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Introduction

In conjunction with our core values of integrity, honor and duty, the Aurora Police Department strives for professionalism in the performance of our duties. We encourage positive behavior in our employees by the use of awards and commendations. We also encourage our employees and citizens to report any perceived misconduct by our officers. We investigate every complaint and concern reported to the Department and take appropriate action, protecting the rights of the citizen and the Department member. This report reflects our commitment to openness and transparency to the community we serve.

The Department has four methods to manage complaints and discipline. The four methods used to manage complaints and disciplines are: the Automated Complaint and Commendation System; District / Bureau Discipline; Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreement Process; and Formal Internal Investigations and Discipline.

Automated Complaint and Commendation System

The Aurora Police Department created the Automated Complaint and Commendation System in 2006 to manage and record all allegations and investigations of complaints and commendations received on sworn officers of the Department. Regardless of how received, all complaints and commendations are entered into the automated system.

Citizens can enter their complaint or commendation directly online through the City’s website. If the Department receives a complaint or commendation in person, on the telephone or in writing, the receiving employee enters the information into the system. Once entered in the automated system, the complaint is forwarded to the Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) Commanding Officer. Once the Internal Affairs Commanding Officer or designee has reviewed the case, if he or she determines the case in an allegation that can be investigated at the District / Bureau level, he or she will send the case to the appropriate Commanding Officer. The Commanding Officer will assign the case to an appropriate supervisor in the District / Bureau and a preliminary investigation will be completed. If during the preliminary investigation, the investigator believes the allegation should not be handled at the District / Bureau level, a request for investigation by the IAB will be completed and forwarded, through the complaint management system to the subject member’s Division Chief.

Safeguards built into the system include the following: no one can delete the complaint or commendation; only one supervisor can work on the complaint at a time (following the chain of command); supervisors can add information but cannot remove it; all information inserted into the system is saved, documenting the date and time submitted and by whom; supervisors can search the system to determine if the officer has similar complaints and or commendations.

The system records all of the information and produces statistical information. Police managers use the information to determine future training needs as well as to decide an appropriate level of discipline.

District/Bureau Discipline

Cases that result in corrective measures (training verses discipline) are recorded in the Automated Complaint and Commendation System. A Police Department Supervisor or Manager investigates all District / Bureau Discipline cases. He/she obtains all the necessary information and reports his/her
findings to his/her supervisor. The employee’s chain of command reviews the investigation. If any supervisor in the chain of command determines that the employee violated a Department Directive(s) and decides the appropriate level of discipline is a Written Reprimand, he/she makes that recommendation to the Chief of Police or his designee. If the Chief concurs with the findings, a Written Reprimand is prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Chief. The Chief of Police may personally issue and serve the Written Reprimand on the employee or delegate this duty to a command officer within the employee’s chain of command. The Written Reprimand is part of the employee’s permanent discipline file.

**Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreement Process**

When an internal or external complaint is entered into the automated complaint system, it is immediately routed to IAB for review. The IAB Commander or designee will review the complaint to determine if it should be assigned to IAB for a full IAB investigation or reassigned to the subject member’s Commander for either Preliminary Investigation or an NDSA (Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreement). The IAB Commander or designees will add notes to the automated complaint system indicating the matter is eligible for the NDSA process. The tracking note will include a range of discipline based on the comparable discipline for prior similar policy violations resulting in a 40-hour suspension or less. The purpose of the NDSA process is to provide efficient resolution of Departmental Directives violations requiring limited formal discipline without the necessity of a formal Internal Affairs investigation.

**Formal Internal Investigations and Discipline**

The Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) Commanding Officer or designee receives allegations of misconduct. The IAB Commanding Officer determines whether the allegation of misconduct necessitates an IAB investigation. The IAB has the authority of the Chief of Police to conduct investigations. The IAB completes the investigation and will notify the subject member/members’ Division Chief(s), and District / Bureau Commander Officer(s) that the case is available for review. Once the involved Chiefs and Commanding Officers have read the case, the Deputy Chief, on behalf of the Chief of Police, will convene a Chief’s Review Board (CRB). The CRB will review the case and discuss the recommendation of finding from the IAB Commander. If the CRB determines a finding of sustained for any allegation of misconduct, or noncompliance for any compliance review, the CRB will make a recommendation of discipline to the Chief of Police. The Chief of Police will inform the member of recommended discipline. Additionally, critical incidents (i.e. police shootings, use of force resulting in serious injuries or death, serious traffic accidents involving officers, etc.) may result in a formal investigation regardless of whether there is any evidence or accusation of misconduct.
Perspective Statistics

The Department provides the following statistical information for the purpose of perspective. The Department currently employs 711 sworn officers, 136.5 civilian employees, and 69 public safety communication employees (total 916.5). During 2018, the Department handled 236,646 calls for service from the public, arrested 10,218 suspects, issued 5,909 criminal summonses (non-custodial arrests) and issued 33,413 traffic citations (this excludes parking tickets and General Offense related traffic summonses).

As noted in detail in the following sections, the Department received a total of 511 complaints for sworn members, 8 complaints for non-sworn members, 52 commendations for sworn members and one commendation for a non-sworn member.
Automated Complaint and Commendation Report

The Automated Complaint and Commendation System accepts and records all submissions. The Department designed the system to manage the complaints and commendations reported on sworn personnel.

During 2018, there were 519 complaints received online or entered by a Police Department member that involved 511 sworn members and eight non-sworn members. (Please note: some complaints may include several officers).

Additionally, 52 commendations were received for sworn officers. There was one commendation submitted for non-sworn members of the Department.

2018 Automated Complaints and Commendations

- Sworn Complaints (511)
- Non-Sworn Complaints (8)
- Sworn Commendations (52)
Automated Complaints by Type

The Automated Complaint System categorizes the submissions for the Department to analyze, determine trends and provide instruction if needed.

The system categorized the complaints received during 2018 as follows: One allegation of an illegal search, no reports of neglect of duty, 69 reported violations of court issues or missed court, four reported violations of Constitutional rights, four allegations of unsatisfactory performance, 12 allegations of racial profiling, 20 reports of excessive use of force, 34 complaints of improper or incomplete investigations, 113 for other directives or standard operation procedures not captured under the other types and 115 complaints of rudeness or professionalism issues.

Complaints by Event Type

- Illegal Search (1)
- Neglect of Duty (0)
- Constitutional Requirements (4)
- Unstatisfactory Performance (44)
- Bias-based Profiling (12)
- Use of Force (20)
- Improper/Incomplete Investigation (34)
- Other Dept. Directive or SOP (113)
- Officer Professionalism (115)
- Court Issue (69)
Automated Complaints by Validity

In each of the complaint submissions received, the officer’s supervisor has investigated the complaint. The officer’s chain of command has reviewed the investigations before closing them.

The Department has reviewed each of the complaints and ascertained the validity of the complaint. From these there were 187 sustained, 174 not sustained, 109 unfounded, 41 within policy, no misunderstandings, and none with an unresponsive complainant.

Complaints by Validity

- Sustained (187)
- Not Sustained (174)
- Unfounded (109)
- Policy Compliance (41)
- Misunderstanding (0)
- Unknown Validity (0)
Automated Complaints, Results

The Automated Complaint System records any corrective action taken by the Department as a result of the investigation. The results range from “none justified” to an order by the Chief for the Internal Affairs Bureau to formally investigate the complaint. Careful study and comparison of this information will reveal that more incidents result in some form of correction than incidents that are found to be valid. This is because the complaint may not be valid in light of the Department Directives, but the supervisor may determine the officer needs some degree of instruction to help him/her do a better job.

The results of the complaints submitted are as follows, in descending order of severity. The Chief of Police ordered the Internal Affairs Bureau to formally investigate 67 members (see page 20 for results of formal investigations). The Department sent six cases through the Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreement (NDSA) process. The Department issued 23 Written Reprimands for violations of Department Directives. A Written Reprimand is permanent discipline that remains in the officer’s file for his/her entire career. The Department issued nine Corrective Action Reports instructing the officers to change their behavior. The Corrective Action Report is not discipline but a notice or warning to modify behavior. The Corrective Action Report remains in the officer’s file for one to two years, depending on his/her evaluation date and cycle. It is documentation of past problems and corrective measures taken to correct the behavior. The officer’s supervisors issued 61 Performance Appraisal Entry (PAE) reports documenting negative performance. The supervisors use the PAE reports as documentation to be included in the officers’ annual evaluations. On 30 occasions, the supervisors verbally counseled the officers. One complaint was referred to mediation. The supervisors completed 12 Performance Appraisal Entry reports that were to document the investigation only (nothing negative toward the officer). The Department concluded in 296 of the complaints that the complaint was not valid, and that no documentation was needed.

![Automated Complaints - Results](image-url)
Automated Complaints, Follow Up Contact Method

At the conclusion of the investigation the supervisor is required, if possible, to contact the complainant and explain the findings. The Automated Complaint System records show the supervisor contacted that person.

The supervisors contacted the complainant by telephone in 105 of the cases. The supervisors used e-mail 125 times. In 78 cases, the supervisor could not contact the complainant (anonymous complaint or attempted but unable to contact). The supervisor met the complainant in person 65 times.
Automated Commendations by Type

The system categorized the 52 commendations received during 2018 as follows:

12 citizen submissions expressed appreciation for the officer. Two others reported a job well done. Four submissions stated the officer was professional. Two reported the officer went above and beyond expectations and 32 expressed a thank you.
Automated Complaint and Commendation System,
Miscellaneous Information on People Reporting

The automated complaint and commendation system allows the submitting person the opportunity to provide information about himself/herself. The system has a drop-down menu giving the person a choice of options to describe himself/herself. 98 of the people submitting a complaint or commendation indicated they were a citizen of Aurora. 53 indicated they were a non-resident. 46 said they were an employee member of the Department, and 73 indicated they were a government official.

Source of Commendations or Complaints

- Resident (98) - 36%
- Non-Resident (53) - 27%
- APD Member (46) - 17%
- City Official (73) - 20%
Gender of People Submitting Complaints

- Male (155) 43%
- Female (159) 42%
- Unknown Gender (58) 15%

Reported Ethnicity of People Submitting Complaints

- White (192) 52%
- African American (66) 26%
- Latino (16) 18%
- Asian (1) 0%
- American Indian (0) >1%
- Arab (0) >1%
- Unknown (96) 4%
Gender of People Submitting Commendations

- Male (12): 38%
- Female (17): 53%
- Unknown Gender (3): 9%

Reported Ethnicity of People Submitting Commendations

- White (14): 47%
- African American (0): 0%
- Latino (3): 9%
- Asian (0): 0%
- American Indian (0): 0%
- Arab (0): 0%
- Unknown (15): >1%
District and Bureau Discipline Report

Chief Metz and the Aurora Police Department recognize members of the Aurora Police Department have a right to privacy in the contents of their personnel files and expect the contents of these files will be held in confidence by their employer. This expectation and right to privacy flows from the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution, the Colorado Open Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes § 24-72-201, et. seq., the Colorado Criminal Justice Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes, § 24-72-301, et. seq., the City of Aurora Personnel Policies and Procedures, and the Aurora Police Department Directives. While there is little, if any, public interest in investigations stemming from allegations relating to purely administrative matters such as the use of equipment, abuse of leave and the like, these matters are nonetheless provided below.

Further, the City of Aurora also maintains the right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. The following summaries are included with these privileges of confidentiality in mind. The following summaries do not constitute a waiver of either the individual employee’s expectation of privacy in the contents of his/her personnel file, nor waiver of the City of Aurora’s right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential.

During 2018, the Department completed and finalized 30 District / Bureau investigations. Each resulted in the Chief of Police ordering a Written Reprimand as discipline for the violation of one or more Department Directives. A Written Reprimand is permanent discipline that remains in the employee’s file for his/her career.

The Department has categorized these 30 cases as follows: Six cases involved members not following Department policies for vehicle operations and/or the Department’s emergency response policy. One case involved issues of professional conduct. Two cases involved department equipment. Three cases involved the handling of evidence and/or property. Eight involved court issues. One case involved request for leave. Seven cases involved unsatisfactory performance. One case involved supervisor responsibilities. One case involved body worn camera operation.

The 30 District/Bureau written reprimands involved 28 members and were issued to one civilian, three recruit officers, 21 officers, one agent, one sergeants, and one lieutenant.

These matters that resulted in written reprimands are summarized with more detail below.

1) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility.

While working off duty, this member was involved in an accident on the property of another off-duty job.

2) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.9.2 Responsibility for Handling or Depositing Evidence and Other Property.

This officer collected the property of an arrestee and after transporting the prisoner it was realized the property bag was missing and never located.
3) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.9.2 Responsibility for Handling or Depositing Evidence and Other Property.

While making an arrest of a suspect, this officer removed personal property from the arrestee and placed it on the hood of the patrol vehicle. Prior to leaving the scene for the jail, the property was not retained and secured and was lost.

4) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.1.3 Vehicle Operation.

This member received a second photo red light violation.

5) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.

This member failed to satisfactorily complete a report on a curfew violation and had multiple errors on the forms associated with the report.

6) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.10.13 Supervisory/Command Review of Reports.

An arrest was made on a juvenile subject which members of investigations later learned lacked probable cause for an arrest. This supervisory member approved the warrantless arrest application.

7) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.9.2 Responsibility for Handling or Depositing Evidence and Other Property.

Following the arrest of a suspect, this officer placed personal property from the arrestee on the hood of the patrol vehicle. The arrestee was then transported but the member failed to retrieve the property from the hood of the vehicle and the property was never located.

8) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.10 Reports, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance and 14.2.9 Constitutional Requirements.

Officers were dispatched on a report of a disorderly party who was highly intoxicated. The reporting party did not want to pursue any charges, so officers provided a courtesy transport from the location. The subject later became argumentative and combative and was physically arrested and jailed for trespassing despite the reporting party’s request.

9) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.

This recruit member failed three geography tests.

10) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.

This recruit member failed three geography tests.
11) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.2.8 Authorized Use of Police Pursuits.

Member pursued a stolen vehicle against department policy.

12) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

Member failed to appear for a DOR hearing resulting in the case being dismissed.

13) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

Member failed to appear for court.

14) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.

This recruit member failed three geography tests.

15) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

Member failed to appear for court.

16) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

Member failed to appear for court.

17) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

Member failed to appear for court.

18) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.1.3 Vehicle Operation.

This officer was involved in a preventable traffic accident.

19) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

Member failed to appear for court.

20) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance.

Agent did not provide discovery to the District Attorney’s Office in a timely manner.

21) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

Member failed to appear for court.

22) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.1.3 Vehicle Operation.
This officer was involved in a preventable traffic accident.

23) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 16.4 Body Worn Camera Operation.

   Member failed to activate their department issued body worn camera during a pursuit.

24) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.10 Reports, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance and 14.2.9 Constitutional Requirements.

   Officers were dispatched on a report of a disorderly party who was highly intoxicated. The reporting party did not want to pursue any charges, so officers provided a courtesy transport from the location. The subject later became argumentative and combative and was physically arrested and jailed for trespassing despite the reporting party’s request.

25) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court.

   Member failed to appear for court.

26) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.6.5 Use of Departmental Equipment.

   Member lost their wallet containing their department issued ID card.

27) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.6.5 Use of Departmental Equipment.

   Member lost their wallet containing their department issued ID card.

28) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.1.3 Vehicle Operation.

   This officer was involved in a preventable traffic accident.

29) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.2.1 Scheduled Leave, 8.2.3 Request for Leave, APD SOP 1.1.1 Reporting for Duty, and APD SOP 14.1 Leave Requests/Trade Days.

   This member failed to contact supervisors for approval for leave time or deviation from their work schedule.

30) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.2 Emergency Response and Police Vehicle Pursuits.

   While attempting to stop a vehicle for speeding, this member traveled at unsafe speeds and later crashed into another vehicle.
Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreement

Chief Metz and the Aurora Police Department recognize members of the Aurora Police Department have a right to privacy in the contents of their personnel files and expect the contents of these files will be held in confidence by their employer. This expectation and right to privacy flows from the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution, the Colorado Open Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes § 24-72-201, et. seq., the Colorado Criminal Justice Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes, § 24-72-301, et. seq., the City of Aurora Personnel Policies and Procedures, and the Aurora Police Department Directives. While there is little, if any, public interest in investigations stemming from allegations relating to purely administrative matters such as the use of equipment, abuse of leave and the like, these matters are nonetheless provided below.

Further, the City of Aurora also maintains the right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. The following summaries are included with these privileges of confidentiality in mind. The following summaries do not constitute a waiver of either the individual employee’s expectation of privacy in the contents of his/her personnel file, nor waiver of the City of Aurora’s right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential.

During 2018, the Department completed and finalized six Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreements. Each resulted in the Chief of Police ordering a Written Reprimand or a suspension as discipline for the violation of one or more Department Directives.

The Department has categorized these six cases as follows: One case involved issues of professional conduct. One cases involved department equipment. Two cases involved unauthorized firing of a weapon. One involved court issues. One case involved preliminary investigations.

The six Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreements cases involved six members and were issued to 3 officers, two agents, and one sergeant.

1) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3.3 Member Duties and Responsibilities. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

   Member arrived late to court.

2) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility. The member received a 20-hour suspension.

   This member was found to have used derogatory language towards an arrestee.

3) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.6 Issuance of Equipment, Badges and ID Card. The member received a Written Reprimand.

   Member lost his department issued ID card and building pass.

4) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 6.11 Preliminary Investigation. The member received a 30-hour suspension.
Member failed to adequately investigate a harassment/Domestic Violence complaint.

5) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 5.1.3 Other Unauthorized Firing of a Weapon. The member received a 20-hour suspension.

Member accidentally fired a weapon in the armory.

6) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 5.1.3 Other Unauthorized Firing of a Weapon. The member received a 20-hour suspension.

Member accidentally fired his weapon while at his residence.
Formal Internal Investigations and Discipline Report

Chief Metz and the Aurora Police Department recognize the individual members of the Aurora Police Department have a right to privacy in the contents of their personnel files, including the results of formal investigations and incidents of discipline, and expect the contents of these files will be held in confidence by their employer. This expectation and right to privacy flows from the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution, the Colorado Open Records Act, Colorado Revised Statute, § 24-72-201, et. Seq., the Colorado Criminal Justice Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes § 24-72-301. et. Seq., the City of Aurora Personnel Policies and Procedures, and the Aurora Police Department Directives.

Further, the City of Aurora also maintains the right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. The following summaries are included below with these privileges of confidentiality in mind. The inclusion of the following summaries does not constitute a waiver of either the individual employee’s expectation of privacy in the contents of his/her personnel files, nor waiver of the City of Aurora’s right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. In an effort to balance the privacy and confidentiality rights of the individual officers, retaining the deliberative process privilege associated with the decision making detailed below, while at the same time providing our citizens with sufficient information to evaluate the adequacy, thoroughness and impartiality of the Aurora Police Department’s internal investigation and disciplinary process, the following information is provided:

Summary

The Department conducted and resolved 38 formal Internal Affairs investigations in 2018 involving 59 department members. (Please note: some investigations were initiated in prior years however, were not resolved until 2018). The members consisted of two civilians, one recruit, 43 officers, seven sergeants, one sergeant major, and three lieutenants. (Please note: some employees may be involved in more than one IAB case). The discipline included 20 suspensions without pay, 15 written reprimands, and seven corrective actions and one negative PAE. Two members resigned or retired before discipline was issued. One member was terminated. The Department cleared 11 members of any wrongdoing.

1) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.1.1 Lawful Orders, 14.2.3 Associations, 14.2.4 Interventions, 14.3.5 Neglect of Duty, 17.2 Use of CAD and MDC, 14.1.5 Conformance to Law, and 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. The member was terminated.

This member engaged in criminal activity and associated with known felons.

2) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 8.10.9 Warrantless Arrest Affidavits, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance and 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. One member was sustained on 8.10.9 and received a 12-hour suspension and one member was sustained on 14.3.1 and received a 20-hour suspension.

Officers responded to robbery with shots fired where two arrests were made. Two warrantless arrest affidavits were completed but did not contain the required information to establish probable cause. The affidavits also did not contain other required information, such as victim
names. One supervisor approved the warrantless affidavits. The DA’s office dismissed the charges against both suspects.

3) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.2.3 Request for Leave, 14.1.5 Conformance to Law, 14.1.7 Conduct Involving Moral Turpitude, 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration, and 14.3.5 Neglect of Duty. The member retired prior to discipline.

While assigned to an external task force, this member did not work the required number of hours per work. The member untruthfully submitted requests for overtime when they were not working and neglected their duties.

4) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.8 Police-Community Relations. The member received a Written Reprimand.

While working off-duty, this member was enforcing the rules of the condominium complex rather than enforcing the law. The member was overbearing and aggressive during the contact with the parties on scene.

5) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 5.3 Use of Physical Force and 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. One member was sustained on 5.3 but retired prior to discipline.

Officers became involved in a shooting investigation and contacted the victim and associated parties at a medical facility. A decision was made to impound a vehicle for evidentiary purposes and during this process the female driver of the vehicle refused to provide the keys to the vehicle. One officer attempted to place the female under arrest, resulting in a struggle. Officers attempted to gain control of the female by taking her to the ground where she was accidentally kicked in the head.

6) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.1.5 Conformance to Law, 14.2.4 Interventions and 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. The member was sustained on 14.1.5 and received a 160-hour suspension.

Officer was charged criminally in Boulder County. The charges stemmed from the officer’s interactions with the Erie Police Department regarding a felony menacing case involving his nephew. Officer pled guilty to a reduced charge.

7) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 6.9.1 Domestic Violence – Enforcement Guidelines, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance and 14.3.10 Reporting Responsibility. One member was sustained on 6.9.10 and 14.3.10 and received a 20-hour suspension.

Officers responded to a Domestic Violence call where the officers reported that the victim stated there was not a physical altercation however several items of clothing were torn, and the victim stated to the City Attorney that she did tell the officers her husband had been physical and attempted to rape her. These statements the victim made were captured on the officer’s body cameras.
8) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 7.1.2 Required Training, 7.2.5 Attendance of In-Service, 8.2.3 Request for Leave, 14.1.1 Lawful Orders, and 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. The member was sustained on 7.1.2, 7.2.5, 8.2.3, and 14.1.1. The member received a 20-hour suspension.

Officer failed to attend a full day of a make-up in-service and did not notify a supervisor.

9) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 14.2.9 Constitutional Requirements, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance and 16.4.3 Body Worn Camera Operation. One member was sustained on 14.3.1 and 16.4.3 and one member was sustained for 14.3.1. Both members received a Written Reprimand.

Sergeant and Officer were dispatched to a welfare check. The officers made entry into the residence through an unlocked front door without being invited in and without exigency. They talked to a resident through a closed door and left the scene without making face to face contact and without searching the residence.

10) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations, 8.10.3 General Offense Reports and 16.4.3 Body Worn Camera Operation. The member was sustained on 6.11.2 and 16.4.3 and received a 20-hour suspension.

Officer was working as a SRO when he was called to the school counseling office for a suicidal student where he contacted the subject and her mother. During his interaction, the student and her mother told the officer that she had been sexually assaulted by another student. The officer did not complete a report detailing the sexual assault allegation and he did not activate his body camera during the encounter.

11) The Department investigated a civilian member for violating 1.5 Professionalism and Conflicts and 1.6 Disciplinary Action Policy from the City of Aurora Employee Manual. The member was not sustained.

While attending a party after hours and off-duty, this member purchased shots of alcohol for other employees. The member also directed another employee to call in sick before purchasing more alcohol. Later that week, while on-duty this member showed other employees pictures of an intoxicated employee from that night.

12) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.9.2 Responsibility for Handling or Depositing Evidence and Other Property, 8.10.4 Supplemental Reports, 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility and 16.4.5 Body Worn Camera Operation. The member was sustained on 8.9.2, 8.10.4 and 16.4.5 and received a 10-hour suspension.

Officer assisted with a robbery investigation and found a $100 bill in the street and picked the bill up and kept it for himself and did not enter the recovered bill into property as either evidence or found property.

13) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance, 14.3.10 Reporting Responsibility and 1.4.11 Supervisor Responsibility: Accountability for Performance of Subordinates. One member was sustained on 14.3.10 and received a Written Reprimand.
Agent was assigned a forgery/counterfeit case in which he conducted follow-up on the case but did not document the follow-up information in a supplement report and later requested a no-file from the DA without providing follow-up information. The Sergeant approved the Agent’s reports.

14) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility. The member received a Written Reprimand.

Officer made statements to other members of APD alleging that a lieutenant was driving under the influence of alcohol and another lieutenant covered it up. Officer also made unsubstantiated statements that the same lieutenant would come to work drunk.

15) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 8.3.5 Procedures for Requesting Continuances and Dismissals and 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. All members were sustained on 14.3.1 and received Written Reprimands.

Officers responded to the Aurora Municipal Courts to testify on a Domestic Violence case and it is alleged that the officers encouraged the court staff to dismiss the charges against the defendant on the day of trial.

16) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations and 6.1.2 Release of Adults Arrested without a Warrant. One officer was sustained on 6.11.2 and one supervisor was sustained on 6.1.2. Both members received a Written Reprimand.

All three officers were dispatched to a Domestic Violence investigation which was not properly documented. The male half on the call was arrested for Possession of a Weapon by a Previous Offender, however his prior felony conviction was not valid.

17) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations and 16.4.5 Body Worn Camera Operation. The member received a 40-hour suspension.

Officer did not conduct a preliminary investigation involving possible abuse of a non-verbal autistic child by a staff member at an elementary school.

18) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 4.2.1 Authorized Emergency Response and 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. The member was sustained on 4.2.1 and received a 20-hour suspension.

It is alleged that Officer was untruthful during an EEO investigation involving his recruit. In addition, while on duty and without authorization, the Officer drove his recruit to the hospital outside of his assigned district to visit her mother with emergency lights and siren activated.

19) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.12.3 Requirements/Limitations of Sworn Members Engaged in Secondary Employment and 14.3.5 Neglect of Duty. The member received a Written Reprimand.
While working at an off-duty job, the owner of the business observed this Officer allegedly sleeping in his vehicle.

20) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. The member received a 40-hour suspension.

Recruit Officer was alleged to have cheated during an academy exam.

21) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 16.4.9 Body Worn Camera Member Responsibility and 16.4.10 Body Worn Camera Retention, Storage and Duplication. Two members were sustained on the allegations and both members received a 10-hour suspension.

An Officer made a traffic stop on the son of an elected official. The son was belligerent and argumentative. This officer showed the body-cam footage to fellow officers. Another officer recorded the video with his cellphone and showed the clip to yet another officer who in turn showed it to her husband, who was not a department member. The cellphone video was eventually leaked to the media without the approval of the Chief’s Office.

22) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility and 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. The member was sustained on 14.3 and received a Written Reprimand.

Officer investigated a possible drunk driver where he arrested the driver for DUI. The defendant alleged that the Officer lied during the DOR hearing. The officer did not adequately prepare for the DOR hearing.

23) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 5.1.3 Other Unauthorized Firing of a Weapon. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

Officer unintentionally discharged his duty weapon while in a foot pursuit of a burglary subject.

24) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 6.1.13 Search Incident to Arrest, 6.5.1 Searching Detainees before Transport and 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance. All three members were sustained on 14.3.1 and received a Corrective Action.

Officers responded to a report of a physical altercation where they took a subject into custody for an active warrant. All three officers searched the subject however did not find a small pistol that was concealed in his sock. The gun was found by a detention officer.

25) The Department Investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility. The member was not sustained.

Allegations were made that this member used profane and unprofessional language with recruit officers during scenario day at the academy.

26) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 6.11.2 Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations, 8.10.5 Time-Sensitive Reports and 16.4.3 Body Worn Camera Operation. Both members were sustained on 8.10.5 and received Written Reprimands.
Officers were dispatched to a Domestic Violence call but failed to take photographs of an injury and did not write their supplemental reports in a timely manner.

27) The Department sustained sworn members for violating Department Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility. One member received a 240-hour suspension and one received a 40-hour suspension.

While conducting briefing, a Sergeant read out-loud a text message from an officer which contained anti-gay slurs.

28) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility. The member was not sustained however she did receive a Corrective Action.

While at home member had placed her duty bag, which contained her holstered taser, on the floor in her bedroom. The members daughter and her friend were able to access the taser. The friend shot the members daughter with the taser, resulting in her daughter being shocked and the taser barbs being lodged in her chest and neck.

29) The Department investigated sworn members for violating Department Directives 5.3 Use of Force, 5.4.6 Responsibilities of Supervisory Officer Notified, 6.1.10 Release of Handcuffed Persons Following Investigatory Stop, 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance, 16.4.3 Body Worn Camera Operation, and 17.2.2 Unauthorized Use of CAD and MDC Systems. One member was sustained for 16.4.3 and received a Negative PAE. Another member was sustained on 6.1.10 and 16.4.3 and received a Corrective Action. The supervisor was sustained on 5.4.6 and received a Written Reprimand.

Officers from the Gang Intervention Unit conducted a traffic stop and during the stop they forcibly removed an occupant from the vehicle and arrested him. The subject alleged he was physically assaulted. In addition, it is alleged the officers also placed the second occupant of the vehicle in handcuffs and then released him without charges.

30) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 5.1.3 Other Unauthorized Firing of a Weapon and 7.3.5 Automatic/Semi-Automatic Rifle Training. The member received a 20-hour suspension.

While assisting in looking for a possible armed subject, this member accidentally discharged a round from his rifle causing damage to his patrol vehicle.

31) The Department investigated a non-sworn member for violating Public Safety Communications SOP 108 – General Office Equipment – Console Intercom. The member was not sustained.

Member failed to follow an established Dispatch Standard Operating Procedure regarding the use of the intercom system during a medical emergency that may have delayed the response of Aurora Fire Rescue.

32) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

Officer missed duty assignments at Municipal Court on six occasions.
33) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.3.8 Police-Community Relations and 17.2.2 Unauthorized Use of CAD and MDC Systems. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

   Officer was unprofessional during his contact with a citizen, and also entered inappropriate notes into the CAD after clearing a parking complaint.

34) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3 Court. The member received a Written Reprimand.

   Officer was subpoenaed to, and failed to attend, a DOR hearing resulting in the case being dismissed.

35) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Special Order 18.02 Starchase Vehicle Pursuit Management Technology and Department Directive 14.2.9 Constitutional Requirements. The member was sustained on 14.2.9 and received a Corrective Action.

   Member placed a StarChase tracker on a parked, unoccupied vehicle that had previously fled from him.

36) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility. The member received a Corrective Action.

   It is alleged that this member made inappropriate gestures towards another member of the police department.

37) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.3.1 Unsatisfactory Performance and 14.3.3 Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. The member was sustained on 14.3.1 and received a Written Reprimand.

   This Officer made statements to a Sergeant indicating he had never filled up a patrol car with gas, when in fact he had and that he had never been to District 2 to get blank business cards or actually handed them out, when in fact he had.

38) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.1.5 Conformance to Law, 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility and 14.2.7 Payment of Debts. The member was sustained on 14.2.7 and received a 20-hour suspension.

   This member failed to claim income earned while working at an off-duty job.