**Summarize**

[**2005-08-27 Unlawful Arrest Comm140\_Timothy\_Buelow\_C06-123\_OCC\_0601-05\_\_part\_1\_Redacted.pdf**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/3e7368fda254a943628717e234568261/content#page=1)

[**Pages 1-8**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/3e7368fda254a943628717e234568261/content#page=1)

* The document details the proceedings of a police commission hearing regarding disciplinary charges against officer Timothy J. Buelow.
* Buelow was charged with "Unwarranted Action" for detaining, handcuffing, and arresting an individual in violation of Department General Orders 2.01 and 5.03.
* Manuel Fortes, an attorney, represented the Office of Citizen Complaints and the San Francisco Police Department, while Buelow was represented by Lidia Stiglich.
* The parties reached a stipulated agreement, which included: Buelow admitting to the charges A four-day suspension for Buelow Buelow undergoing retraining regarding Fourth Amendment issues
* The commission adopted resolution 21-10, which ordered the stipulated agreement to be carried out.

[**Pages 9-20**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/3e7368fda254a943628717e234568261/content#page=9)

* The document begins by identifying the Office of Citizen Complaints and the San Francisco Police Commission as the two entities involved in the case.
* The document then identifies the case number and the accused officer, Timothy J. Buelow.
* The stipulated agreement between the parties is outlined, which includes: Buelow admitting to the charges A four-day suspension for Buelow Buelow undergoing retraining regarding Fourth Amendment issues
* The document then details the charges against Buelow, which include "Unwarranted Action" for detaining, handcuffing, and arresting an individual in violation of Department General Orders 2.01 and 5.03.
* The document goes on to describe the incident in detail, including the date, time, and location of the incident, as well as the actions taken by Buelow and the victim.
* The document argues that Buelow did not have sufficient cause to detain, handcuff, or arrest the victim, and that he violated Department General Orders 2.01 and 5.03.
* The document concludes by stating that the charges could result in discipline ranging from reprimand to termination, and includes a verification statement from Kevin Allen, the Director of the Office of Citizen Complaints.

[**Pages 21-29**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/3e7368fda254a943628717e234568261/content#page=21)

* The document begins by detailing the process of serving charges to Officer Timothy J. Buelow.
* It then outlines the stipulated agreement between the parties, which includes Buelow admitting to the charges, a four-day suspension, and retraining.
* The document goes on to describe the motion to dismiss the charges based on the OCC's failure to serve Buelow with charges within the one-year period required by the statute.
* The document concludes by requesting that the Commission dismiss the charges against Buelow.

[**Pages 30-37**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/3e7368fda254a943628717e234568261/content#page=30)

* The document begins by recounting the District Attorney's investigation into possible criminal liability for Officer Buelow, which was ultimately dismissed.
* It then discusses the civil rights lawsuit filed against Buelow and the City of San Francisco, which was also dismissed.
* The document goes on to detail the OCC's investigation into Buelow, which resulted in charges being filed against him.
* However, the document argues that Buelow was never properly served with the charges, and that the statute of limitations has since expired.
* The document concludes by requesting that the charges against Buelow be dismissed.

[**Pages 38-50**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/3e7368fda254a943628717e234568261/content#page=38)

* The document contains multiple exhibits, each detailing different aspects of the disciplinary charges against Officer Timothy J. Buelow.
* Exhibit A is a motion to dismiss the case against Buelow.
* Exhibit B is the complaint filed against Buelow, which alleges violations of civil rights, assault and battery, false arrest and imprisonment, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and negligence.
* Exhibit C is the order of dismissal for the case against Buelow.
* Exhibit D is proof of service of the police commission charges against Buelow.
* Exhibit E is a letter from the police commission detailing the hearing date for the charges against Buelow.
* Exhibit F is the San Francisco Police Department's General Order 2.07, which outlines the disciplinary process for sworn officers.

[**Pages 51-57**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/3e7368fda254a943628717e234568261/content#page=51)

* The document begins with a section from the San Francisco Police Department's General Order 2.07, which outlines the disciplinary process for sworn officers.
* The section details the process for filing an appeal, the rights of the officer, and the penalties that can be imposed after a trial.
* The document then moves on to a declaration from Timothy Buelow, the accused officer, in support of a motion to dismiss the charges against him.
* Buelow states that he was interviewed by the OCC, but was never made aware that charges had been filed against him.
* Buelow also claims that he was never served with the charges.
* The document then includes a declaration from Lidia Stiglich, Buelow's attorney, in support of the motion to dismiss.
* Stiglich outlines the history of the case, noting that the District Attorney's Office dismissed the matter and that a federal civil rights action was also dismissed.

[**Pages 58-63**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/3e7368fda254a943628717e234568261/content#page=58)

* The document begins with a proof of service from Lidia Stiglich, an attorney, detailing how she served documents related to the disciplinary charges against officer Timothy Buelow.
* Stiglich describes the documents she served, the parties she served them to, and the methods she used to serve them.
* Stiglich declares under penalty of perjury that her account is true and correct.
* The document then moves on to a section detailing the Police Commission's proceedings against Buelow.
* The section includes information about the charges against Buelow, the hearing date, and the assigned commissioner.
* The document then moves on to the OCC's opposition to Buelow's motion to dismiss.
* The OCC argues that the motion is without merit because Buelow was properly and timely served with the charges.
* The OCC cites evidence to support their argument, including a proof of service from Captain Mario Gonzalez and a letter from the Police Commission to Buelow.
* The OCC requests that the Police Commission deny the motion and proceed with the hearing.

[**Pages 64-70**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/3e7368fda254a943628717e234568261/content#page=64)

* The document begins by asserting that the charges against Officer Buelow were served in accordance with Department General Order 2.07.
* Captain Mario Gonzalez, now retired, served Officer Buelow on August 29, 2006, and executed a Proof of Service under penalty of perjury.
* Captain Gonzalez also complied with the Municipal Court Department's standard operating procedure and confirmed the personal service of charges on Officer Buelow.
* The document argues that the reliability of Captain Gonzalez's assertion is supported by the detailed entry of the precise time when Officer Buelow was served.
* The document then argues that Officer Buelow's assertion that he was not served with the charges is a desperate attempt to avoid responsibility.
* The document points out that Officer Buelow admits that he was able-bodied enough to come in and be interviewed by the Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC) on April 5, 2006.
* The document then argues that Captain Gonzalez would not have risked committing perjury and risking termination by intentionally making false representations.
* The document also argues that the Accused Officer's Motion to Dismiss is not supported by credible evidence, as the declaration is not stated under penalty of perjury.
* The document argues that the Accused Officer's declaration lacks credibility, is misleading, and disingenuous.
* The document concludes by urging the Commission to deny the Accused Officer's Motion to Dismiss.

[**Pages 71-81**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/3e7368fda254a943628717e234568261/content#page=71)

* The document begins with a declaration from Inés Vargas Fraenkel, an attorney with the Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC), in support of the opposition to the motion to dismiss.
* Fraenkel outlines her duties as an attorney with the OCC, which include advising in investigations and representing the OCC in disciplinary charges and hearings.
* Fraenkel discusses her attempts to contact Captain Mario Gonzalez, who served the charges on Officer Buelow, and her conversations with him.
* Gonzalez confirmed that he personally served the charges on Buelow, and would not have executed the Proof of Service if he had not done so.
* The document then includes a declaration from Lieutenant Joseph Reilly, the Secretary to the San Francisco Police Commission, who is also the custodian of records for the Commission.
* Reilly discusses the Proof of Service, the letter sent to Buelow notifying him of the Commission meeting, and the letter notifying the Police Chief of the assignment of a Commissioner to take evidence in the disciplinary charges against Buelow.
* Reilly states that the letters were not returned as undelivered, and that he would have known if they had been.

[**Pages 82-91**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/3e7368fda254a943628717e234568261/content#page=82)

* The document begins with a resolution adopted by the Police Commission, which assigns Commissioner Petra DeJesus to conduct the taking of evidence in the disciplinary charges against Officer Timothy Buelow.
* The document then includes a declaration from Ashley Worsham, a legal counsel in the San Francisco Police Department Management Control Division (MCD), in support of the opposition to the motion to dismiss.
* Worsham discusses her duties as a legal counsel, which include representing the Police Department in disciplinary charges and hearings.
* Worsham discusses the service procedure for charges against officers, which requires the Commanding Officer to return confirmation of the date and time of service.
* Worsham includes a memorandum from Captain Mario Gonzalez, which confirms that Buelow was served with the charges.
* The document then includes a proof of service from Inés Vargas Fraenkel, which confirms that she served documents to Lidia Stiglich, the attorney for Buelow.
* Finally, the document includes a reply from Stiglich to the OCC's opposition to Buelow's motion to dismiss, in which she argues that the OCC failed to comply with the service and time requirements set forth in section 3304 of the Government Code.

[**Pages 92-100**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/3e7368fda254a943628717e234568261/content#page=92)

* The document begins with a discussion of the charges against Officer Buelow, which include detaining, handcuffing, and arresting an individual without justification.
* Buelow's attorney argues that he was not properly served with the charges, and that the burden is on the OCC to demonstrate proper service.
* Buelow's attorney argues that the OCC has not met this burden, and that the charges should be dismissed.
* The document then discusses the timing of the events in the case, and argues that it is unlikely that Buelow would have been at the Hall of Justice to be served with the charges.
* Buelow's attorney concludes by arguing that the OCC has not met its burden of proving legal and effective service of process, and that the charges should be dismissed.

[**Pages 101-114**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/3e7368fda254a943628717e234568261/content#page=101)

* The document begins with a description of the incident in which Officer Timothy J. Buelow allegedly did not see any gang affiliation or weapons on the victim, but still acted aggressively.
* The document then outlines the disputed facts, with the victim claiming that Buelow was aggressive and used excessive force, while Buelow claims the victim was acting aggressively and posed a threat.
* The document then outlines the legal issues at hand, specifically whether Buelow violated Department General Orders 2.01 and 5.03.
* The document then includes the OCC's trial brief, which reiterates the charges against Buelow and the disputed facts.
* The document also includes a proof of service, which states that the trial brief was served to Buelow's attorney, Lidia Stiglich, via email.
* The document concludes with a letter from the Police Commission to the Police Officers' Association and the Office of Citizen Complaints, setting a hearing date for the disciplinary charges against Buelow.

[**Pages 115-127**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/3e7368fda254a943628717e234568261/content#page=115)

* The document begins with a letter from Kevin Allen, Director of the Office of Citizen Complaints, to Chief Heather Fong, informing her of the upcoming hearing for disciplinary charges against Officer Timothy J. Buelow.
* The letter also includes a request for Buelow and/or his counsel to attend the hearing.
* The document then outlines the charges against Buelow, specifically that he detained, handcuffed, and arrested an individual without justification, in violation of Department General Orders 2.01 and 5.03.
* The document goes on to detail the incident in which Buelow allegedly violated these orders, including the circumstances leading up to the arrest, the arrest itself, and Buelow's explanation for his actions.
* The document then argues that Buelow did not have sufficient cause to detain the individual, and that his actions were in violation of the Department General Orders.
* The document concludes with a verification from Kevin Allen, a proof of service, and a notice from the Police Commission setting the hearing date.

[**2005-08-27 Unlawful Arrest Comm140 redaction index.pdf**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/f41db69029acb36d406f0ae035f13bad/content#page=1)

[**Pages 1-2**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/f41db69029acb36d406f0ae035f13bad/content#page=1)

* The document discusses various legal exemptions that allow for the redaction of certain information from records related to an unlawful arrest by Officer Timothy Buelow on August 27, 2005.
* The document references multiple California state laws and codes, including: California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(A), which allows for the redaction of personal data or information of peace and custodial officers. California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(B), which allows for the redaction of information to preserve the anonymity of complainants and witnesses. California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(C), which allows for the redaction of confidential medical, financial, or other information. California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(D), which allows for the redaction of information if disclosure would pose a significant danger to the physical safety of an individual. California Penal Code § 832.7(a), which states that personnel records of peace officers and custodial officers are confidential. California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(7), which allows for the redaction of personal identifying 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 the dissemination of criminal offender record information (CORI).
* The document also references California Government Code § 7927.500, which exempts from disclosure preliminary drafts, notes, or memoranda.
* California Government Code § 7923.600 is also mentioned, which exempts from disclosure records of complaints, investigations, intelligence information, or security procedures.
* The document references California Code of Civil Procedure § 129, which restricts the disclosure of photographs of a deceased person.
* California Welfare & Institutions Code § 5328, which protects confidential mental health records, is also mentioned.
* California Welfare & Institutions Code § 827 and California Government Code § 6254(k) are referenced, which protect juvenile records.
* The document also references California Government Code §§ 7927.705, 7930.110, and Evidence Code § 954, which protect attorney-client privilege.
* California Evidence Code 1040(b)(2) is mentioned, which allows a public entity to refuse to disclose official information.
* Finally, the document references California Penal Code § 832.7(g) and § 832.7(h), which clarify the scope of the exemptions.

[**2005-08-27 Unlawful Arrest Comm140\_Timothy\_Buelow\_C06-123\_OCC\_0601-05\_\_part\_2\_Redacted.pdf**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/84174b7eabf381bbb523e1e6f7dd2184/content#page=1)

[**Pages 1-9**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/84174b7eabf381bbb523e1e6f7dd2184/content#page=1)

* The document is a transcript of a hearing before the San Francisco Police Commission.
* Officer Timothy Buelow is contesting charges against him on the grounds that he was not properly served.
* Key participants mentioned include Buelow, his attorney Lidia Stiglich, and Manuel Fortes from the Office of Citizen Complaints.
* The hearing took place on Wednesday, February 10, 2010 in San Francisco.
* The Police Commission is made up of six commissioners, including President Dr. Joe Marshall and Vice President Thomas P. Mazzucco.
* Testimony was given by Steve Johnson, Officer Timothy Buelow, and Inez Vargas Fraenkel.
* Stiglich argues that Buelow was not served with charges, and that the statute of limitations has expired.
* Fortes argues that Buelow was personally served, and that letters were sent to his home address and representative.

[**Pages 10-17**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/84174b7eabf381bbb523e1e6f7dd2184/content#page=10)

* Stiglich argues that whether Buelow was served is irrelevant.
* Commissioner Onek questions Buelow's credibility, suggesting that if he did receive the letters and is lying, it makes his credibility suspect.
* Stiglich clarifies that the incident occurred on August 27, 2005, and the complaint was filed on August 29, 2005.
* Proof of service was signed by Captain Gonzalez on August 29, 2006.
* Stiglich argues that Buelow had no idea the complaint had been filed against him for three and a half years.
* Stiglich claims that Buelow was not personally served according to Department General Order 2.07.
* Commissioner Mazzucco questions the definition of "personal service" in these matters.
* Stiglich argues that the proof of service is in question because Buelow has sworn he did not receive it.
* Steve Johnson testifies that he first discussed the charges with Buelow two months prior, and that he had not contacted Buelow about the charges before that.

[**Pages 18-26**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/84174b7eabf381bbb523e1e6f7dd2184/content#page=18)

* Fortes questions Johnson about his role as a business agent for the police association.
* Johnson confirms that he typically receives copies of correspondence to officers regarding discipline.
* Fortes asks Johnson if he received two specific letters related to the charges against Buelow, which Johnson confirms.
* Johnson testifies that he never spoke to Buelow about the letters, but that it is unusual for an officer not to call him when they receive such a letter.
* Johnson explains that he assigned the case to attorney Freya Horne, but is not aware if she contacted Buelow.
* Commissioner DeJesus asks for clarification on when the attorney was assigned and whether the POA is authorized to accept service on behalf of officers.
* Fortes asks Johnson if he calendars cases when they come in, which Johnson confirms.
* Stiglich asks Johnson about his frequent appearances on behalf of attorneys in front of the Commission.

[**Pages 27-35**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/84174b7eabf381bbb523e1e6f7dd2184/content#page=27)

* Stiglich questions Buelow about whether he made any misrepresentations or untrue statements, which Buelow denies.
* Stiglich asks Buelow about his conversation with Captain Gonzalez, and whether Gonzalez would be able to identify Buelow in a line-up, which Buelow doubts.
* Stiglich calls Buelow to testify, but Commissioner DeJesus notes that they may need to deduct time from cross-examination because Stiglich is out of time.
* Buelow testifies that he has been a San Francisco police officer for 13 years, and that he signed a declaration under penalty of perjury in this matter.
* Buelow denies being present at the Hall of Justice on the day the charges were allegedly served, and claims he has never met Captain Gonzalez.
* Buelow also denies receiving the charges in the mail, and claims he has not seen the charges to date.
* Buelow confirms that he was interviewed by the OCC and was aware of the investigation, but only heard that the charges were dismissed.
* Fortes requests to make the OCC's presentation before cross-examining Buelow.
* Fortes argues that Buelow's motion to dismiss is a desperate attempt to avoid a hearing, and that the proof of service is unimpeachable.
* Fortes notes that Captain Gonzalez is retired and unavailable, but that his declaration is trial evidence.
* Fortes argues that Buelow's declaration three and a half years later is less reliable than the proof of service and memorandum.
* Fortes also discusses the letters sent to Buelow, which he claims to have not received, and argues that this goes to Buelow's credibility.
* President Marshall asks for clarification on the DGO regarding proof of service.

[**Pages 36-44**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/84174b7eabf381bbb523e1e6f7dd2184/content#page=36)

* Fortes reads from the DGO, explaining that service of charges is accomplished by filing a copy of the charges with the accused, and filing the original copy with the Police Commission.
* President Marshall expresses confusion, and Fortes clarifies where he is reading from.
* Fortes continues, explaining that if personal service cannot be made, the charges can be left at the officer's home.
* President Marshall asks for clarification on what constitutes "reasonable diligence," and Fortes explains that personal service means delivery to the person.
* President Marshall asks if Fortes is claiming that personal service was made, and Fortes confirms that Captain Gonzalez did effect the personal service.
* Commissioner Mazzucco suggests asking Buelow directly if he was served, and Buelow denies being at the Hall of Justice or being served with the charges.
* Buelow also denies working at the Hall of Justice, but says he may have been in #3, #12 on the day in question.
* Fortes cross-examines Buelow, asking if he was in #3, #12 on the day in question, and if he has any evidence to support his claim that he was not at the Hall of Justice.
* Buelow claims he only found out the issue was going to come up that night, and does not have any evidence with him.
* Fortes shows Buelow the proof of service, which Buelow claims to be seeing for the first time.
* Buelow refuses to say that the proof of service is incorrect, but maintains that he did not receive the charges.

[**Pages 45-53**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/84174b7eabf381bbb523e1e6f7dd2184/content#page=45)

* Fortes finishes cross-examining Buelow, asking if he received two letters, which Buelow claims not to remember seeing before.
* Buelow acknowledges that the address on one of the letters was not his address at the time, but says he has no proof to show the Commission.
* Buelow confirms that he did give the Department that address to contact him.
* Fortes calls Chief Attorney Inez Fraenkel to the stand, who testifies about a conversation she had with Captain Gonzalez.
* Fraenkel says that Gonzalez was surprised that anyone would question his integrity, and that he did not remember what Buelow looked like, but that he served many officers in his role as staff services commander.
* Fraenkel says that Gonzalez told her he would never state something he had not done, but that he was unable to attend the hearing.
* Stiglich cross-examines Fraenkel, asking about Gonzalez's lack of recollection and why he did not sign a declaration.
* Fraenkel explains that they were unable to coordinate with Gonzalez in the short time frame they had to file the opposition.

[**Pages 54-61**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/84174b7eabf381bbb523e1e6f7dd2184/content#page=54)

* The document begins with testimony from an unidentified individual who claims that Buelow never refused to sign a declaration, but that he was unavailable to receive anything.
* Stiglich questions the individual about the proof of service, which the individual claims not to know much about.
* Commissioner DeJesus asks the individual to move on, as they are running out of time.
* Fortes questions Fraenkel about the process of serving Buelow, and she explains that the proof of service and memo are pre-printed documents that the officer fills in.
* Fraenkel denies talking to Buelow about preparing documents, and says she only knows what she sees on the proof of service.
* Commissioner Mazzucco asks Fraenkel if Gonzalez told her that he contacted Buelow, and she says that he did not, but that he did explain the process he uses to serve officers.
* Stiglich argues that the OCC should have obtained a declaration from Gonzalez, and that the proof of service is in question.
* Fortes argues that the proof of service is evidence and that the OCC has met its burden to show that Buelow was served.
* The Commission votes to take no action and return the case to Commissioner DeJesus for a hearing.

[**Pages 62-71**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/84174b7eabf381bbb523e1e6f7dd2184/content#page=62)

* The document begins with a reporter's certificate from Anna C. Greenley, a certified shorthand reporter, attesting to the accuracy of the transcript.
* The transcript begins with the attendance of various individuals, including Commissioner Petra DeJesus, R. Manuel Fortes (attorney for the Office of Citizen Complaints), Lidia Stiglich (attorney for Officer Timothy Buelow), and Lt. Joseph Reilly (secretary).
* The hearing begins with Commissioner DeJesus outlining the rules and procedures for the hearing.
* Stiglich and Fortes discuss a potential disposition in the case, which would involve Buelow admitting to one count and accepting a four-day suspension.
* The parties agree to go off the record to discuss the disposition further.
* Upon returning to the record, the parties announce that they have reached a settlement, which includes Buelow admitting to one count, accepting a four-day suspension, and participating in retraining.
* The hearing is adjourned.

[**2014-10-13 Unlawful Arrest SFPD246.pdf**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=1)

[**Pages 1-14**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=1)

* The document contains reports, correspondence, and internal memos related to a disciplinary case within the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD).
* Key individuals mentioned include Melonee Alvarez (a sergeant with the SFPD), Ashley Worsham (legal counsel for the SFPD), and Benjamin Houston (a human resources manager for the SFPD).
* The case number is MCDO-2014-0053 and the incident date is 10/13/2014.
* The case originated from an incident at 24th Avenue and Santiago Street in San Francisco, CA.
* The case is now closed, with a closure date of 12/20/2018.
* Alvarez is accused of "unwarranted action" and "improper conduct" and was given a written reprimand and ordered to undergo retraining.
* Other officers mentioned in the document (Barajas, Burke, Padilla, Seavey, and Thompson) are also accused of various violations, but the document does not contain detailed information on the outcomes of their cases.
* The document also contains information on the assignment of hearing officers, employee scheduling, and a memorandum regarding the delivery of a disciplinary reprimand to Alvarez.
* Finally, the document contains a series of email exchanges between various SFPD personnel regarding the status of Alvarez's retirement and the request for a copy of her personnel file.

[**Pages 15-21**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=15)

* The document begins with a description of employee scheduling for Melonee Alvarez, a sergeant with the SFPD.
* It then moves on to a letter from the Chief of Police to Alvarez, informing her that she is being disciplined for violating Department General Order 2.01, Rules 7 and 9.
* The letter details the events leading up to the disciplinary action, including an incident on October 4, 2014, in which Alvarez and her team entered a residence in Antioch, CA, without a warrant in order to arrest a suspect.
* The letter states that the officers relied on the doctrine of "fresh pursuit" to justify their actions, but the Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC) concluded that this was incorrect.
* The OCC found that the officers violated the 4th Amendment to the US Constitution and Department General Order 2.01, Rules 7 and 9.
* The letter concludes by stating that Alvarez is being reprimanded and ordered to undergo retraining.

[**Pages 22-29**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=22)

* The document begins with a letter from the Chief of Police to Sgt. Melonee Alvarez, informing her of a disciplinary reprimand and order for retraining.
* The letter outlines the process for requesting a hearing to refute or mitigate the findings of the Internal Affairs Division.
* The letter also provides instructions for obtaining the materials the Department will rely on in the hearing.
* A form is included for requesting a hearing, which must be returned within ten days.
* The document then includes a memorandum from the Internal Affairs Division to the Commanding Officer of Ingleside Station, requesting that the letter be personally delivered to Alvarez.
* The document also includes a request for a hearing from Alvarez to the Chief of Police.
* Finally, the document includes a memorandum from the Internal Affairs Division to the Commanding Officer of Ingleside Station, detailing the disciplinary reprimand and order for retraining.

[**Pages 30-44**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=30)

* The document begins with a description of a disciplinary case within the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) involving Sgt. Melonee Alvarez, Ashley Worsham (legal counsel for the SFPD), and Benjamin Houston (a human resources manager for the SFPD).
* The document then details the accounts of various officers involved in the incident, including Officer Seavey, Officer Padilla, Officer Barajas, and Officer Quintero.
* Lieutenant John Burke is also mentioned, as he was in phone contact with Alvarez during the incident.
* The document then discusses the findings of the Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC) investigation, which concluded that the police did not have the proper warrants to enter the home of the complainant.
* The document also discusses the OCC's conclusion that Alvarez's reliance on the doctrine of "fresh pursuit" was incorrect.
* The document then references two rules from the Department General Order 2.01 that Alvarez violated.
* The document then discusses the Chief's intention to impose a disciplinary reprimand and order mandatory retraining for Alvarez.
* The document also outlines the process for requesting a hearing to refute or mitigate the findings of the Internal Affairs Division.
* The document then includes a request for a hearing from Alvarez to the Chief of Police.
* Finally, the document includes a memorandum from the Internal Affairs Division to the Commanding Officer of Ingleside Station, detailing the disciplinary reprimand and order for retraining.

[**Pages 45-55**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=45)

* The document begins with three email exchanges between Ashley Worsham (legal counsel for the SFPD) and Captain Joseph McFadden.
* In the first email, Worsham sends four directives for four officers (Tompson, Barajas, Seavey, and Padilla) regarding their conduct in OCC-0600-14.
* In the second email, Worsham follows up with McFadden, requesting the signed memorandums from the four officers.
* In the third email, Worsham requests that McFadden serve a disciplinary reprimand notice to Sgt. Melonee Alvarez.
* The document then includes a routing and transmittal slip from Captain Greg Northern, requesting that Lt. Yick Lad investigate and report on the complaint results from the OCC.
* The document then includes a memorandum from Officer Dack Thompson, requesting an investigative hearing regarding OCC Case 0600-14.
* The document then includes a letter from the Executive Director of the OCC, summarizing the preliminary findings of the investigation.
* The document then includes a memorandum from Acting-Lieutenant Cristina Franc, requesting that Captain Joseph McFadden serve a disciplinary reprimand and order for retraining to Sgt. Melonee Alvarez.
* Finally, the document includes a letter from the Chief of Police to Sgt. Melonee Alvarez, detailing the disciplinary reprimand and order for retraining.

[**Pages 56-63**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=56)

* The document begins with a description of a disciplinary case within the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) involving reports, correspondence, and internal memos.
* Key individuals mentioned include Melonee Alvarez (a sergeant with the SFPD), Ashley Worsham (legal counsel for the SFPD), and Benjamin Houston (a human resources manager for the SFPD).
* The document then details the events leading up to the arrest of Mr. 7, a suspect in a criminal case.
* Sergeant Shepard, the investigating officer, obtained statements from the victim and witnesses, and determined that there was probable cause to arrest Mr. 7.
* Sergeant Shepard did not obtain an arrest warrant, but disseminated a crime alert to the SFPD.
* Sgt. Alvarez and her team conducted surveillance on a residence in Antioch, CA, where they believed Mr. 7 was staying.
* After observing Mr. 7, the team entered the residence without a search warrant, and arrested him.
* The Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC) investigated the incident and concluded that Sgt. Alvarez and her team violated the 4th Amendment to the United States Constitution and two rules of the Department General Order.
* The Chief of Police intends to impose a disciplinary reprimand and order mandatory retraining for Sgt. Alvarez.
* Sgt. Alvarez has the option to request a hearing before the Chief of Police to refute or mitigate the findings.

[**Pages 64-69**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=64)

* The document begins with a letter from the Chief of Police to Sgt. Melonee Alvarez, informing her that she is being disciplined for violating Department General Order 2.01, Rules 7 and 9.
* The letter details the events leading up to the arrest of Mr. 7, a suspect in an aggravated assault case.
* Sgt. Shepard, the investigating officer, determined that there was probable cause to arrest Mr. 7, but did not obtain an arrest warrant.
* Sgt. Alvarez and her team conducted surveillance on a residence in Antioch, CA, where they believed Mr. 7 was staying.
* After observing Mr. 7, the team entered the residence without a search warrant, and arrested him.
* The OCC investigated the incident and concluded that Sgt. Alvarez and her team violated the 4th Amendment to the United States Constitution and two rules of the Department General Order.
* The OCC found that the team's reliance on the doctrine of "fresh pursuit" to justify entering the residence was incorrect.
* The Chief of Police intends to impose a disciplinary reprimand and order mandatory retraining for Sgt. Alvarez.

[**Pages 70-76**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=70)

* The document continues with a letter from the Chief of Police to Sgt. Alvarez, informing her that the reprimand and order for retraining will not be in effect until twenty days from the date of the letter.
* Sgt. Alvarez has the right to request a hearing before the Chief to present evidence to refute or mitigate the findings.
* The Department will make available the materials they will rely on for the hearing, and Sgt. Alvarez must contact Attorney Ashley Worsham to pick up the materials.
* If Sgt. Alvarez wants a hearing, she must sign and return the enclosed form within ten days.
* The document also includes a request form for the hearing, as well as a letter from the Chief of Police to Sgt. Alvarez detailing the allegations against her.

[**Pages 77-86**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=77)

* The document begins with a description of a case involving an aggravated assault with a bat.
* Officer Richard Morgante responds to the scene and interviews the victim, who identifies the complainant as the suspect.
* Sergeant Mari Shepard is assigned as the lead investigator and gathers evidence to establish probable cause to arrest the complainant.
* Sgt. Shepard does not obtain an arrest warrant, believing it is not necessary due to the probable cause.
* Sgt. Shepard provides details of the case to Sgt. Alvarez, who leads a team to Antioch to locate the complainant.
* The team conducts surveillance and eventually enters the residence to arrest the complainant.
* The Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC) investigation concludes that Sgt. Alvarez and her team violated the 4th Amendment by not securing an arrest warrant or search warrant.
* The Chief of Police intends to impose a disciplinary reprimand and order mandatory retraining for Sgt. Alvarez.

[**Pages 87-93**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=87)

* The document details the actions of various officers as they attempt to locate and arrest the complainant.
* Officers Quintero and Barajas observe the complainant peek out from a garage door before retreating inside.
* Officer Padilla sees the complainant crouched down in an attempt to hide.
* Sgt. Alvarez sets up a perimeter and calls the Antioch Police Department for assistance.
* Officers Thompson, Lustenberger, and Seavey are all involved in the search for the complainant.
* The complainant is eventually located in the attic and arrested.
* The OCC investigates the incident and finds that the officers violated the 4th Amendment by not obtaining a search warrant or arrest warrant.
* Officer Barajas is found to have omitted important information from the incident report.
* Sgt. Alvarez is also found to have failed to review the incident report thoroughly.

[**Pages 94-105**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=94)

* The document discusses a disciplinary case within the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD).
* The case revolves around the actions of Sgt. Melonee Alvarez, Ashley Worsham (legal counsel for the SFPD), and Benjamin Houston (a human resources manager for the SFPD).
* The Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC) states that Sgt. Alvarez's belief that the doctrines of fresh pursuit or hot pursuit allowed her to enter a residence without a warrant was misguided.
* The OCC cites various cases to support their argument that the exception to the warrant requirement only applies when officers are in immediate and continuous pursuit of a suspect from the scene of a crime.
* The OCC argues that Sgt. Alvarez violated the complainant's 4th Amendment rights by entering the residence without a warrant.
* The OCC also finds that Sgt. Alvarez failed to review and approve an incident report that omitted important information.
* The Acting Commanding Officer of the Internal Affairs Division (IAD) disagrees with the OCC's findings regarding Lt. John Burke, arguing that he was off duty and not aware of all the details of the incident.
* The document also provides the IAD complaint history for various officers involved in the case.
* The document concludes with recommendations for disciplinary action against the officers involved.

[**Pages 106-117**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=106)

* The document begins by outlining various allegations against Sergeant Melonee Alvarez and other officers.
* Allegation Nos. 5-12 are not sustained, while Allegation Nos. 13-15 are sustained.
* The sustained allegations pertain to Sergeant Alvarez unlawfully entering a third-party residence, searching for, and arresting the complainant.
* Allegation No. 16 against Officer Carlos Padilla is also sustained.
* Allegation Nos. 17-19 against Officers Matthew Seavey, Dack Thompson, and Carlos Padilla are sustained as well.
* The document then outlines three OCC-Added Allegations, all of which are sustained.
* The document goes on to provide a detailed summary of the complaint, which includes the complainant's account of two separate incidents.
* The first incident involves officers allegedly vandalizing the complainant's van, while the second incident involves officers allegedly entering a residence without a warrant, arresting the complainant, and terrorizing him during transport.
* The document then provides a detailed analysis of the sustained allegations, including summaries of evidence, applicable rules, and analysis.
* The document concludes with a table of contents and a list of attachments.

[**Pages 118-125**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=118)

* The document begins by outlining the allegations against various officers, including Sergeant Melonee Alvarez, Sergeant Mari Shepard, and Officer Carlos Padilla.
* Allegation Nos. 1-4 and 5-12 are not sustained, while Allegation Nos. 13-15 are sustained.
* The sustained allegations pertain to Sergeant Alvarez unlawfully entering a third-party residence, searching for, and arresting the complainant.
* Allegation No. 16 against Officer Carlos Padilla is also sustained.
* Allegation Nos. 17-19 against Officers Matthew Seavey, Dack Thompson, and Carlos Padilla are sustained as well.
* The document then outlines three OCC-Added Allegations, all of which are sustained.
* The document goes on to provide a detailed summary of the complaint, which includes the complainant's account of two separate incidents.
* The first incident involves officers allegedly vandalizing the complainant's van, while the second incident involves officers allegedly entering a residence without a warrant, arresting the complainant, and terrorizing him during transport.
* The document then provides a detailed analysis of the sustained allegations, including summaries of evidence, applicable rules, and analysis.
* The document concludes with a table of contents and a list of attachments.

[**Pages 126-129**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=126)

* The document begins with a summary of the complainant's account of two separate incidents with the SFPD.
* In the first incident, the complainant alleges that officers vandalized his van, which he was living in at the time, and towed it away.
* In the second incident, the complainant alleges that officers entered a residence without a warrant, arrested him, and mistreated him during transport.
* The document then provides a summary of the witness's account, who corroborates some of the complainant's claims.
* The document goes on to summarize Sergeant Mari Shepard's account, who was the lead investigator in the case against the complainant.
* Sergeant Shepard explains that she did not obtain a warrant for the complainant's arrest because she believed there was probable cause to arrest him.
* She also explains that the van was towed because it was used in the commission of a felony and there was reason to believe the weapon used in the crime may have been inside.

[**Pages 130-134**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=130)

* The document begins with a summary of Sergeant Mari Shepard's account of the incident, in which she asserts that she did not engage in any inappropriate behavior.
* Shepard states that she did not accompany the plainclothes unit to the residence where the complainant was arrested, but did interview him after he was transported to the station.
* The document then summarizes Shepard's follow-up interview, in which she discusses the details of the investigation, including the complainant's possible addresses and vehicle registrations.
* Shepard also discusses her communication with Sergeant Melonee Alvarez, who was tasked with locating the complainant.
* The document then summarizes Sergeant Alvarez's account of the incident, in which she describes assembling her team and conducting surveillance at the Silver Creek Circle address.
* Alvarez explains that they made contact with the homeowner, and then saw a male who matched the complainant's description peek out from a door.
* Alvarez states that they set up a perimeter and called Antioch PD for assistance, and eventually located the complainant hiding in the attic.
* Alvarez denies ransacking the home or threatening the homeowner, and also denies slapping the complainant after his arrest.
* In her follow-up interview, Alvarez discusses her training and experience, and reiterates that she was working under the direction of Sergeant Shepard.

[**Pages 135-138**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=135)

* Sergeant Alvarez discusses the difficulty of tracking everyone's movements during the incident, but states that her team was together in front of the house for safety reasons.
* Alvarez defines "fresh pursuit" and explains how it applied to the situation.
* Alvarez discusses her plainclothes attire and how the complainant likely knew they were police officers.
* Alvarez describes searching neighboring homes and contacting Antioch PD for assistance.
* Alvarez explains the conditions under which they could search the homeowner's residence, and how they obtained consent.
* Alvarez discusses the incident report and why she did not request statements from Antioch PD officers.
* Alvarez clarifies her understanding of the department's policy on requesting assistance from outside agencies.
* Officer Thompson discusses his training and what he knew about the complainant prior to the incident.
* Thompson describes the briefing they received and their plan to locate the complainant.

[**Pages 139-142**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=139)

* Officer Thompson describes his role in the incident, including his positioning and observations.
* Thompson discusses the justification for entering the home without a warrant, citing "hot pursuit."
* Thompson explains the difference between a probable cause warrant and an arrest warrant.
* Thompson recounts the search for the complainant, including the discovery of the complainant in the attic.
* Officer Seavey discusses his training and experience with the SFPD.
* Seavey recounts the initial plan to conduct surveillance on the house, and the decision to approach the house after seeing a woman leave.
* Seavey describes the search for the complainant, including the discovery of the complainant in the attic.
* Officer Padilla discusses his training and experience with the SFPD.
* Padilla recounts the briefing they received and the plan to conduct surveillance on the house.

[**Pages 143-146**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=143)

* Officer Padilla recounts the events leading up to the discovery of the complainant, including the initial surveillance and the decision to approach the house.
* Padilla describes the search for the complainant, including the establishment of a perimeter and the inability to use their radios.
* Officer Barajas discusses his training and experience with the SFPD.
* Barajas recounts the briefing they received and the plan to conduct surveillance on the house.
* Barajas describes the events leading up to the arrest of the complainant, including the identification of the complainant by Officer Padilla.
* Barajas discusses the justification for entering the home without a warrant, citing "hot pursuit."
* Barajas recounts the search for the baseball bat used in the crime, and the completion of the Consent to Search form.
* Officer Lustenberger discusses his training and experience with the SFPD.
* Lustenberger recounts the briefing they received and the plan to conduct surveillance on the house.
* Lustenberger describes the events leading up to the arrest of the complainant, including the identification of the complainant by Officer Padilla.

[**Pages 147-150**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=147)

* Officer Lustenberger recounts his attempt to look over the fence into the backyard of the house, and the damage caused to the fence.
* Lustenberger describes his interaction with Antioch PD, and his decision not to draw his weapon.
* Officer Quintero discusses his training and experience with the SFPD.
* Quintero recounts the briefing they received and the plan to arrest the complainant.
* Quintero describes the events leading up to the arrest of the complainant, including the identification of the complainant by Officer Padilla.
* Quintero recounts the search for the baseball bat used in the crime, and the transportation of the complainant to Ingleside Station.
* Lieutenant Burke discusses his role as the SIT Lieutenant at Ingleside Station.
* Burke recounts the decision to arrest the complainant sooner rather than later, and the importance of preserving evidence.
* Burke discusses the importance of notifying the local law enforcement agency when conducting operations outside of their jurisdiction.
* Burke explains the rationale for not obtaining a search warrant, citing the need to move quickly to preserve evidence.

[**Pages 151-155**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=151)

* Lieutenant Burke discusses the distinction between "hot pursuit" and "fresh pursuit" in relation to the arrest of the complainant.
* Burke states that neither Sergeant Shepard nor Sergeant Alvarez were admonished, counseled, or retrained following the incident, and that they should be commended for their actions.
* The summary of Event History Detail No 142770943 recounts the initial call to the SFPD, the response by officers, and the subsequent investigation.
* The summary of Event History Detail No 142862031 recounts the investigative detail in Antioch, CA, and the subsequent arrest of the complainant.
* The summary of Initial Incident Report No. 140835975 recounts the assault on Mr. 2 by the complainant, and the subsequent investigation.
* The summary of Supplemental Incident Report No. 140835975 recounts the arrest of the complainant in Antioch, CA, and the search for the baseball bat used in the assault.
* Sergeant Shepard's Chronological of Investigation details the steps taken to investigate the assault, including interviews with the victim and witnesses, and the search for the complainant.
* The Crime Alert authored by Sergeant Shepard warns officers of the complainant's potential danger and provides information on his vehicles and whereabouts.
* The Antioch Police Department Event Report details the request for assistance from SFPD and the subsequent arrest of the complainant.

[**Pages 156-159**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=156)

* The document discusses the applicability of various rules and legal precedents to a disciplinary case within the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD).
* Section III outlines the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution, which guarantees due process and protects against unreasonable searches and seizures.
* Section III.B discusses two legal doctrines that may justify warrantless searches and arrests: "fresh pursuit" and "hot pursuit."
* "Fresh pursuit" allows for warrantless entry into a home if the investigation is immediate and continuous, and there is no reasonable opportunity to obtain a warrant.
* "Hot pursuit" applies when officers are in immediate and continuous pursuit of a suspect from the scene of a crime.
* Section IV analyzes the case at hand, noting that the warrantless entry and arrest of the complainant in a third party's home nine days after the incident does not seem to be justified by either "fresh pursuit" or "hot pursuit."

[**Pages 160-163**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=160)

* The document discusses a disciplinary case within the SFPD involving Sergeant Melonee Alvarez, legal counsel Ashley Worsham, and human resources manager Benjamin Houston.
* The document discusses the legality of a warrantless entry and search of a third party's home in Antioch, California, in order to arrest the complainant.
* The document argues that the entry and search violated the Fourth Amendment of the US Constitution.
* The document discusses the "fresh pursuit" and "hot pursuit" doctrines, which may justify warrantless searches and arrests.
* The document argues that neither doctrine applies in this case, as the investigation was not immediate or continuous, and the officers had ample time to obtain a warrant.

[**Pages 164-172**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=164)

* The document discusses the legality of a warrantless entry and search of a third party's home in Antioch, California, in order to arrest the complainant.
* The document argues that the entry and search violated the Fourth Amendment of the US Constitution.
* The document discusses the "fresh pursuit" and "hot pursuit" doctrines, which may justify warrantless searches and arrests.
* The document argues that neither doctrine applies in this case, as the investigation was not immediate or continuous, and the officers had ample opportunity to obtain a warrant.
* The document discusses the case of United States v. Santana, which defines what constitutes a "public place" for the purposes of the hot pursuit doctrine.
* The document argues that the complainant was not in a public place when the officers saw him, and therefore the hot pursuit doctrine does not apply.
* The document discusses the case of Payton v. New York, which requires a search warrant to enter a third party's home to search for a suspect.
* The document argues that the officers violated this rule by entering the home without a warrant.
* The document concludes that the allegations against Sergeant Melonee Alvarez, Officer Carlos Padilla, and Officers Matthew Seavey and Dack Thompson are sustained.
* The document also discusses an allegation against Officer Danny Barajas for failing to include critical information in an incident report.

[**Pages 173-181**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=173)

* The document discusses an incident in which officers entered a third party's home in Antioch, CA, to arrest a suspect.
* The document argues that the officers violated the Fourth Amendment by entering the home without a warrant.
* The document discusses the "fresh pursuit" and "hot pursuit" doctrines, which may justify warrantless searches and arrests.
* The document argues that neither doctrine applies in this case, as the investigation was not immediate or continuous, and the officers had ample opportunity to obtain a warrant.
* The document discusses the case of United States v. Santana, which defines what constitutes a "public place" for the purposes of the hot pursuit doctrine.
* The document argues that the complainant was not in a public place when the officers saw him, and therefore the hot pursuit doctrine does not apply.
* The document discusses the case of Payton v. New York, which requires a search warrant to enter a third party's home to search for a suspect.
* The document argues that the officers violated this rule by entering the home without a warrant.
* The document concludes that the allegations against Sergeant Melonee Alvarez, Officer Carlos Padilla, and Officers Matthew Seavey and Dack Thompson are sustained.
* The document also discusses an allegation against Officer Danny Barajas for failing to include critical information in an incident report.

[**Pages 182-195**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=182)

* The document begins with a narrative of an incident in which the complainant alleges that he was mistreated by the police.
* The document includes an acknowledgement form that the complainant must sign, which outlines the rights of citizens to file complaints against police officers.
* The document then lists several allegations against various officers, including Melonee Alvarez, Danny Barajas, Carlos Padilla, Matthew Seavey, Dack Thompson, Jonathon Ozol, and Mari Shepard.
* The allegations include claims of unwarranted action, improper search and seizure, and reckless driving.
* The document also includes an added allegation against John Burke for an unspecified offense.

[**Pages 196-201**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=196)

* The document begins with a detailed account of a call to the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) regarding an assault with a baseball bat.
* The document includes a timeline of events, detailing the response of various officers and the actions they took.
* The document also includes information about the suspect, victim, and witness, including their names, addresses, and other identifying information.
* The document concludes with an incident report, which includes the type of incident, location, and other details.

[**Pages 202-204**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=202)

* The document begins with an initial incident report detailing an assault that occurred on 10/04/2014, in which the victim (RV) was hit with a baseball bat by the suspect (S).
* RV recounts the events leading up to the assault, including a history of animosity between RV and S, which RV believes is due to his sexual orientation.
* RV also describes the events immediately following the assault, including calling 911 and receiving medical attention.
* The document then includes a supplemental report, which provides additional information about the incident, including the type of incident, location, and suspect information.
* The document also includes information about the booking process for the suspect, including charges, booking location, and warrant information.
* Finally, the document includes a second supplemental report, which provides additional information about a second suspect.

[**Pages 205-211**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=205)

* The document begins with a supplemental report detailing the seizure of various items from a residence in Antioch, CA, including baseball bats, a CD-ROM, and a fence.
* The report also includes information about the search of the residence, which was conducted with the consent of the homeowner.
* The document then moves on to a narrative of the events leading up to the arrest of the suspect, including the surveillance of the residence, the identification of the suspect, and the eventual apprehension of the suspect in the attic.
* The document also includes information about the booking process for the suspect, including charges, booking location, and warrant information.
* Finally, the document includes a chronological report of the investigation, which details the various steps taken by the investigator, including interviews with the victim and witnesses, and the collection of evidence.

[**Pages 212-220**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=212)

* The document begins with a chronological report of an investigation, detailing various activities such as conducting a LexisNexis search, emailing crime alerts, and contacting other law enforcement agencies.
* The report also mentions key individuals involved in the investigation, such as Corporal Dee, Officer Rector, and Sgt. C. Hurley.
* The document then moves on to a description of an interview with the suspect, in which the suspect denies owning any guns, claims to live in his van, and refuses to give permission to search the van.
* The document then details a second interview with the suspect, in which the suspect denies threatening to kill anyone, claims to have been beaten up in the past, and expresses concern about the chain of custody for evidence.
* The document then moves on to a description of the rebooking process for the suspect, including the discharge of charges due to lack of corroboration.
* Finally, the document includes two attachments: one detailing an aggravated assault case, and the other providing an event history detail for a call to the San Francisco Police Department.

[**Pages 221-257**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ce82bc555368088ec58e9f91a2e54b26/content#page=221)

* The document begins with an event report from the Antioch Police Department, detailing the time, location, and individuals involved in the event.
* The report also includes information about the classification and priority of the event, as well as the services requested.
* The document then moves on to a series of supplemental reports, detailing various updates and actions taken during the event.
* The document then includes a general order from the San Francisco Police Department, outlining the policy and procedures for obtaining search warrants.
* The general order emphasizes the importance of search warrants in preserving the admissibility of evidence in court, and outlines the steps for obtaining a search warrant, including review and approval by a supervisor, submission to the appropriate investigative section, and submission to the Office of the District Attorney.
* The general order also outlines the responsibilities of the affiant-officer, including registration of the search warrant, delivery of certified copies, and booking of evidence.
* Finally, the general order addresses the issue of outside agency assistance, instructing members to comply with the provisions of the order when assisting other law enforcement agencies.

[**2014-10-13 Unlawful Arrest SFPD246 redaction index.pdf**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/0b7e43215c33dcef1248d0ea5a69558d/content#page=1)

[**Pages 1-2**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/0b7e43215c33dcef1248d0ea5a69558d/content#page=1)

* The document is from the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD)
* It references Mayor London N. Breed and Chief of Police William Scott
* The document discusses records related to an incident involving a peace officer, Melonee Alvarez, who conducted an unlawful search and arrest on October 13, 2014
* The records include documents related to IA# MCDO-2014-0053
* Redactions have been made to the records based on various exemptions, which are outlined in the document
* Exemptions include: Protecting personal data or information of peace and custodial officers Preserving the anonymity of complainants and witnesses Protecting confidential medical, financial, or other information Protecting the physical safety of the peace officer, custodial officer, or another person Keeping personnel records of peace officers and custodial officers confidential Protecting personal identifying information Restricting access to information from the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) Restricting dissemination of criminal offender record information (CORI) Exempting preliminary drafts, notes, or memoranda Exempting records of complaints, investigations, intelligence information, or security procedures Protecting photographs of a deceased person Protecting against an unwarranted invasion of privacy Protecting confidential mental health records and juvenile records Respecting attorney-client privilege Allowing a public entity to refuse to disclose official information Not superseding or affecting the criminal discovery process

[**2000-03-14 Unlawful Search Comm143.pdf**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/f443e3a8bb48582cbe1489e86b1ce36f/content#page=1)

[**Pages 1-14**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/f443e3a8bb48582cbe1489e86b1ce36f/content#page=1)

* The document contains a series of disciplinary charges against police officer Timothy P. Fitzgerald.
* The charges were filed by the Chief of Police, Fred H. Lau.
* The Police Commission adopted resolutions related to the charges.
* The resolutions include: Resolution No. 52-01, which continued the charges off calendar due to Fitzgerald's resignation from the police department. Resolution No. 30-01, which assigned Commissioner Sidney Chan to conduct the taking of evidence in the disciplinary charges.
* Fitzgerald was served with the charges on April 18, 2001.
* The charges include: Sexual slur (for using sexually derogatory language to a civilian, in violation of Department General Order 2.01, Rule 9 and 14). Unwarranted Action (for searching a civilian without justification, in violation of Department General Order 2.01, Rule 7).

[**2000-03-14 Unlawful Search Comm143 redaction index.pdf**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/77aae067121ce8790680bfe22c24c491/content#page=1)

[**Pages 1-2**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/77aae067121ce8790680bfe22c24c491/content#page=1)

* The document discusses the redaction of information from records related to Officer Timothy Fitzgerald's misconduct.
* Multiple California state laws and codes are referenced as justification for redaction, including: California Penal Code § 832.7, which protects personal data and information of peace and custodial officers, as well as 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 laws referenced include: 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). California Government Code § 7927.500, which exempts preliminary drafts, notes, or memoranda from disclosure. California Government Code § 7923.600, which exempts records of complaints, investigations, or security procedures from disclosure. California Code of Civil Procedure § 129, which protects photographs taken by the coroner. California Welfare & Institutions Code § 5328, which protects mental health records. California Welfare & Institutions Code § 827, which protects juvenile records.
* The document also references the attorney-client privilege and the public entity privilege to refuse to disclose official information.
* Finally, the document notes that California Penal Code § 832.7 does not supersede or affect the criminal discovery process or the admissibility of personnel records.

[**2006-07-06 Unlawful Search Comm144.pdf**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/00fe0da53d4a124bbe67a65d100745c2/content#page=1)

[**Pages 1-8**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/00fe0da53d4a124bbe67a65d100745c2/content#page=1)

* Officer Michael Alexander violated department rules by searching three vehicles without proper authorization.
* The incident occurred on July 6, 2006, when Alexander obtained a search warrant for one vehicle, but the judge modified the warrant to only allow the search of one vehicle.
* Alexander's actions violated Department General Order 5.16.II.G, which outlines the procedures for obtaining search warrants.
* As a result, the Chief of Police ordered Alexander's suspension for one day, which was held in abeyance for three years.
* Alexander appealed the decision, but ultimately agreed to the settlement offer and forfeited his right to appeal.

[**Pages 9-18**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/00fe0da53d4a124bbe67a65d100745c2/content#page=9)

* Officer Michael Alexander violated department rules by searching three vehicles without proper authorization.
* The incident occurred on July 6, 2006, when Alexander obtained a search warrant for one vehicle, but the judge modified the warrant to only allow the search of one vehicle.
* Alexander's actions violated Department General Order 5.16.II.G, which outlines the procedures for obtaining search warrants.
* As a result, the Chief of Police ordered Alexander's suspension for one day, which was held in abeyance for three years.
* Alexander appealed the decision, but ultimately agreed to the settlement offer and forfeited his right to appeal.

[**2006-07-06 Unlawful Search Comm144 redaction index.pdf**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ee4dfecf1450fe6399edc14d428096fe/content#page=1)

[**Pages 1-2**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/ee4dfecf1450fe6399edc14d428096fe/content#page=1)

* The document pertains to a sustained complaint of unlawful search involving Officer Michael Alexander on July 6, 2006.
* The document lists various legal exemptions that allow for the redaction of information in records related to the complaint.
* Exemptions include: Protecting personal data or information of the officer (Redaction #1) Preserving the anonymity of complainants and witnesses (Redaction #2) Protecting confidential medical, financial, or other information (Redaction #3) Protecting the physical safety of the officer or another person (Redaction #4) Keeping personnel records of peace officers and custodial officers confidential (Redaction #5) Protecting personal identifying information (Redaction #7) Restricting access to information from the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) (Redaction #8) Exempting preliminary drafts, notes, or memoranda from disclosure (Redaction #9) Exempting records of complaints, investigations, intelligence information, or security procedures from disclosure (Redaction #10) Protecting photographs of a deceased person taken by the coroner (Redaction #11) Protecting against an unwarranted invasion of privacy (Redaction #12) Protecting confidential mental health records or juvenile records (Redaction #13-15) Upholding attorney-client privilege (Redaction #16)
* The document also references two sections of the California Penal Code that clarify the scope of the redaction exemptions (Redaction #17-18).