**Summarize**

[**1994-06-06 Dishonesty SFPD193.pdf**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ecfbd2fac472facaf47cf6d3e1d9474c/content#page=1)

[**Pages 1-9**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ecfbd2fac472facaf47cf6d3e1d9474c/content#page=1)

* The document contains a collection of correspondence and reports related to a complaint against Officer Guillermo Amigo for unwarranted action.
* The Chief of Police, Anthony D. Ribera, and the Interim Director of the Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC), John Parker, are both involved in the case.
* The Management Control Division (MCD) concurs with the findings of the OCC, which sustained the complaint against Amigo.
* The MCD recommends that Amigo receive a written reprimand.
* Ribera concurs with the recommendation.
* In a later letter, Ribera informs Parker that the complaint has been adjudicated and Amigo received a written reprimand.
* The reprimand is for violating rules related to the handling of property taken from a citizen.
* In a separate report, the OCC outlines the allegations against Amigo, which involve him taking a marijuana pipe from a citizen and throwing it down a storm drain.

[**Pages 10-16**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ecfbd2fac472facaf47cf6d3e1d9474c/content#page=10)

* The document begins with a report from the OCC to the Chief of Police, Anthony D. Ribera, detailing the complaint against Officer G. Amigo.
* The complaint alleges that Amigo searched the complainant, took his pipe, and did not return it.
* The report includes the date, time, and location of the incident, as well as the names of the officers involved.
* The OCC finds that Amigo's actions were unwarranted and sustains the complaint.
* The document also contains summaries of interviews with the complainant, Officer Amigo, and other officers who were present during the incident.
* Amigo admits to confiscating the pipe and not issuing a receipt, which is a violation of department policy.
* The OCC concludes that Amigo violated General Order Q-4, which requires officers to issue a receipt when confiscating property.

[**Pages 17-27**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ecfbd2fac472facaf47cf6d3e1d9474c/content#page=17)

* The document begins with a description of General Order Q-4, which outlines the procedures for booking property that is not connected with an arrest or crime.
* The order specifies the types of property that can be booked for identification or safekeeping, as well as the types of property that should not be returned to the owner.
* The order also outlines the process for receipt and booking of property, including the requirement to complete form SFPD 315 and prepare an incident report.
* The document concludes with the signature of the Chief of Police, Cornelius P. Murphy, who issued the order.

[**1994-06-06 Dishonesty SFPD193 redaction index.pdf**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/f145628ec2b6f60c56c50b21bdb5fcf4/content#page=1)

[**Pages 1-2**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/f145628ec2b6f60c56c50b21bdb5fcf4/content#page=1)

* The document is from the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) and details records related to an incident involving a peace officer.
* The incident occurred on June 6, 1994 and involved officer Guillermo Amigo.
* The records include documents related to Internal Affairs Report OCC 0430-94.
* Redactions have been made to the records based on various exemptions, which are outlined in the document. Exemption 1: California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(A) - personal data or information. Exemption 2 & 3: California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(B) - anonymity of complainants and witnesses. Exemption 5: California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(C) - confidential medical, financial, or other information. Exemption 7: California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(D) - danger to physical safety. Exemption 8: California Penal Code § 832.7(a) - personnel records of peace officers and custodial officers. Exemption 9: California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(7) - personal identifying information. Exemption 10: California Penal Code §§ 11076, 11105 (b) - confidentiality of information from the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS). Exemption 11: California Penal Code §§ 13300(b) - criminal offender record information (CORI). Exemption 12: California Government Code § 7927.500 - preliminary drafts, notes, or memoranda. Exemption 13: California Government Code § 7923.600 - records of complaints, investigations, or security procedures. Exemption 14: California Code of Civil Procedure § 129 - photographs of a deceased person. Exemption 15: California Government Code §§ 7927.700, 7927.705, and 7930.100 - unwarranted invasion of privacy. Exemption 16: California Welfare & Institutions Code § 5328 - confidential mental health records. Exemption 17: California Welfare & Institutions Code § 827, California Government Code § 6254(k) - juvenile records. Exemption 18: California Government Code §§ 7927.705, 7930.110, Evidence Code § 954 - attorney-client privilege. Exemption 19: California Evidence Code 1040(b)(2) - privilege to refuse to disclose official information. Exemption 20: California Penal Code § 832.7(g) - discovery or disclosure of information. Exemption 21: California Penal Code § 832.7(h) - criminal discovery process.

[**1997-12-31 Dishonesty Comm133.pdf**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/71c897f9aadbf6bb1a23f1a4145c7b8f/content#page=1)

[**Pages 1-2**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/71c897f9aadbf6bb1a23f1a4145c7b8f/content#page=1)

* The document discusses records related to a sustained complaint of dishonesty involving Officer Peter Ma from July 1997 through December 1997.
* The document lists various legal exemptions that allow for the redaction of information in these records.
* Exemption 1 pertains to personal data or information, such as a home address, telephone number, or identities of family members.
* Exemption 2 allows for the anonymity of complainants and witnesses.
* Exemption 3 protects confidential medical, financial, or other information that would cause an unwarranted invasion of privacy.
* Exemption 4 pertains to situations where disclosure of the record would pose a significant danger to the physical safety of someone.
* Exemption 5 refers to California Penal Code § 832.7(a), which states that personnel records of peace officers and custodial officers are confidential.
* Exemption 7 refers to California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(7), which allows for the redaction of personal identifying information when the public interest is better served by not disclosing it.
* Exemption 8 pertains to the confidentiality of information from the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS).
* Exemption 9 refers to California Government Code § 7927.500, which exempts from disclosure preliminary drafts, notes, or memoranda.
* Exemption 10 refers to California Government Code § 7923.600, which exempts records of complaints, investigations, intelligence information, or security procedures.
* Exemption 11 pertains to photographs of the body of a deceased person taken by or for the coroner.
* Exemption 12 refers to California Government Code §§ 7927.700, 7927.705, and 7930.100, which protect against unwarranted invasions of privacy.
* Exemption 13 refers to California Welfare & Institutions Code § 5328, which protects confidential mental health records.
* Exemption 14 refers to California Welfare & Institutions Code § 827 and California Government Code § 6254(k), which protect juvenile records.
* Exemption 15 refers to California Government Code §§ 7927.705, 7930.110, and Evidence Code § 954, which protect attorney-client privilege.
* Exemption 16 refers to California Evidence Code 1040(b)(2), which allows a public entity to refuse to disclose official information.
* Exemption 17 refers to California Penal Code § 832.7(g), which states that this section does not affect the discovery or disclosure of information in a peace or custodial officer's personnel file.
* Exemption 18 refers to California Penal Code § 832.7(h), which states that this section does not supersede or affect the criminal discovery process.

[**1997-12-31 Dishonesty Comm133 redaction index.pdf**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/e917909a498b1bf59d6e97b042f5bbe9/content#page=1)

[**Pages 1-13**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/e917909a498b1bf59d6e97b042f5bbe9/content#page=1)

* The document contains a collection of documents related to a disciplinary hearing for police officer Peter D. Ma.
* The document includes correspondence between various parties involved in the hearing, subpoenas, and a response to a motion to compel discovery.
* Key individuals mentioned include Sidney Chan (president of the Police Commission), Connie Perry (vice president of the Police Commission), and Jean Field (attorney for the Office of Citizen Complaints).
* The Police Commission adopted a resolution to continue the charges against Ma off calendar after he resigned from the department.
* Subpoenas were issued to Ma, Officer Daniel Simone, and Officer Chad Campos to appear before the Police Commission.
* Ma was notified of the hearing date and instructed to appear in proper court attire and to check his firearm with the station keeper.
* The Police Commission scheduled a special meeting to take evidence on the charges against Ma.
* Jean Field, attorney for the Office of Citizen Complaints, filed a response to a motion to compel discovery, arguing that the Police Commission has the power to create and enforce rules regarding discovery.

[**Pages 14-21**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/e917909a498b1bf59d6e97b042f5bbe9/content#page=14)

* The document argues that the Police Commission's Standing Order Governing Discovery, rather than criminal or civil discovery case law, governs the proceedings before the Police Commission.
* The Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC) argues that it has complied with the Standing Order Governing Discovery by providing the Accused Officer with documents, audio and video recordings, and other information related to the disciplinary charges.
* The OCC argues that the Complaint Work Summary is an "evaluative summary" that is exempt from discovery under the Police Commission's Standing Order Governing Discovery.
* The OCC argues that it has complied with state and federal discovery requirements by providing the Accused Officer with taped interviews and all exculpatory evidence.
* The OCC argues that the Accused Officer is not entitled to post-interview summaries because he already possesses unedited, taped statements of the interviews.
* The OCC argues that the Investigative Hearing Rules do not apply to Police Commission hearings.
* The OCC asks the Police Commission to deny the Accused Officer's motion to compel the production of the work summary.

[**Pages 22-32**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/e917909a498b1bf59d6e97b042f5bbe9/content#page=22)

* Jean Field, an attorney for the Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC), argues against a motion to compel discovery in the disciplinary hearing for police officer Peter D. Ma.
* Field asserts that she provided all relevant evidentiary material to the accused officer's attorney, including tape recordings and documents.
* Field argues that the remainder of the Work Summary is exempt from disclosure according to the Police Commission's Standing Order Governing Discovery.
* Field references a previous case in which the Police Commission did not provide a full, unredacted Work Summary to the accused officer's attorney.
* Mary Dunlap, the Director of the OCC, argues that the Complaint Work Summary is essential to the OCC's goal of establishing reasoned, consistent, and accurate resolutions to citizen complaints.
* Dunlap argues that making the Work Summary discoverable would disrupt the reasoning process of the OCC and would be comparable to judges requiring prosecutors to provide work product-privileged materials to opponents.

[**Pages 33-43**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/e917909a498b1bf59d6e97b042f5bbe9/content#page=33)

* The document begins with a discussion of the OCC's case review process, noting that there has never been an instance of evidence being fabricated or misstated by the OCC.
* The document argues that the accused officer already has access to all evidence, including exonerating and incriminating material, and that the Complaint Work Summary would not provide any additional safeguards.
* The document discusses the Police Commission's role in governing what evidence is admitted or excluded, and notes that the Complaint Work Summary is not typically admitted as evidence.
* The document argues that the Complaint Work Summary is protected as "attorney work product" and should not be discoverable.
* The document references a previous case in which a judge reviewed the Complaint Work Summary in camera and only provided redacted versions to the defense.
* The document argues that the defense's citation of OCC's internal investigative hearing rules is misleading, as those rules are separate from the Police Commission's hearing rules.

[**Pages 44-48**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/e917909a498b1bf59d6e97b042f5bbe9/content#page=44)

* Jean Field, an attorney for the Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC), responds to a request for additional discovery in OCC Case No. 1106-97.
* Field outlines the materials that have already been provided to the defense, including a copy of the Sustained Case Report, tape-recorded interviews, and a laboratory report.
* Field explains that she cannot fully comply with the request for original documents because the OCC only has copies of the questioned documents, and the handwriting samples are confidential.
* Field offers to grant access to the documents, but requests a protocol to ensure their safe return.
* Field provides a list of additional evidentiary materials that she is enclosing with the letter, including witness lists, personnel histories, and police schedules.
* Field also includes sections of the Investigator's Work Summary, but argues that the rest of the summary does not contain any factual information not already available to the defense.
* Field references the Police Commission's Standing Order Governing Discovery, which states that "evaluative summary containing opinions, impressions and conclusions" are not subject to discovery.

[**Pages 49-52**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/e917909a498b1bf59d6e97b042f5bbe9/content#page=49)

* The document begins by defining various terms, such as "complainant," "investigator," and "San Francisco Police Department member."
* It then outlines the rules for calculating time periods for notices and requests.
* The document goes on to describe the qualifications and selection process for Investigative Hearing Officers (IHOs).
* It also outlines the powers and duties of IHOs, including the ability to summon witnesses and maintain confidentiality.
* The document specifies who may be present at hearings, and who may be excluded.
* Finally, it discusses the consequences of failing to appear at a hearing.

[**Pages 53-56**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/e917909a498b1bf59d6e97b042f5bbe9/content#page=53)

* The document begins by outlining the rules for evidence, including what types of evidence are admissible and how they should be handled.
* It then discusses the authority to compel witnesses to appear, and the process for subpoenaing documents.
* The document goes on to describe the process for requesting an investigative hearing, and the criteria for when a hearing will be held.
* It also outlines the procedures for postponing or continuing a hearing.
* The document specifies that all hearings will be tape recorded, and that only the named member may record their own statement.
* Finally, it discusses the IHO's decision and the Director's duties following receipt of that decision.

[**Pages 57-64**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/e917909a498b1bf59d6e97b042f5bbe9/content#page=57)

* The document begins by outlining various rules for the Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC) hearing, including definitions for neglect of duty, racial/sexual/ethnic slurs, policy failure, supervisory failure, and training failure.
* It then discusses the process for making findings of proper or improper conduct, and the consequences of each.
* The document also authorizes the Director to transmit confidential records to the Chief of Police.
* The document then transitions to a motion for pretrial discovery compliance order, filed by the attorney for accused officer Peter D. Ma.
* The motion requests the entire "Complaint Work Summary" from the OCC, which was only partially produced.
* The motion is based on the attached declaration of counsel, memorandum of points and authorities, and oral evidence.
* The declaration of counsel details the attorney's request for discovery, the OCC's response, and the importance of the "Complaint Work Summary" to the case.
* The memorandum of points and authorities discusses the OCC's failure to comply with state and federal requirements for complete production of discovery.

[**Pages 65-80**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/e917909a498b1bf59d6e97b042f5bbe9/content#page=65)

* The document begins by discussing the definition of "statements" in relation to discovery rules.
* It cites several cases that support the disclosure of witness interview notes.
* The document argues that the "Complaint Work Summary" is discoverable under the Thompson case.
* It then discusses the OCC's failure to provide discovery that was requested informally.
* The document argues that the "Complaint Work Summary" is discoverable under the OCC's own rules.
* It concludes by requesting the Police Commission order the OCC to produce the "Complaint Work Summary" in its entirety.
* The document also includes two exhibits: a letter requesting discovery and a partially redacted "Complaint Work Summary."

[**Pages 81-100**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/e917909a498b1bf59d6e97b042f5bbe9/content#page=81)

* The document begins with a summary of the investigation into a police officer, Peter D. Ma.
* It details various activities undertaken by the investigator, Heppe, including contacting different police stations and departments to gather information.
* The document also mentions key individuals involved in the disciplinary hearing, such as Sidney Chan, Connie Perry, and Jean Field.
* The document discusses the investigator's attempts to locate and identify citation books and records.
* It also details the investigator's interactions with the complainant, who expresses concerns about her safety.
* The document concludes with a proof of service, detailing how the motion for prehearing discovery compliance order was served to Jean Field.

[**Pages 101-113**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/e917909a498b1bf59d6e97b042f5bbe9/content#page=101)

* The document begins with two letters from the Police Commission to Chief of Police Fred H. Lau, informing him of the resolution to assign Commissioner Wayne Friday to conduct the taking of evidence in the disciplinary charges against Officer Peter D. Ma.
* The second letter informs Officer Ma of the date and location of the hearing, and instructs him to attend unless excused.
* The document then moves on to the charges against Officer Ma, which include issuing citations to a civilian without justification, in violation of Department General Order 2.01, Rule 9.
* The document details four citations that the victim received, all of which she claims she did not commit.
* The document also discusses the victim's prior interactions with Officer Ma, which include a complaint to store management and a threat of bodily harm from the officer.
* The document concludes with a verification from Chief of Police Fred H. Lau, a proof of service from Lt. Mary Stasko, and a filing notice from the Secretary of the Police Commission.

[**2001-10-04 Dishonesty Comm134.pdf**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/9ae4dc356795d0b2c2cf3d0cb3b6b07e/content#page=1)

[**Pages 1-2**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/9ae4dc356795d0b2c2cf3d0cb3b6b07e/content#page=1)

* The document pertains to the redaction of information from records related to a complaint against Officer Laurence Barker.
* The document lists various legal exemptions that allow for the redaction of information, including: California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(A), which protects personal data such as home addresses and phone numbers. California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(B), which preserves the anonymity of complainants and witnesses. California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(C), which protects confidential medical, financial, or other information. California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(D), which allows for redaction if disclosure would pose a danger to someone's physical safety.
* Other exemptions cited include: California Penal Code § 832.7(a), which makes personnel records of peace officers confidential. California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(7), which allows for redaction if the public interest is better served by not disclosing information. California Penal Code §§ 11076, 11105 (b), which restrict access to information from the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS). California Penal Code §§ 13300(b), which restricts dissemination of criminal offender record information (CORI).
* The document also references exemptions related to: Preliminary drafts or notes (California Government Code § 7927.500). Records of complaints or investigations by local police agencies (California Government Code § 7923.600). Photographs of a deceased person taken by the coroner (California Code of Civil Procedure § 129). Information that would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy (California Government Code §§ 7927.700, 7927.705, and 7930.100). Confidential mental health records (California Welfare & Institutions Code § 5328). Juvenile records (California Welfare & Institutions Code § 827, California Government Code § 6254(k)). Attorney-client privilege (California Government Code §§ 7927.705, 7930.110, Evidence Code § 954). Official information that needs to remain confidential (California Evidence Code 1040(b)(2)).
* The document also clarifies that: California Penal Code § 832.7(g) does not affect the discovery or disclosure of information in a peace officer's personnel file. California Penal Code § 832.7(h) does not supersede the criminal discovery process.

[**2001-10-04 Dishonesty Comm134 redaction index.pdf**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/44f02d5f722d742780a64904fa94d95b/content#page=1)

[**Pages 1-9**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/44f02d5f722d742780a64904fa94d95b/content#page=1)

* The document contains a collection of documents related to a disciplinary case against police officer Laurence B. Barker.
* There are notices of unavailability of counsel, subpoenas, and letters between various parties involved in the case.
* The Police Commission of the City and County of San Francisco is involved in the case, with Louise Renne as president and Gayle Orr-Smith as vice president.
* The resolution adopted by the Police Commission on June 23, 2004, states that Barker resigned from the department, but not in good standing.
* The charges against Barker include conduct that undermines the good order and discipline of the department and brings discredit on the department.
* Earl J. Disselhorst is Barker's attorney and has filed notices of unavailability for certain dates.
* The Police Commission postponed the disciplinary hearing for Barker due to the expiration of the current commissioners' terms.
* Subpoenas were issued to Lt. John Hennessey and Captain Thomas O'Neill to appear as witnesses in the trial.

[**Pages 10-18**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/44f02d5f722d742780a64904fa94d95b/content#page=10)

* The document begins with a letter from the Police Commission to Chief of Police Prentice Sanders, informing him of a resolution that was adopted to assign Commissioner Wayne Friday to conduct taking of evidence in the disciplinary charges against Officer Laurence B. Barker.
* The resolution states that the date for taking evidence will be set at a later date.
* Next, there is a letter from the Police Commission to Officer Barker, informing him that the assignment of a Commissioner and setting of a date for taking evidence will be on the Commission Calendar for the meeting on Wednesday, July 24, 2002.
* Barker is instructed to be in attendance unless excused by the Police Commission Secretary, Lieutenant Edward Geeter.
* The document then contains the charges against Barker, which include conduct that undermines the good order and discipline of the department and brings discredit on the department.
* The charges detail two specifications: the first alleges that Barker left work early to attend a prearranged meeting, but instead went to a restaurant to buy food, and the second alleges that Barker provided false and misleading information to a traffic officer about a car accident.
* The document also contains a verification from Chief of Police Fred H. Lau, who declares that he is the complainant and that the charges are based on his information and belief.
* Finally, the document contains a proof of service, which states that the charges were personally served to Barker by Lt. David Berhoffer.