

**Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage
Salt Lake City Police Department
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200
June 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 June 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 5 case numbers (out of 5,555 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

Subject Officer approaches a group of individuals seated on the sidewalk adjacent to a fenced construction site. The group is already being attended to by law enforcement officers. The subject officer exchanges greetings with several individuals and requests their names and dates of birth. The officer then accompanies another officer, potentially the field training officer, back to the patrol vehicle to perform warrant checks on those detained. During this process, the officer identifies that one of the detained females has an outstanding felony warrant.

The Subject Officer consulted with another officer to determine if there were any outstanding warrants for other individuals at the scene. The officer returned to the scene and allowed some individuals to depart. The officer then proceeded to detain a female suspect in connection with a confirmed felony warrant, placing her in handcuffs and escorting her to the patrol vehicle. A female officer was requested to conduct a search of the suspect; during the search, the female officer discovered pills, which were collected and secured in evidence bags. The suspect was subsequently transported in the patrol vehicle.

Subject officer advised the female subject of her Miranda rights. After she waived her rights, the officer conducted an interview regarding the current situation. The officer, who is familiar with the female subject from a previous case, offered some constructive guidance on leading a law-abiding lifestyle. The Field Training Officer then asked the female subject additional questions, and the officers conducted further computer inquiries to possibly investigate potential drug distribution charges related to the case.

An officer announces, "I'm muting," and the audio is silenced, likely for both the Subject Officer and the FTO. The officers then transport the female subject to the facility. Upon arrival at the facility, the Subject Officer makes an inaudible remark and deactivates the Body Worn Camera (BWC).

Finding

Officers appeared to comply with State Code. The Subject Officer appears to be in violation of City Code and Police Department policy by not stating the purpose for muting the BWC audio and deactivating the body-worn camera. Officers were professional and respectful with all persons, including the Subject female.

Case No. 2

Summary

Subject Officer is at the airport walking with other officers and an airport employee. Airport employee approaches the Subject male with the police officers and the Subject male begins to curse at the airport employee and police officers. Subject Officer asks airport employee what she would like to be done with the Subject male and she informs him that she's going to try to get an airline ticket for Subject male to fly to New York.

Subject Officer asks Subject male for his name and when he gives his name the Subject Officer recognizes the name and knows that the Subject male had already been trespassed the night before at the airport. The officers inform the Subject male that he has been trespassed and officers place handcuffs on the Subject male. After placing handcuffs on the Subject male, the officers struggle to take off the backpack that is still on Subject male. Subject male continues to curse at officers and saying he's going to kill officers and shoot people. The officers call for an additional officer and then secure the Subject male while they briefly unhand cuff him and remove the backpack.

Subject Officer departs the scene to move his patrol car to the "drop-off curb" site at the airport. Two officers escort Subject male to Subject Officer's patrol car. Subject Officer searches Subject male and then places him in the patrol car. Subject Officer drives Subject male to jail. When the Subject Officer arrives at jail, he fills out paperwork in his patrol car. When done, Subject Officer assists Subject male out of the patrol car and escorts him to the jail entrance.

Subject Officer turns off BWC without a statement on why BWC was turned off.

Finding

Officers appeared to comply with State and City Codes. The Subject Officer appears to be in violation of Police Department policy by speaking on the mobile phone while driving the patrol car and not stating why he turned off BWC. The Officers remained calm and respectful while engaging the confrontational Subject male.

Case No. 3

Summary

Subject Officer and another officer approach the Subject male who is standing on the sidewalk. Subject Officer informs Subject male that there have been reports that he is throwing objects at vehicles passing by and that he has been asked to leave the premises. Subject Officer asks Subject male for his name but he refuses to give his name. Subject

male speech is slurred and hard to understand. Subject Officer asks again for his name and warns Subject male that he needs to give name or “go to jail for failure to identify”. Subject Officer tells the subject male to turn around and the Subject male does not comply. Subject Officer unholsters her taser and Subject male tells her his first name and she holsters taser and places handcuffs on Subject male.

After being handcuffed, the Subject male provides his full name and date of birth. While two officers remain with Subject male, the Subject Officer goes to talk with the security guard who placed the service call. Security guard say he confronted Subject male after he was falling asleep and left trash at the scene. Security guard asked Subject male to leave but he wouldn’t. Guard says that the Subject male was “clearly inebriated” and there is no drinking or drugs allowed on the premises. Guard called PD saying he wants Subject male trespassed. Guard inform Subject male that PD was called and Subject male got upset and threw a bottle on the ground and trash at the cars driving by them.

Subject Officer goes to patrol car to conduct a warrant check on the Subject male. Subject Officer mutes audio and appears to be using a mobile phone to make a call. Subject Officer prints documents and walks to the Subject male and informs him that he is getting a ticket for “Failure to identify”. Subject Officer informs Subject male that her should not return to the Gallivan Center because he is trespassed and he will get arrested. Subject male is non-compliant with Subject Officer’s orders to leave the premises. Subject Officer informs Subject male that he needs to not threatened her because she may use a taser on him.

It appears that one of the officers tells the Subject Officer that she can leave the scene, possibly to de-escalate the situation because Subject male seems focused on irritating the Subject Officer.

Subject Officer says “thank you guys” and she begins to depart the scene. Subject Officer says “Going off end of contact” & turns off BWC.

Finding

The officers appeared to comply with State Code. The Subject Officer was observed to be in violation of Police Department policy by using profane language while on duty and by muting audio without providing a reason, which is a violation of City Code and Police Department Policy. The assisting officers demonstrated professionalism by engaging the subject male in a positive manner during the investigation. Additionally, the assisting officers effectively guided the Subject Officer to leave the premises in order to de-escalate the situation.

Case No. 4

Summary

Subject Officer is with another officer who is speaking with a female and male in a hospital. The Subject Officer asks the Subject female to explain the situation. Subject female states that she and her boyfriend gave a ride to a person and when the person was dropped off, two males physically assaulted her boyfriend. Subject female states that her boyfriend was bleeding a lot and was placed in the back of a truck. The truck then got into an accident and another person brought her and the boyfriend to the hospital.

Subject Officer then goes to interview the boyfriend in a hospital room. Subject Officer meets with a crime lab technician to discuss the case, while the technician takes pictures of the boyfriend's injuries. The boyfriend is not in a condition to be interviewed due to his physical injuries. A member of the medical staff assists the crime lab technician to photograph the boyfriend's injuries.

Subject Officer and the technician walk back to Subject female to document her injuries. Subject Officer and the technician leave the hospital to observe the crime scene.

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

Finding

Officer appeared to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy. Subject Officer was compassionate and empathetic with the Subject female while conducting a good investigation and collaboration with the crime scene investigator and hospital staff.

Case No. 5

Summary

Subject Officer walks into a convenience store and approaches a security guard. The guard describes the Subject male placing store items in his pants as he walks through store. Guard states the Subject male dropped some coins and then went to front of store and accused a lady that she stole his coins. The guard says that the Subject male is being belligerent with a store employee and she tells him that she will not sell him anything and that he needs to leave store. The guard states that he shows up to the store and confronts the Subject male. The guard then explains that the Subject male acts like he is going to hit the store employee. The guard then escorted the Subject male out of the store. The guard informs the Subject Officer that the entire incident is all on camera.

Subject Officer collects information on items stolen. Subject Officer asks the guard to see the video of incident. While watching the video, two males are seen involved in the incident, one male is stealing the items in store while another male is outside to drive a car.

Subject Officer speaks to store employee and she says she sees the Subject male all the time under the bridge as she walks to the store for work. Subject Officer describes the process to the guard and the store employee.

Subject Officer says “going off, end of contact” and turns off BWC.

Finding

Subject Officers appeared to comply with State and City Codes and Police Department policy. Subject Officer was very patient with the guard and store employee. Subject Officer did a good job providing realistic information to the guard and store employee on what they can expect in the case.

CONCLUSION

In two of the five cases reviewed, the audit found that police officers appeared to materially comply with City Code, State law, and Police Department policies. In three cases, the Subject Officers appeared to commit violations of City Code and Police Department policies.