matching the criteria listed in CD #206: as a call initiated as a sex crime but later changed to a miscellaneous incident or non-criminal category that was cleared. The audit revealed that SVD was compliant with CD #206 regarding calls initiated as sex crimes and later changed to miscellaneous incidents or non-criminal categories.

Incident Recalls:

As a result of the Communication District (Dispatch) transitioning from using "Plain Language" descriptions in their CAD system back to the use of NOPD complaint signals, there are a variety of different incident types coded to 43B by NOPD in the first quarter, through cross-mapping translation that might not otherwise be, as the translation list is limited to two (2) signal codes, 43B and 42. Twenty-three (23) cases coded by NOPD, were initially assigned a signal 42 (Aggravated Rape) through the NOPD cross-mapping, and changed to a signal 21 (Miscellaneous) with the disposition of NAT or RTF. See the breakdown below:

Ten (10) of the entries were reports of a possible sexual assault under the signal codes 43B and 42.

- Four (4) of the signal 42 coded entries involved SVD notification.
- Six (6) of the 42 coded entries that involved a possible sexual assault, do not appear to have SVD involvement.
- Twelve (12) of the entries were determined to be other signals that did not involve a sexual assault, via the NOPD cross-mapping, but were coded into 43B or 42; per Chapter 81.7:
- Nine (9) of the coded entries were signals describing, "35 – Simple Battery".
- Three (3) of the coded entries were signals describing incidents that did not involve an actual sexual

assault. They include the following totals:

- One (1) Signal 81 – Indecent Behavior.
- One (1) Signal 103D – Domestic Disturbance.
- One (1) Signal 107 – Suspicious Person.

Within this total of entries of changed signal codes, seven (7) of the entries do not appear to have Supervisor or SVD approval. However, these entries were not coded in plain language as a “Sexual Assault”. Therefore, items not plainly coded as a “Sexual Assault” are not classified as a Sex Crime and did not involve the Sex Crimes Section.

Signals 42 and 43B “Not SVD Notified”

Total: 19 of the total 23

District	Type	Type Text	Initial Type	Initial Type Text	Approved By	NOPD Policy Signal
4th	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	SUPV	81
3rd	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	U	35
6th	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	U	35
2nd	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	SUPV	42
5th	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	U	35
3rd	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	SUPV	42
5th	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	SUPV	35
6th	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	U	35
6th	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	SUPV	42
8th	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	SUPV	35
1st	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	SUPV	103D
6th	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	SUPV	42
7th	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	SUPV	35
4th	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	SUPV	107
7th	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	SUPV	42
7th	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	SUPV	42
7th	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	SUPV	42
2nd	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	U	35

3rd	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	SUPV	42
5th	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	U	35
2nd	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	U	35
5th	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	SUPV	42
5th	21	COMPLAINT OTHER	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	SUPV	42

Gone on Arrival:

In addition to the twenty-three (23) NAT/RTF cases covered under consent decree paragraph #206, two (2) were initiated as a signal 43B (Sexual Battery) or 42 (Aggravated Rape) and later changed to a 21 (Miscellaneous) with a disposition of Gone on Arrival (GOA). If a case is finalized with a disposition of GOA, SVD will not be notified, as the victim, caller, and/or suspect are no longer at the scene. However, SVD will still follow up with the case as part of their GOA review.

Signal 43B to Signal 21 (GOA)

Total: 2

Type	Initial Type	Initial Type Text	Disposition	Approved By	NOPD Signal
21	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	GOA	SUPV	42
21	42	AGGRAVATED RAPE	GOA	SUPV	42

CD #207

NOPD agrees to train supervisors and investigators in the Sex Crimes Section in the proper definitions and application of “unfounded,” “false,” and “baseless” classifications in the context of sexual assault. The immediate supervisor in the Sex Crimes Section and the Special Victims Division Commander shall closely review and approve in writing any decision to classify a report as “unfounded.” NOPD agrees to track each of these conclusions separately in NOPD’s Criminal Case Management System (CCMS) and publicly report them on at least a semi-annual basis.

Since the cyber-attack in December of 2019, the NOPD’s CCMS system has not been restored and is unavailable for tracking and reporting purposes. Since that time, the Special Victim’s Division has created and used a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet for tracking purposes. During the Sex Crimes Checklist Audit, the Audit and Review Section reviewed the sexual assault cases as input into the Sex Crimes Section for the 1st half of 2025 (January-June). The review revealed that of the 336 cases documented by the Sex Crimes Section there were fifteen (15) cases matching the criteria listed in CD #207 as a call initiated as a sex crime and later cleared with the disposition of “Unfounded”. The audit revealed that SVD was compliant with CD #207 regarding calls initiated as sex crimes and later cleared with the disposition “Unfounded” by Sex Crimes.

Order	Signal	District	Case Status
1	42	7	Unfounded
2	43U	8	Unfounded
3	42	1	Unfounded
4	42O	6	Unfounded
5	42	4	Unfounded
6	43B	8	Unfounded
7	42U	5	Unfounded
8	80O	8	Unfounded
9	43B	8	Unfounded

10	43B	8	Unfounded
11	43	8	Unfounded
12	42U	6	Unfounded
13	43	8	Unfounded
14	43U	1	Unfounded
15	43O	8	Unfounded

CD #208

The Department is required to track all reports of felony sexual assault including drug-facilitated sexual assault, sexual assaults involving persons with disabilities rendering them unable to consent, sodomy, and male victims of sexual assault. The Department must collect data on the final disposition of sexual assault investigations, including whether an arrest was made and whether the DA charged the suspect or rejected the case and, if so, the reason for the rejection if the DA provides a reason.

The Lieutenant advised the SVD /Sex Crimes stores Sexual Assault Kits (SAK) in the SAK Tracking database. The SVD inputs all sexual assault investigations/ cases in the Sexual Assault Management System or S.A.M.S.

CD #209

The New Orleans Police Department is required to track in an Information Management System the Evidence collected and whether it is submitted to a crime lab for testing. Where evidence is not submitted, the NOPD agrees to record in this system the justification for the decision.

The Detective of the Investigative Support Bureau continues to track the SVD Evidence Log. The log consists of evidence entries and outgoing evidence lab testing. The log is a spreadsheet consisting of formulas that allows the detective to track cases that are entered within the log. The two spreadsheets, the Sexual Assault Kit, and the Evidence Tracker, are utilized together in the process.

Both spreadsheets are updated weekly, and Sex Crimes Sergeant verifies that the work is done correctly.

The process for the DNA request is as follows:

- 1. Officers submit their DNA request via email to NOPD DNA.gov.**
- 2. ISB Detective reviewed the DNA requests and responded via email acknowledging that the DNA request was received.**
- 3. ISB Detective then submits a request to a CEP officer, and requests that the evidence is pulled, so that it can be transported to the Louisiana State Police Crime Lab.**
- 4. ISB Detective then enters the information into the Louisiana State Police Portal, also known as Justice Trax.**
- 5. The evidence is then transported to the Louisiana State Police Crime Lab by an ISB investigator weekly, every Tuesday.**
- 6. The spreadsheets are then updated weekly by the ISB Detective.**

CD #210

The Department is required to work with the District Attorney (DA), community service providers,

and other stake holders to develop and implement Sexual Assault Response Team (SART). SART was established over five years ago and meets monthly.

A member of SART advised the Audit and Review Section that it has been a pleasure working with NOPD's SVD as a community partner. The member additionally advised that she has witnessed countless acts of selfless service and acts of excellence from NOPD's SVD.

CD #211

The Department developed a committee of representatives from the community, including rape crisis advocates, service providers, and/or legal providers to review, on a semi-annual basis (1) any sexual assault investigation disposed of as unfounded, (2) a random sample of open sexual assault investigations with the approval of the DA, (3) any reported sexual assault placed in a miscellaneous signal that are considered to be a non-criminal category. The Department has agreed to ensure that feedback and recommendations from the committee are incorporated into policies, general training, remedial training for specific officers or detectives, and the decision to re-examine and re-open investigations, if warranted.

A member of SART and the NOFJC advised that the NOPD is actively participating with established committees such as SART. The member advised that the organizations and the NOPD discuss unfounded dispositions on a frequent basis. An Assistant District Attorney from the Orleans Parish District Attorney's Office advised that the relationship with the NOPD's SVD is "great". A supervisor with the OPDA's Office SVD liaison advised that NOPD's SVD is a great business partner and stated that the Lieutenant and the Detectives go above and beyond with their assigned cases. There has been no change in the participating members/partners.

Overall Compliance Score (Final)

Based on the combined total of the one thousand five hundred fifty (**1,550**) checklist items rated, from the sample size of fifty (**50**) case files audited; the "overall score" of this October 2025 Sex Crimes Unit case file audit conducted by the Auditing Review Unit was **99.9%**.

Conclusions (Final)

Results

The overall results of the October 2025 Sex Crimes audit revealed a compliance threshold score of **99.9%**. There were no checklist items that fell below the threshold of 95%.

Recommendations

There were no checklist items below the threshold of 95%; therefore, there were no areas of concern.

Sex Crimes Section Responses & PSAB Notes:

Unit Response to PSAB

Unit Deficiency: Is there documentation of CASTNET usage (criminal history check)? The overall score for this category was 98%. Of the 50 cases reviewed, 39 were audited as positive, one (1) was negative and 10 were N/A (not applicable).

Unit Response: Under NOPD item, the detective had the CASTNET for the victim, not the suspect, as the suspect's date of birth was unknown. The victim chose not to provide the information or proceed with the investigation.

Unit Action: The commander, SVD, will ensure that supervisors correct identified deficiencies by providing focused instruction through designated In-Service Training classes or Daily Training Bulletins (DTBs). This guidance should be supported with consistent oversight and documented using Supervisor Feedback Logs.

No action is required by PSAB.

ARU Attachments: Excel Raw Data Spreadsheets for October 2025 scorecard.

Timothy A. Lindsey

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

Jovan M. Berry

**Performance Auditor
Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau**

Appendix C – Report Distribution

Superintendent – NOPD

Assistant Supt. - NOPD

Deputy Supt. PSAB Bureau

Captain PSAB Bureau

Deputy Supt. ISB Bureau

Captain ISB Bureau

Lieutenant SVD Unit

ARS Unit

Sex Crimes Unit Review Checklist Template

The following checklist was the instrument used by the auditing team to review each case file.

Item Number: _____
 Monitor: _____
 Date: _____

NA = Not Applicable
 Y = Compliant
 N = Not compliant
 U = Unknown

1. Is there BWC video applicable to this case?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
2. Was there an on-scene response by SVS?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
3. Is there an Incident Report in the case file?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
4. Is there a MORF in the case file?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
5. Is there an Initial Investigator's Supplement Report?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
6. Is there a Follow up Investigation & Supplement Report?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
7. Is there a victim statement (video, audio, or transcribed)?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
8. Is there evidence of attention to the victim's needs (i.e., Did the investigator demonstrate empathy, safety & medical needs of the victim, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
9. Was there a follow-up interview after the initial on-scene investigation?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
10. Are there documented witnesses (video, audio, or transcribed) statements?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
11. Is there a communications log (incident recall)?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
12. Is there a documented 911 recording available?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
13. Were there crime scene photos taken when evidence could be captured/recorded, as appropriate? (photos may be in Property & Evidence or Case File materials)	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
14. Is there documentation of CastNet usage (criminal history check)?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
15. If there is evidence of a drug-facilitated sexual assault with follow up according to policy?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
16. Is there a medical and/or SANE report?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
17. Does the EPR or Supplement Report document the required referral to NOFJC?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
18. Is there documentation of a CODIS hit notification in the file?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
19. Is there arrest or search warrant documentation?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
20. Is there a suspect statement (video, audio, or transcribed)?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
21. Is evidence collection documented in a report?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
22. Were the evidence & property receipts included within the Case File for submitted evidence?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
23. If evidence was not submitted for testing, was the reason documented in a report?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
24. Are there crime lab reports?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
25. Is there documentation of a search of surveillance video?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
26. Is there documented evidence of a witness canvas?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
27. Are there composite sketches relative to the case?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
28. Did the Detective complete (initial and date) the Case File Index as items were included in the Case File?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
29. Was the incident appropriately classified?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
30. Was there documented authorization for a Signal change if required?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
31. Is there documented supervisory review of reports and dispositions?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N / <input type="checkbox"/> U
Did the Auditor listen to recordings of the victim interview(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N
Did the Auditor listen to suspect interview(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/> NA / <input type="checkbox"/> Y / <input type="checkbox"/> N

Auditor Comments: Explain in the narrative below whether there were any exceptional strategies used by the investigator or any deficiencies noted in the case investigation by Auditor: