Jessica Navarro, Ali Zaidi, Glenn, Alhassane Samassekou
ITAI2372
In depth case study analysis of Abuse of AI in any Industry

Case Study Analysis: The Trouble with AI in Law Enforcement – PredPol's Predictive Policing

Industry: Law Enforcement

Technology: Predictive Policing Algorithm (PredPol)

Overview of Predictive Policing

Predictive policing sounds like something out of a sci-fi movie: using artificial intelligence (AI) to predict where crimes might happen and stop them before they do. It's built on the idea that crime follows patterns—like burglaries spiking in certain neighborhoods at certain times. By feeding historical crime data into an algorithm, police can figure out where to send officers to prevent trouble. One of the big players in this space was PredPol, developed by PredPol Inc. The tool used machine learning to analyze past crime reports—things like where crimes happened, when, and what kind—and then spit out "hotspot" maps for police to focus on. The pitch was simple: smarter policing without needing more cops.

Implementation of PredPol

PredPol got rolled out in dozens of police departments across the U.S., including big ones like the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) and smaller ones in places like Richmond, California. Here's how it worked: every day, officers got maps with boxes highlighting areas where the algorithm thought crimes—mostly property stuff like burglaries or violent incidents—were likely to pop up. The LAPD, for instance, started testing it back in 2011 in neighborhoods like Foothill, hoping to cut property crime rates (Hvistendahl, 2016). The system relied entirely on old crime data from police reports, assuming that what happened before would clue them into what's coming next.

Challenges and Negative Outcomes

This all sounds great on paper, but PredPol ran into some serious problems. Here's what went wrong:

1. **Bias Baked In**: The biggest issue was racial bias. Since PredPol learned from historical crime data, and that data came from years of policing that often targeted Black and Latino neighborhoods more heavily, the algorithm ended up pointing police right back to those same areas. A 2016 study by the think tank Upturn found that predictive policing tools like PredPol could trap communities in a vicious cycle: more police in minority neighborhoods meant more arrests, which fed more data

into the system, which then predicted more crime there (Lum & Isaac, 2016). For example, in Oakland, California, researchers showed how these tools flagged Black neighborhoods at twice the rate of white ones, even when crime rates didn't justify it.

2. **No One Knew How It Worked**: PredPol was a "black box"—even the cops using it didn't fully understand what was going on inside. The company didn't share the details of its algorithm, so there was no way to check if it was fair or accurate. A report from the Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF) in 2019 called this lack of transparency a huge red flag, arguing it made accountability impossible (Stanley, 2019).
3. **Over-Policing and Privacy Worries**: Sending cops to "hotspots" meant some neighborhoods got watched way more than others. In LA, residents in flagged areas complained about constant patrols and stops, even when no crime had happened. The ACLU warned that this kind of AI-driven policing could turn into mass surveillance, stomping on people's privacy rights (ACLU, 2016). Imagine living in a neighborhood where cops are always around just because a computer said so—it's unsettling.
4. **Did It Even Work?**: Here's the kicker: there's not much proof PredPol actually stopped crime. A 2019 RAND Corporation study found that in some cities, like Chicago, predictive policing didn't lower crime rates any better than old-school methods like random patrols (Saunders et al., 2019). In Richmond, California, police saw a drop in property crimes at first, but it wasn't clear if PredPol deserved the credit or if other factors—like community programs—were at play.
5. **Legal and Ethical Mess**: Using AI to decide where to police raised big questions. Could this violate the Fourth Amendment, which protects against unreasonable searches? What about fairness? If innocent people in "hotspots" got hassled more, was that just? Civil rights groups like the ACLU argued it could undermine trust in the justice system (ACLU, 2016).

Outcome and Reactions

By 2020, PredPol hit a wall. Facing criticism from civil rights advocates and growing evidence of its flaws, the company stopped selling its software to police departments and rebranded as Geolitica, shifting focus to less controversial tools. But the damage was done. Years of use had already spotlighted how AI could go wrong in law enforcement.

Groups like the ACLU cheered the pivot but kept pushing for tougher rules on AI in policing (ACLU, 2020).

Takeaways

1. **AI Can Amplify Bias**: PredPol shows how AI isn't neutral—it's only as good as the data it's fed. If that data's biased, the results will be too.
2. **Transparency Matters**: When no one can see inside the AI, it's hard to trust it—especially in something as serious as policing.
3. **Ethics Can't Be Ignored**: Using AI in law enforcement needs guardrails to protect people's rights and prevent harm.
4. **Humans Still Rule**: AI can crunch numbers, but it shouldn't replace human judgment. Cops and communities know more than any algorithm.

Conclusion

PredPol's story is a warning: AI can sound like a magic fix, but without care, it can make things worse—especially in law enforcement, where the stakes are sky-high. It's not just about catching bad guys; it's about fairness, trust, and making sure technology helps everyone, not just a few. As AI keeps popping up in places like this, we've got to keep asking: who's it helping, and who's it hurting?

Jessica Navarro, Ali Zaidi, Glenn, Alhassane Samassekou
ITAI2372
In depth case study analysis of Abuse of AI in any Industry

Sources

- ACLU. (2016). *Predictive Policing: A Threat to Civil Liberties*. American Civil Liberties Union. Retrieved from https://www.aclu.org
- ACLU. (2020). *Victory Against Predictive Policing Tools*. American Civil Liberties Union. Retrieved from https://www.aclu.org
- Hvistendahl, M. (2016). "Can Predictive Policing Be Fair?" *Science Magazine*. DOI:10.1126/science.aal0669
- Lum, K., & Isaac, W. (2016). "To Predict and Serve?" *Significance Magazine*, Royal Statistical Society. Retrieved from https://rss.onlinelibrary.wiley.com
- Saunders, J., et al. (2019). *Evaluating Predictive Policing: A RAND Study*. RAND Corporation. Retrieved from https://www.rand.org
- Stanley, J. (2019). "The Problems with Predictive Policing." *Electronic Frontier Foundation*. Retrieved from https://www.eff.org