

**Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage  
Salt Lake City Police Department  
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200  
Mar 2025**

---

**SUMMARY**

This memorandum constitutes a random audit, pursuant to City Code 2.10.200.E, of body worn camera recordings for the month of March 2025. The ordinance requires that any findings of material non-compliance with state law, City code and Police Department policy to be referred to the Chief of Police, the Mayor, the Council Chair, the Mayor's Chief of Staff, and the City Attorney.

The system used by the Department, at the time this audit was conducted cannot randomly generate a body worn camera (BWC) recording based on a particular timeframe. Because of that limitation, a random number generator was used to identify five case numbers (out of 5,355 case numbers) from the month. If a case number had multiple recordings for that case number, a recording was randomly selected for review.

**Body Worn Camera Reviews**

**Case No. 1**

***Summary***

Two police officers are in front of a home. A male answers the door and officers informed him that they were doing a "check" on the Subject male. The male says Subject male left the house. The officers then see the Subject male outside standing on the sidewalk.

The officers approach the Subject male, and Subject Officer begins speaking with him. The Subject male says he has been "cut a few times" while sleeping so he wants to go to a hospital to be evaluated. Subject Officer examines the cuts on the Subject male's body, which appear to be scratches. Subject male states that he went to University of Utah and LDS hospitals but did not have a pleasant experience. The Subject Officer asked if he wanted to go to Holy Cross hospital. Subject male agrees to go there. Subject Officer obtains the Subject male's consent to do a brief pat-down of his jacket for weapons. The Subject Officer's partner does a brief pat-down of the Subject male's jacket and does not find any weapons.

An ambulance arrives and Subject Officer informs medical staff that Subject male wants to go to the hospital to get evaluated. The Subject Officer also informs one medical staff member that Subject male is calm and just seeking help.

Medical staff ask the Subject male about his mental health history. Officers walk away and wait for an ambulance to depart. Subject Officer informs dispatch that Subject male is in good condition and officers will not follow.

Subject Officer turns off BWC.

### ***Finding***

Officers appeared to comply with State and City codes and Police Department policy. Officers were polite and empathetic with the Subject male who was suffering from a mental health crisis.

### **Case No. 2**

#### ***Summary***

Subject Officer is sitting in a patrol car and calls the Subject male on his cell phone. Subject male states that he is supposed to have his custodial visit with his children but his ex-wife, the children's mother, refuses to let him see his children.

Subject male wants to report and document the problems that he has had with his ex-wife regarding custodial visits with his children.

Subject male says he wants to press charges on his ex-wife because the problems have occurred for over three months. Additionally, Subject male stated that his ex-wife took the children out of state and that she is not following the decree. Subject male also requests an evidence link to download past text messages. Subject Officer provides him with the link via text message and completes the call.

Subject Officer says, "end of phone call, going off" and turns off BWC.

### ***Finding***

Subject Officer appeared to comply with State law, City code and Police Department policy. He was courteous throughout the call.

### **Case No. 3**

#### ***Summary***

Three officers approach the Subject male, who is an unsheltered person and sitting on the corner of an apartment building. As the officers' approach, the Subject male begins to stand up. One of the officers asks the Subject male to show the officers his hands. As the Subject male is getting up, the Subject Officer tells the other two officers, "he's got a knife

there,” and points to the Subject male’s adjacent wheelchair, which contains much of the Subject male’s property. The other officer then asks the Subject male to step away from the wheelchair and other property.

One of the officers asks Subject male for his name and date of birth. The Subject Officer (possibly the FTO) and another officer (possibly the trainee) return to the patrol car while the other officer continues questioning the Subject male. Subject Officer and the trainee officer inaudibly mumble to each other, but it appears that they are unable to positively identify the Subject male using the MDT.

The Subject Officer and trainee officer return to Subject male. The trainee officer and the other officer take Subject male into physical custody and apply handcuffs. Subject male informs officers that he has a problematic shoulder so the officers use double-cuffs to avoid straining his shoulder.

To better identify the Subject male, the other officer once again asks the Subject male for a clear spelling of his name and social security number. The trainee officer asks Subject male if he has any weapons or contraband. The Subject male says he has a “cooking knife” and a piece of glass that he smokes tobacco through.

The trainee officer asks the Subject male if he can search him, and the Subject male says yes. Trainee officer searches the Subject male and locates multiple pieces of broken glass tubing and a pouch of tobacco. The knife is with the Subject male’s property on his wheelchair. The other officer asks Subject male if he smokes tobacco out of a crack pipe or meth pipe. The Subject male says yes because it’s the same thing. The Subject male informs the officers that he does not do any drugs — no meth or heroin.

The other officer goes to do a criminal background check on the Subject male. The other officer returns and inform the officers that Subject male has warrants for trespassing and threats of violence.

The other officer asks trainee officer if he wants to arrest the Subject male. Trainee officer says he wants to look at the warrants first before deciding. Trainee officer calls the office manager of the building and asks her if she wants the Subject male to be trespassed. Officer manager says “no” and just wants the area clear of the Subject male for her tenants.

Subject Officer guides the trainee officer on the decision-making process for the present case. The trainee officer then discusses the case with the other officer while the Subject Officer stays with the Subject male.

The other officer and Subject Officer discuss whether glass pipes are ever used for smoking tobacco or only for illegal drugs. The other officer searches the Subject male’s

property (the property already found on his person), which includes bags of tobacco, but no illegal drugs.

Trainee officer decides not to arrest Subject male and informs him that he needs to leave the premises.

Subject Officer turns off BWC

### ***Finding***

Officers appeared to comply with State law, City code and Police Department policy. Officers were polite and professional with the Subject male. The officers also had a good, robust conversation regarding the glass pipes and possible illegal drug or tobacco use.

### **Case No. 4**

#### ***Summary***

The Subject Officer is sitting at a desk in front of a laptop. Subject Officer is not wearing his BWC but has it on a desk facing him. Subject Officer calls the Subject female on a cell phone. Subject female informs Subject Officer that her daughter has been harassed by the daughter's boyfriend, which includes threats. Subject female says she just wants to document the incidents of harassment. Subject Officer asks Subject female for the name and contact information for the boyfriend. Subject female is speaking with her daughter and providing information to the Subject Officer. Subject female informs Subject Officer that boyfriend would send her daughter threatening texts, such as "I know what you did. You will not get away with it. I know where you sleep." Boyfriend also threatened her via social media, impersonated her on social media, and has made unauthorized changes to her social media accounts, including changing a profile picture for the daughter to an image that says, "Go kill yourself."

Subject Officer asks if he can receive the harassing texts messages and changes to the daughter's social media and then provides the evidence link to the daughter. Subject Officer provides Subject female a case number and asks Subject female and daughter if he can call the boyfriend and they reply "yes." Subject Officer informs Subject female and daughter that he will call the boyfriend and will give him a warning about the harassing behaviors and possible consequences. Subject Officer recommends to Subject female and daughter that if harassment continues or if daughter feels unsafe, they may consider petitioning the court for a protective order. Subject Officer asks Subject female and daughter if there is anything else that he can help with. They reply "no."

Subject Officer ends call. Subject Officer says, "going off camera end of contact" and turns off BWC.

## **Finding**

Subject Officer appeared to comply with State law and City code. He appears to have committed a technical violation of Police Department policy with respect to providing the daughter with the full information that should be included on the Department's blue victim information card. The Subject Officer was respectful, professional, thorough and deescalating throughout the call.

## **Case No. 5**

### ***Summary***

Subject Officer, possibly the FTO, and another officer, possibly the trainee officer, get out of the patrol car and confront Subject male and immediately place him in custody and apply handcuffs. The Subject Officer indicates that the Subject male has felony warrants. The Subject male is not resisting and is complying with all instructions. The officers search Subject male and place him in the patrol car. The Subject male asks if he can speak with and hug his aunt, who was with the Subject male before he was taken into custody. Subject Officer goes to speak to the "aunt" who is sitting in a truck with her adult son. Subject Officer asks the other officer to take the aunt to Subject male for the requested hug and then returns to aunt's son to get his driver's license. Subject Officer conducts a check on the son's license to ensure that he can legally drive.

Another officer shows an item to the Subject Officer and asks whether it is heroine or another drug. Subject Officer gives him an evidence bag. Another officer informs Subject Officer that the aunt has a suspended driver's license and that she was driving. The officer had informed her to park on the side of street and let her son drive, who has a license and Subject Officer did not find any problems with the son's license.

Subject Officer takes a phone to the Subject male to call a female. Subject male informs her that he is going to jail because her has warrants. Subject male asks to talk with his sons, and he informs them that he is going to jail. The Subject male ends call.

Subject Officer returns to speak with Subject male and asks him about history of gang membership. Subject male says he left gang membership a long time ago. Subject Officer informs Subject male that he will probably be OCR (overcrowding release) because none of his warrants are "no bail."

Subject Officer and trainee officer get into the patrol car and drive Subject male drive to the jail.

Officers arrive at the jail with Subject male and as they are entering the jail the Subject Officer says, "End of contact" and turns off BWC.

### ***Finding***

All officers appeared to comply with State law and City codes. There was a violation of Police Department policy when the Subject Officer uses profanity repeatedly and frequently while in uniform. Officers took decisive action during the arrest to reduce risk to the community, police officers and Subject male. As soon as it was safe, officers were respectful and valued the family of Subject male. The officers established and maintained a good rapport with the Subject male.

### **CONCLUSION**

In three of the five cases that were reviewed, the audit found that police officers appeared to materially comply with City code, State law, and Police Department policies. In one case, the Subject Officer appeared to commit a violation of Police Department policy by using profanity in uniform. In another case, the Subject Officer committed a technical violation of Police Department policy by failing to provide all required information to a victim of potential dating violence.