

BOARD MEMBERS

JAMES ACHENBACH
Chair
GEORGE DELABARRE
Vice Chair
EDDIE CASTORIA
Secretary
SHERYL BENNETT
RILEY GORDON
THOMAS INIGUEZ
CAROLYN NORRIS RHEIN
LOREN VINSON
LOUIS WOLFSHEIMER



EXECUTIVE OFFICER
PATRICK A. HUNTER

County of San Diego
CITIZENS' LAW ENFORCEMENT REVIEW BOARD

1168 UNION STREET, SUITE 400, SAN DIEGO, CA 92101-3819
TELEPHONE: (619) 238-6776 FAX: (619) 238-6775
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/clerb

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Tuesday, July 13, 2010, 5:30 P.M.
San Diego County Administration Center
1600 Pacific Highway, Room 302/303, San Diego, 92101

The public portion of the meeting must be concluded in time to allow the public to vacate the building by 6:00 p.m.

(Free parking is available on the street or pay Ace Parking on the south side. Enter at the north entrance.)

Pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.2 the Citizens' Law Enforcement Review Board will conduct a meeting at the above time and place for the purpose of transacting or discussing business as identified on this agenda. Complainants, subject officers, representatives or any member of the public wishing to address the Board on any of today's agenda items should submit a "Request to Speak" form to the Administrative Secretary prior to the commencement of the meeting.

DISABLED ACCESS TO MEETING

A request for a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, may be made by a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in the public meeting. Any such request shall be made to Ana Becker at (619) 238-6776 at least 24 hours before the meeting.

1. ROLL CALL

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

- a) Minutes of the May 2010 Regular Meeting *(Attachment A-1)*
- b) Minutes of the May 2010 Special Meeting *(Attachment A-2)*

3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

- a) Open Complaints/Investigations Workload Report *(Attachment B)*

4. NEW BUSINESS

- a) Training Presentation: **Jail Population Management**
Deputy Richard Madden, Lieutenant Ericka Frierson, and Sergeant Jack Shawcroft
- b) Board Member Reappointments

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- a) CLERB Rules and Regulations
- b) CLERB 20 Year Anniversary Celebration
- c) SDSO Representative in Closed Session Meetings

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS

This is an opportunity for members of the public to address the Board on any subject matter that is within the Board's jurisdiction. Each speaker should complete and submit a "Request to Speak" form to the Administrative Secretary.

7. CLOSED SESSION

- a) **Discussion & Consideration of Complaints & Reports:** Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957 to hear complaints or charges brought against Sheriff or Probation employees by a citizen (unless the employee requests a public session).

DEFINITION OF FINDINGS	
Sustained	The evidence supports the allegation and the act or conduct was not justified.
Not Sustained	There was <u>insufficient evidence</u> to either prove or disprove the allegation.
Action Justified	The evidence shows the alleged act or conduct did occur but was lawful, justified and proper.
Unfounded	The evidence shows that the alleged act or conduct did not occur.
Summary Dismissal	The Review Board lacks jurisdiction or the complaint clearly lacks merit.

CASES FOR SUMMARY HEARING (18)

ALLEGATIONS, RECOMMENDED FINDINGS & RATIONALE

09-041

- 1. False Reporting - Deputy 1 wrote a false report about the complainant's inmate grievance.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Court decisions applicable to the Review Board and Government Code §3304(d) of the Public Safety Officers' Procedural Bill of Rights require that an investigation of a misconduct allegation that could result in discipline be completed within one year of discovery of the allegation, unless statutory exceptions apply. Because of an increase in complaints and an investigator vacancy in 2009, staff did not complete investigation of this allegation within one year. A review of the complaint showed no exceptions applied. The Review Board lacks jurisdiction.

- 2. False Reporting – Deputy 3 falsely reported that the complainant stated, “I’m going to kill you, mother fucker.”

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

- 3. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 3 failed to properly house the complainant.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

4. Misconduct/Medical – Deputy 3 refused to arrange for the complainant to have medical and dental treatment outside of jail at his own expense.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

5. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 2 took a pencil and magazine during a cell inspection.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

6. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 2 dropped the complainant’s food tray.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

7. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 3 stopped the complainant’s mail.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

8. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 3 gave the complainant’s mother’s address to an inmate who is a gang member.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

9. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 3 failed to respond to the complainant’s inmate grievances.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

10. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 3 failed to review the complainant’s administrative segregation classification.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

11. Misconduct/Medical – Deputy 3 failed to give the complainant Oxycontin as requested.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

09-043

1. Misconduct/Discourtesy - Deputy 1 was “aggressive” with the complainant and treated him as though he were not a victim, even though the complainant was threatened and rammed in a “road rage” incident by the other driver/passenger.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Court decisions applicable to the Review Board and Government Code §3304(d) of the Public Safety Officers’ Procedural Bill of Rights require that an investigation of a misconduct allegation that could result in discipline be completed within one year of discovery of the allegation, unless statutory exceptions apply.

Because of an increase in complaints and an investigator vacancy in 2009, staff did not complete investigation of this allegation within one year. A review of the complaint showed no exceptions applied. The Review Board lacks jurisdiction.

2. Misconduct/Intimidation – Deputy 1 yelled at the complainant about taking him into custody.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

3. Misconduct/Procedure - Deputy 1 improperly investigated a traffic collision by failing to interview a witness and to consider the complainant’s evidence.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

4. False Arrest - Deputy 1 improperly cited the complainant for not having proof of insurance, even though the insurance paperwork was with the registration for the complainant’s recently purchased car.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

5. False Reporting - Deputy 1 wrote a report that faulted the complainant and contained numerous misrepresentations about the “road rage” incident and collision.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

6. Misconduct/Procedure - Deputy 1 failed to cite the other driver, a minor who was not properly insured, and mistreated the complainant because of a relationship with the driver and/or passenger of the other car.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

09-044

1. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 1 unlawfully recorded the complainant’s phone calls from jail to his employees, tax clients, and attorney.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Court decisions applicable to the Review Board and Government Code §3304(d) of the Public Safety Officers’ Procedural Bill of Rights require that an investigation of a misconduct allegation that could result in discipline be completed within one year of discovery of the allegation, unless statutory exceptions apply. Because of an increase in complaints and an investigator vacancy in 2009, staff did not complete investigation of this allegation within one year. A review of the complaint showed no exceptions applied. The Review Board lacks jurisdiction.

2. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 1 blocked phone calls to jail staff about “eavesdropping” on the complainant.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

3. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 3 subjected the complainant to “unbearably cold” temperatures by removing blankets and running the air conditioning.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

4. Misconduct/Intimidation – Deputy 2 threatened the complainant with: sleep deprivation torture; making him stand naked in the recreation yard at night every hour on the hour; removal of food; loss of dayroom/recreational yard/phone privileges; taking away the medications of other inmates so the complainant would get sick; and putting on black leather gloves and assuming a fighting stance in front of the complainant.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

5. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 2 mistreated the complainant by: failing to provide toilet paper, haircuts, razors, nail clippers, blankets; flicking lights on and off for 15 minutes; failing to replace a clock so the complainant could not tell the time; removing towels; taking phone account money; opening legal mail; listening to phone calls to an attorney; failing to provide grievance forms; and failing to respond to three grievances about going to the law library.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

6. Misconduct/Discourtesy – Deputy 2 said “fuck,” “asshole” and “dumbshits.”

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

09-046

1. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 1 and/or 2 prematurely terminated the complainant’s doctor’s appointment because of personal plans.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Court decisions applicable to the Review Board and Government Code §3304(d) of the Public Safety Officers’ Procedural Bill of Rights require that an investigation of a misconduct allegation that could result in discipline be completed within one year of discovery of the allegation, unless statutory exceptions apply. Because of an increase in complaints and an investigator vacancy in 2009, staff did not complete investigation of this allegation within one year. A review of the complaint showed no exceptions applied. The Review Board lacks jurisdiction.

2. Misconduct/Discourtesy – Deputy 1 “blew off at a doctor” and “humiliated” the doctor and the complainant in public.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

3. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 2 did not properly investigate and/or prematurely closed the complainant’s complaint.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

4. Misconduct/Medical – Deputy 2’s negligence placed the complainant’s health in jeopardy.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

09-049

1. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 1 improperly classified the complainant.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Court decisions applicable to the Review Board and Government Code §3304(d) of the Public Safety Officers' Procedural Bill of Rights require that an investigation of a misconduct allegation that could result in discipline be completed within one year of discovery of the allegation, unless statutory exceptions apply. Because of an increase in complaints and an investigator vacancy in 2009, staff did not complete investigation of this allegation within one year. A review of the complaint showed no exceptions applied. The Review Board lacks jurisdiction.

2. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 2 failed to enforce cleanliness requirements in a detention facility.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

3. Misconduct/Medical – Deputy 2 failed to provide proper medical care to the complainant.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

09-054

1. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 2 brought a hostile neighbor to the complainant's home to engage in verbal confrontation over acts in which he was uninvolved.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Court decisions applicable to the Review Board and Government Code §3304(d) of the Public Safety Officers' Procedural Bill of Rights require that an investigation of a misconduct allegation that could result in discipline be completed within one year of discovery of the allegation, unless statutory exceptions apply. Because of an increase in complaints and an investigator vacancy in 2009, staff did not complete investigation of this allegation within one year. A review of the complaint showed no exceptions applied. The Review Board lacks jurisdiction.

2. Misconduct/Discourtesy – Deputy 1 attempted to “engage” the complainant by “egging” him on.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

3. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputies 1 and/or 2 failed to take action to the complainant's report of a neighbor's marijuana usage.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

09-055

1. Misconduct/Procedure - Deputies lost photos of the complainant's injuries.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Court decisions applicable to the Review Board and Government Code §3304(d) of the Public Safety Officers' Procedural Bill of Rights require that an investigation of a misconduct allegation that could result in discipline be completed within one year of discovery of the allegation, unless statutory exceptions apply. Because of an increase in complaints and an investigator vacancy in 2009, staff did not complete investigation of this allegation within one year. A review of the complaint showed no exceptions applied. The Review Board lacks jurisdiction.

2. Misconduct/Procedure - Deputies refused to allow the complainant a copy of the battery report, even though he was a battery victim.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

3. Misconduct/Procedure - Deputies failed to arrest a batterer.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

09-057

1. Discrimination/Racial- Deputy 1 asked about the race of involved parties when taking the complainant's report that daycare providers gave his infant daughter a bump on the forehead.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Court decisions applicable to the Review Board and Government Code §3304(d) of the Public Safety Officers' Procedural Bill of Rights require that an investigation of a misconduct allegation that could result in discipline be completed within one year of discovery of the allegation, unless statutory exceptions apply. Because of an increase in complaints and an investigator vacancy in 2009, staff did not complete investigation of this allegation within one year. A review of the complaint showed no exceptions applied. The Review Board lacks jurisdiction.

2. Discrimination/Racial – Deputies 2 and 3 closed the complainant's case without investigation because the reporting party and victim are Asian and the suspect day care provider is white, although they told the complainant that too few detectives were too busy for his case.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

09-059

1. Excessive Force/Pepperball Launcher – Deputy 3 shot the complainant 6 times with a pepper ball gun as he lay facedown on his bunk.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Court decisions applicable to the Review Board and Government Code §3304(d) of the Public Safety Officers' Procedural Bill of Rights require that an investigation of a misconduct allegation that could result in discipline be completed within one year of discovery of the allegation, unless statutory exceptions apply. Because of an increase in complaints and an investigator vacancy in 2009, staff did not complete investigation of this allegation within one year. A review of the complaint showed no exceptions applied. The Review Board lacks jurisdiction.

2. Excessive Force/Taser – Deputy 6 tasered the complainant above the groin area.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

3. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 6 improperly applied leg chains to the complainant after he was tased.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

4. Discrimination/Racial – Deputy 3 said he was going to tase the “nigger.”

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

5. Misconduct/Medical – Deputy 6 did not properly evaluate the complainant’s special medical needs after he was tasered.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

6. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 6 failed to audio and/or video record, their use of force on the complainant as required by policy.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

7. Misconduct/Retaliation – Deputy 6 used excessive force on the complainant in retaliation for complaints made against Deputies 5 and/or 6.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

8. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 5 improperly confiscated the complainant’s safety goggles.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

9. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 6 orchestrated the “pitting” of inmates against one another.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

09-060

1. Illegal Search & Seizure – Deputy 1 and other unidentified deputies illegally detained 9 Latino males without probable cause.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Court decisions applicable to the Review Board and Government Code §3304(d) of the Public Safety Officers’ Procedural Bill of Rights require that an investigation of a misconduct allegation that could result in discipline be completed within one year of discovery of the allegation, unless statutory exceptions apply. Because of an increase in complaints and an investigator vacancy in 2009, staff did not complete investigation of this allegation within one year. A review of the complaint showed no exceptions applied. The Review Board lacks jurisdiction.

2. Misconduct/Discourtesy – Deputy 1 ran toward the complainant and screamed, “Get that camera out of my face!”

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

3. Excessive Force – Deputy 1 attempted to cover the complainant’s lens and pushed her with such force her camera stopped recording.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

4. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 2 failed to intervene on the complainant’s behalf when Deputy 1 “battered” her.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

5. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 2 refused to accept a walk-in complaint and/or guarantee it would be forwarded to the proper entity.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

09-061

1. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 1 declined to put the complainant in a holding cell to await a consultation with a physician.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Court decisions applicable to the Review Board and Government Code §3304(d) of the Public Safety Officers’ Procedural Bill of Rights require that an investigation of a misconduct allegation that could result in discipline be completed within one year of discovery of the allegation, unless statutory exceptions apply. Because of an increase in complaints and an investigator vacancy in 2009, staff did not complete investigation of this allegation within one year. A review of the complaint showed no exceptions applied. The Review Board lacks jurisdiction.

2. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 3 did not follow protocol for an inmate on a hunger strike.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

3. Excessive Force – Deputy 2 yanked, twisted and bent the complainant’s bad knee.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

4. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 3 tampered with and withheld the complainant’s legal mail.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

09-062

1. False Arrest – PO 1 ordered the complainant’s arrest although she was on her way to see him.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Court decisions applicable to the Review Board and Government Code §3304(d) of the Public Safety Officers’ Procedural Bill of Rights require that an investigation of a misconduct allegation that could result in discipline be completed within one year of discovery of the allegation, unless statutory exceptions apply. Because of an increase in complaints and an investigator vacancy in 2009, staff did not complete investigation of this allegation within one year. A review of the complaint showed no exceptions applied. The Review Board lacks jurisdiction.

09-064

1. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 3 kept the complainant bound in chains in solitary confinement for more than one month without telephone or visiting privileges.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Court decisions applicable to the Review Board and Government Code §3304(d) of the Public Safety Officers’ Procedural Bill of Rights require that an investigation of a misconduct allegation that could result in discipline be completed within one year of discovery of the allegation, unless statutory exceptions apply. Because of an increase in complaints and an investigator vacancy in 2009, staff did not complete investigation of this allegation within one year. A review of the complaint showed no exceptions applied. The Review Board lacks jurisdiction.

2. Misconduct/Procedure - Deputies 1 and 2 threw the complainant’s food on the floor of his cell, where it was contaminated by excrement, resulting in the complainant contracting typhoid fever.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See Rationale #1.

3. Misconduct/Procedure - Deputies 1 and 2 told the complainant he wouldn’t get medical treatment until his wounds healed and his bruises didn’t show.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See Rationale #1.

4. Excessive Force – Deputy 3 kicked and beat the complainant with a flashlight more than 4 times while he was handcuffed, resulting in 12 broken teeth and swollen testicles.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See Rationale #1.

5. Misconduct/Procedure - Deputies 1 and 2 stole the complainant’s legal documents and family photos three times, telling the complainant they would masturbate with them.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See Rationale #1.

09-069

1. Misconduct/Medical – Deputy 1 was unresponsive to the complainant’s request for prescription glasses.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Court decisions applicable to the Review Board and Government Code §3304(d) of the Public Safety Officers' Procedural Bill of Rights require that an investigation of a misconduct allegation that could result in discipline be completed within one year of discovery of the allegation, unless statutory exceptions apply. Because of an increase in complaints and an investigator vacancy in 2009, staff did not complete investigation of this allegation within one year. A review of the complaint showed no exceptions applied. The Review Board lacks jurisdiction.

2. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 1 will not allow wire-rimmed prescription glasses into the detention facility although staff are permitted to wear them.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

3. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 1 did not take immediate action to inmates stealing phone minutes and have failed to respond to the complainant's grievances.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

4. Discrimination/Religious – Deputy 1 denied the complainant a Koran, prayer rug, and Kosher diet.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

09-074

1. False Arrest – Deputy 1, acting in “bias”, arrested the complainant for Domestic Violence when he was actually a victim.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Court decisions applicable to the Review Board and Government Code §3304(d) of the Public Safety Officers' Procedural Bill of Rights require that an investigation of a misconduct allegation that could result in discipline be completed within one year of discovery of the allegation, unless statutory exceptions apply. Because of an increase in complaints and an investigator vacancy in 2009, staff did not complete investigation of this allegation within one year. A review of the complaint showed no exceptions applied. The Review Board lacks jurisdiction.

2. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 2 released the complainant's gun collection to his daughter with the stipulation they will not be given to him for over a year.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

3. Misconduct/Harassment – Deputy 1 contacted the complainant's wife and “harassed” her when she wanted to drop the charges against the complainant.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

4. Misconduct/Truthfulness – Deputy 1 untruthfully claimed the complainant said, “My wife got what she deserved.”

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

5. False Reporting – Deputy 1 wrote a police report that was mostly untrue.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

09-076

1. Misconduct/Harassment – Deputy 3 have singled out the complainant about her jewelry or lack thereof during security screening when she entered the Downtown and South Bay courthouses, which the complainant believes jeopardized her safety and is part of a pattern of harassment.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Court decisions applicable to the Review Board and Government Code §3304(d) of the Public Safety Officers' Procedural Bill of Rights require that an investigation of a misconduct allegation that could result in discipline be completed within one year of discovery of the allegation, unless statutory exceptions apply. Because of an increase in complaints and an investigator vacancy in 2009, staff did not complete investigation of this allegation within one year. A review of the complaint showed no exceptions applied. The Review Board lacks jurisdiction.

2. Misconduct/Harassment – Deputy 1 did not apologize to the complainant or tell her the harassment would stop but instead continued the pattern of harassment by following her outside the court house and questioning her about a “conspiracy.”

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See above.

10-026

1. False Arrest – Deputy 1 arrested the complainant without cause or explanation.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: The signed complaint was not submitted in a timely manner as required by CLERB Rules & Regulations. Additionally, Deputy 1 retired from the Sheriff's Department in 2009. CLERB no longer has jurisdiction in this matter as defined by CLERB Rules & Regulations, 4.1 Citizen Complaints: Authority and 4.4 Citizen Complaints: Jurisdiction.

2. Misconduct/Discourtesy – Deputy 1 told the complainant, “Oh yeah bitch, you’re getting arrested.”

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See rationale #1.

3. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 1 cancelled paramedic response for the injured complainant.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See rationale #1.

4. Misconduct/Discourtesy – Deputy 2 said to the complainant, “Boy, you’re a smart-mouth bitch.”

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See rationale #1.

5. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 1 transported the complainant in his patrol vehicle going up to 120 mph.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See rationale #1.

6. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 3 placed the complainant into a safety cell that had blood in it.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: See rationale #1.

10-052

1. Misconduct/Procedure- Deputy 1 gave the complainant a ticket after an officer hit the complainant's vehicle.

Recommended Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: SECTION 4: AUTHORITY, JURISDICTION, DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF REVIEW BOARD. 4.1 Citizen Complaints: Authority. Pursuant to Ordinance #7880, as amended, (Article XVIII, Section 340 340.9 of the San Diego County Administrative Code), the Review Board shall have authority to receive, review, investigate and report on citizen complaints filed against peace officers or custodial officers employed by the County in the Sheriff's Department or the Probation Department... This matter was referred to the Escondido Police Department's, Internal Affairs Unit.