



Custodial Interrogations & Interviews Audit Report June 2026

Report # CI&I072026
(Period Reviewed: Sep
2025 – Feb 2026)

Submitted by PSAB: August 11, 2026
Response from FOB: August 25, 2026
Final Report Published: September 2, 2026

Previous Report Date: September 2025

Audit Team

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

Matt Segraves, Innovation Manager - Auditing
Jovan Berry, Auditor
Taneva Bowers, Auditor
Faith Butler, Auditor
Melinda Foy, Auditor
Danta Lewis, Auditor
Christopher Porter, Auditor

Executive Summary

The Audit and Review Unit (ARU) of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau (PSAB) initiated a Custodial Interrogations and Interviews Audit in March 2026. The audit universe covered the period from September 1, 2025 to February 28, 2026. This audit is conducted to ensure that New Orleans Police Department (NOPD) officers' interrogations and interviews 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.

The programs assessed by this audit are regulated by the following NOPD policies:

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

NOPD policies can be found at nola.gov/next/nopd/topics/policies.

This report documents three audits:

1. A review of custodial interrogations by randomly sampling logged interrogations (aka Checklist Audit)
2. A review of interviews by randomly sampling logged interviews
3. A review of unlogged interrogations by querying police reports

The checklist audit assessed 48 randomly selected interrogations and 5 interrogations logged as interviews. The checklist includes 16 questions (aka criteria), 9 of which scored 95% and above, 3 scored between 85 and 94%, 2 scored below 85%, and two were not applicable to the randomly selected interrogations. Find the detailed results table [here](#).

The review of interviews assessed 44 randomly selected interviews, 5 of which were deemed by the auditing unit to be interrogations and therefore incorrectly logged as interviews, resulting in a compliance score of 89%. Find the results at the bottom of the checklist audit scorecard table [here](#).

The review of, or attempt to find, unlogged interrogations used a query of police reports in EPR and in Mark43. The queries find police reports with keywords that can be associated with interrogations. The review found 60 instances of unlogged interrogations, resulting in a compliance score of 64%. Find the detailed results [here](#).

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Table of Contents	3
Introduction	4
<i>Methodologies</i>	<i>4</i>
Custodial Interrogations and Interviews Scorecard Table	7
<i>Percentage of Interviews Logged Correctly as Interviews</i>	<i>8</i>
Custodial Interrogations and Interviews Scorecard Table by District	9
Unlogged Custodial Interrogations – Results	13
Recommendations.....	14
Re-evaluation Requests	15
Report Distribution	16

Introduction

The Auditing and Review Unit (ARU) of the Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau conducted an audit of custodial interrogations (aka checklist audit) entered into the custodial interrogations and interviews log, an audit of interviews entered into the log, and an audit of unlogged interrogations. The time span to conduct the audits was from March through May 2026.

Purpose

The custodial interrogations audit is conducted to verify Departmental compliance with the NOPD Operations Manual as it pertains to custodial interrogations and interviews.

The following are the NOPD Policy Chapters involved:

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

Find NOPD policies here: nola.gov/next/nopd/topics/policies

Scope

This audit is designed to assess the extent to which custodial interrogations conducted by NOPD officers are done so in accordance with the U.S. Constitution and NOPD policies. The audit has three parts:

1. The checklist audit assesses logged interrogations for compliance on a number of criteria such as the below. For a complete list of checklist audit questions see the [scorecard table](#).
 - a. Does complete video coverage exist?
 - b. Was the interrogation conducted in an authorized room?
 - c. Were there any threats or use of physical violence?
 - d. Were any preceded by pre-interviews?
 - e. Does the case file include any notes taken during the interrogation?
 - f. Was Miranda provided appropriately?
 - g. Was the interrogation conducted in the interviewee's primary language?
 - h. If an interpreter was used, were they an authorized interpreter?
 - i. Was the interrogation logged correctly?
2. The review of interviews in the log assesses whether interviews were entered into the log correctly. Any interviews in the log that were in fact interrogations are reviewed with the complete checklist.
3. The review of police reports with keywords assesses the extent to which interrogations are entered into the log.

Methodologies

Checklist Audit

The unit used a stratified, random sample. The unit used the data for NOPD's custodial interrogations and interviews log (PowerApp, Sharepoint List) to count the total number of interrogations for the audit time period (the universe). The unit used the location of the interview room to create strata. The unit randomly selected 15% or 5, whichever was greater, from each interview room location. When there were less than 5, the unit reviewed all interrogations for the location. The results of the sample design are in the table below.

Stratification Group	N	%	Sample Size
1st District	35	18.4%	5
2nd District	9	4.7%	5
3rd District	6	3.2%	5
4th District	26	13.7%	5
5th District	12	6.3%	5
6th District	3	1.6%	3
7th District	50	26.3%	8
8th District	28	14.7%	5
Special Operations Division	19	10.0%	5
Homicide*	1	0.5%	1
Child Abuse*	1	0.5%	1
Total	190		48

*Interview rooms at 715 S. Broad and are no longer in use. These units use interview rooms at the districts.

Additionally, the unit audited 5 interrogations that were logged as interviews, resulting in a total sample size of 53. These interrogations were discovered as a result of the audit of interviews, details below.

For each incident selected the unit reviewed:

- All associated video footage (L3, BWC) for the interrogation
- Interrogation notes, if observed on video

For each incident selected the unit completed the custodial interrogations audit checklist, which contains 16 questions. See the [results table](#) for the checklist question details.

The audit used a double-blind process. Two auditors were assigned each randomly selected incident. The auditors reviewed each incident independently and answered the audit questions (i.e. checklist, audit form) before discussing the incident with their double-blind counterpart. After discussing the incident and comparing results the auditors completed the audit criteria a third time with their reconciled results. When the auditors ultimately disagreed with the result for one or more audit questions, the decision was made by the audit supervisor.

Interviews Audit

Similar to the checklist audit of interrogations, the unit used a stratified random sample. The unit used the data for NOPD's custodial interrogations and interviews log (PowerApp, Sharepoint List) to count the total number of interviews for the audit time period (the universe). The unit used the location of the interview room to create strata. The unit randomly selected 15% or 5, whichever was greater, from each interview room location. When there were less than 5, the unit reviewed all interviews for the location. The results of the sample design are in the table below.

Stratification Group	N	%	Sample Size
1st District	12	10.4%	5
2nd District	0	0.0%	0
3rd District	7	6.1%	5

Stratification Group	N	%	Sample Size
4th District	17	14.8%	5
5th District	19	16.5%	5
6th District	0	0.0%	0
7th District	48	41.7%	7
8th District	3	2.6%	3
Special Operations Division	4	3.5%	4
Homicide*	0	0.0%	0
Child Abuse*	4	3.5%	4
Sex Crimes*	1	0.9%	1
Total	115		39

*Interview rooms at 715 S. Broad and are no longer in use due to the state of the building.

For each incident selected the unit reviewed:

- All associated video footage (L3, BWC) for the interrogation
- Interrogation notes, if observed on video

For each incident selected the unit recorded whether the interview was correctly logged as an interview. If the interview was in fact a custodial interrogation the unit completed the custodial interrogations audit checklist. This audit also used a double-blind process. See the [results table](#) for the checklist question details and the results of the interviews audit.

Unlogged Interrogations Audit

The intention of the unit's unlogged interrogations audit is to find incidents involving interrogations that do not have a corresponding entry in the custodial interrogations and interview log and to estimate the extent to which interrogations are logged. To find incidents of unlogged interrogations the unit:

1. Queries police reports for keywords that tend to be associated with interrogations, such as: "interrogation", "Miranda rights form", "interview room", "interrogation room", "questioning at the", "custodial interview", "form 153", "waive"
2. Determines whether the police reports have item numbers that are entered into the log
3. Reads a sample of the reports that have item numbers that are not in the log
4. Watches corresponding video when the reports indicate an interrogation was conducted
5. Looks for log entries that may be documented under a different, corresponding item number when the interrogation is confirmed by video review

The unit queried and reviewed police reports documented in two systems for this iteration, EPR and Mark43. NOPD switched to Mark43 to document police reports on 11/4/25. The unit reviewed EPRs from September 2025 through November 3, 2025, and Mark43 reports from November 4, 2025, through February 28, 2026.

After removing reports with an item number that matched an interrogation log entry, the unit reviewed all 84 EPR reports returned by the query and a random sample of 100 reports returned by the Mark43 query. See the [unlogged interrogation results](#) section for more details about the queries.

Custodial Interrogations and Interviews Scorecard Table

Below are the results of the checklist audit.

Check-List Questions		Score	Y	N	U	NA	NA - Notes	NOPD Policy
1	The entire interrogation was audio/visual recorded	88%	46	6	0	1	None	Ch 42.11 p5-p7
2	The interrogation was conducted in an authorized room	100%	53	0	0	0	None	Ch. 42.11 P8
3	If exigent circumstances prevented use of an authorized room, the circumstances were documented in the investigative file and/or incident report.	n/a	0	0	0	53	53 were NA b/c they were conducted in an authorized room	Ch. 42.11 P8
4	The audio/visual recording was not turned off during the interview	100%	52	0	0	1	None	Ch 42.11 p10
5	If the recording was turned off, it was the suspect's decision that he/she did not want the interrogation recorded	100%	1	0	0	52	9 were NA b/c the recording was not halted 43 were NA b/c the recording was complete	Ch 42.11 p10
6	If the recording was turned off and it was the suspect's decision that the interrogation was not to be recorded, the suspect's request was recorded and documented in the case report	0%	0	1	0	52	10 were NA b/c the recording was not halted 42 were NA b/c the recording was complete	Ch 42.11 p10
7	The recording does not reflect any threat or use of physical violence on the individual or the individuals' family	100%	53	0	0	0	None	Ch 42.11 p2, p4
8	The custodial interrogation recording was not preceded by a "pre-interview"	100%	49	0	4	0	None	Ch 42.11 p5, p9
9	There was NOT a video/audio equipment failure during the recording of an interrogation	100%	53	0	0	0	None	Ch 42.11 p28

Check-List Questions		Score	Y	N	U	NA	NA - Notes	NOPD Policy
10	If a recording equipment malfunction occurred, the detective relocated to a facility with functioning recording equipment.	n/a	0	0	0	53	53 were NA b/c there was no equipment malfunction	Ch. 42.11 P28
11	The case file contains all of the officers' notes taken during this interview/interrogation, if seen in A/V taking notes	92%	23	2	0	28	28 were NA b/c no notes were taken	Ch 42.11 p21
12	The interview was conducted in the accused person's primary language	100%	53	0	0	0	None	Ch 42.11 p21, p24, Ch 55.4
13	Miranda was given in person's primary language	96%	51	2	0	0	None	Ch 42.11 p4, p26 Ch 1.9.1, Ch 55.4
14	If an interpreter was used, the interpreter was a Departmentally authorized certified interpreter.	75%	3	1	0	49	49 were NA b/c an interpreter was not required	Ch. 42.11 P19, P24
15	The custodial interrogation was entered correctly as an interrogation in the log (was not entered as an interview)	91%	48	5	0	0	None	Ch 42.11 p20
16	The log entry is complete if the following are included in the log: Correct Item Number, Location of Interrogation, Date and Time, Name of Subject being Interrogated, Name of Officer Conducting the Interrogation	96%	51	2	0	0	None	Ch 42.11 p20, p22
I	Percentage of Interviews Logged Correctly as Interviews	89%	39	5				

Custodial Interrogations and Interviews Scorecard Table by District

Check-List Questions		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	SOD	GRIP	Homicide	Sex Crimes	Child Abuse	Overall Score
1	The entire interrogation was audio/visual recorded	80%	100%	86%	100%	100%	67%	100%	80%	100%	100%	75%	50%	100%	88%
2	The interrogation was conducted in an authorized room	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
3	If exigent circumstances prevented use of an authorized room, the circumstances were documented in the investigative file and/or incident report.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a
4	The audio/visual recording was not turned off during the interview	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
5	If the recording was turned off, it was the suspect's decision that he/she did not want the interrogation recorded	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	-	-	100%

Check-List Questions		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	SOD	GRIP	Homicide	Sex Crimes	Child Abuse	Overall Score
6	If the recording was turned off and it was the suspect's decision that the interrogation was not to be recorded, the suspect's request was recorded and documented in the case report	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	-	-	-	-	0%
7	The recording does not reflect any threat or use of physical violence on the individual or the individuals' family	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
8	The custodial interrogation recording was not preceded by a "pre-interview"	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
9	There was NOT a video/audio equipment failure during the recording of an interrogation	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
10	If a recording equipment malfunction occurred, the detective relocated to a facility with functioning recording equipment.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a
11	The case file contains all of the officers' notes taken during this interview/interrogation, if seen in A/V taking notes	67%	-	-	100%	100%	-	86%	100%	-	-	100%	100%	100%	92%

Check-List Questions		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	SOD	GRIP	Homicide	Sex Crimes	Child Abuse	Overall Score
12	The interview was conducted in the accused person's primary language	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
13	Miranda was given in person's primary language	100%	100%	100%	100%	83%	100%	100%	100%	50%	100%	100%	100%	100%	96%
14	If an interpreter was used, the interpreter was a Departmentally authorized certified interpreter.	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	-	75%
15	The custodial interrogation was entered correctly as an interrogation in the log (was not entered as an interview)	80%	100%	83%	100%	83%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%	67%	100%	91%
16	The log entry is complete if the following are included in the log: Correct Item Number, Location of Interrogation, Date and Time, Name of Subject being Interrogated, Name of Officer Conducting the Interrogation	100%	100%	83%	100%	83%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	96%
I	Percentage of Interviews Logged Correctly as Interviews	80%	-	80%	100%	80%	-	100%	100%	100%	0%	-	67%	100%	89%

Unlogged Custodial Interrogations – Results

The queries returned a total of 380 reports. 96 of the reports had an item number that is also listed in a custodial interrogations and interviews log entry, indicating the interrogation was logged. The table below includes more details about the results of the queries.

Source	# in Query	# in EPR Query	# w/ Corresponding Log Entry
EPR	126	NA	42
Mark 43	254	4	54
Total	380		96

The unit reviewed 184 of the reports with an item number that is not in the log, all 84 EPR reports and 100 randomly selected Mark43 reports. 69 of the reports documented an investigation that involved a custodial interrogation. Sixty (60) of the interrogations were not logged. This results in a compliance score of 64% $((96+69)-60)/(96+69)$. The table below provides more details about the results.

Source	# Reviewed	# Documenting a Custodial Interrogation	# Not Logged	% Logged
EPR	84	26	19	72%
Mark 43	100	43	41	58%
Total	184	69	60	64%

Recommendations

The audit results should be reviewed by Departmental leadership, or their designee(s). Scores below 95% should be addressed with corrective action. The audit unit will make the raw data for the audits available, which allows the reviewer to see the specific incidents and individuals involved in any non-compliance.

Corrective action could include:

- Modifying/enhancing training whether it be Academy courses, roll call training, and/or DTBs
- Counseling individuals whose action or in-action resulted in non-compliance
- Initiating formal disciplinary investigations for individuals whose action or in-action resulted in non-compliance and for whom the audit finding is a repeat issue or represents an intentional policy violation.
- Policy revisions for requirements that are overly burdensome and are determined not needed to meet Departmental goals and which led to non-compliance

Specifically, the unit recommends the following:

1. The 83% compliance score for capturing the entire interrogation on video should be addressed. The recording should capture the interviewee entering and exiting the interrogation room. See the spreadsheet with audit results for specifics (i.e. which interrogations, and whether the recording did not capture the subject entering or exiting or both)
2. The 64% compliance rate for logging interrogations should be addressed. The Department should consider the utility of the custodial interrogations and interviews log. The unit believes the log is necessary because not all custodial interrogation and interviews are documented in police reports. The log software should be reviewed. The log is a Sharepoint PowerApp. It is possible an update, upgrade, or alternative software solution may increase the rate interrogations are logged.
3. The audit unit should avoid audit criteria (questions) that cover two or more required actions. Specifically, the audit should split question 6 “If the recording was turned off and it was the suspect’s decision that the interrogation was not to be recorded, the suspect’s request was recorded and documented in the case report” into two questions:
 - a. If the recording was turned off and it was the suspect’s decision that the interrogation was not to be recorded, the suspect’s request was recorded
 - b. If the recording was turned off and it was the suspect’s decision that the interrogation was not to be recorded, the suspect’s request was documented in the case report

Re-evaluation Requests

2nd District

- I-14122-25: initially scored as having incomplete video, video determined to be complete after further review
- I-23922-25: initially scored as having incomplete video, video determined to be complete after further review
- L-22078-25: initially scored as having incomplete video, video determined to be complete after further review

Special Operations Division (SOD)

- A-15039-26: initially scored as having incomplete video, video determined to be complete after further review
- L-07107-25: results initially assigned to Special Operations Division and scored as an interrogation that was incorrectly entered into the log as an interview, after further review results assigned to GRIP and the Audit Unit did not change the designation as an interrogation
- J-26042-25: misunderstanding between auditee and audit unit, the audit unit did not score any audit criteria for this incident as non-compliant

Report Distribution

- Report and audit data emailed to Field Operations Bureau and Investigation & Support Bureau Deputy Superintendents and Captains
- Report posted to nola.gov/next/nopd/audits-and-reports