Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage
Salt Lake City Police Department
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200
July 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 July 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 6,067 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 exits the patrol car and approaches another police officer who is walking outside an apartment complex. The other officer says out loud that a burglary is in progress. Several officers are then seen walking around the apartment complex searching for the suspect. Some of the officers go to the door and wait to be let into the building.

Dispatch, who is speaking to the complainant, informs the officers that the suspect is on a balcony and that the complaint is the boyfriend.

The complainant opens the door and informs the officers that the suspect is not his boyfriend. He says he does not know the suspect and doesn't know how the suspect ended up on his balcony. Officers approach the complainant's apartment and tell the complainant to wait in the hallway while they enter the apartment. Subject Officer opens door and states "Salt Lake City Police. If you are there, make yourself known!" Officers then come into the apartment. Officers find suspect on the balcony. Officers place handcuffs on suspect, the Subject male. Subject Officer and other officers escort Subject male out of the apartment building. As the officers are escorting the Subject male, they ask him questions about how he came to be on the balcony. The Subject male says the complainant is his boyfriend. In the elevator, the Subject male responded to officer questions, saying he met complainant the night before and the complainant allowed him into the apartment and the balcony. Once outside of the building, officers search Subject male and allow him to sit in the back of patrol vehicle. Subject Officer conducts a warrant check on the Subject male and finds that he has a felony 2 warrant for firearms.

Subject Officer reads Miranda to Subject male. Subject male tells the Subject Officer that he is willing to speak. Subject male says he met complainant the prior night at Pioneer Park, and they smoked marijuana and meth. Subject male says he has been in the apartment since the prior night. Subject male says complainant was acting weird, so Subject male walked out of the building and then got lost. Once he got back into the apartment, he went to the balcony. The officers mute audio and appear to discuss the case. Subject Officer gets into the patrol car and drives Subject male to jail. Subject male tells Subject Officer that he needs to go to the hospital. Subject Officer asks him why he feels he needs to go to the hospital and then informs the Subject male that a nurse will be at the jail will check him. If the nurse determines that he needs to go to the hospital, someone will take him to the hospital. Subject Officer arrives at the jail and says something inaudible and turns off BWC.

Finding

The Subject Officer appears to be in violation of Police Department policies by asking Subject male questions about how he entered the apartment while they were escorting him to the patrol vehicle. The Subject Officer appears to be in violation of Police Department policy, City code, and State statute by engaging Subject male while the BWC audio was muted.

Additionally, another officer used profanity when speaking to the Subject male.

Officers worked well together, coordinating among themselves in a potentially dangerous and consuming situation. Subject Officer treated complainant and Subject male professionally.

Case No. 2

Summary

Subject Officer and other officers approach two males sitting on the ground and a single female lying on an air mattress in what appears to be a porch-like setting in front of a building. Subject Officer informs them that there is a “no trespassing” sign posted on the structure.

Other officers run warrant checks on the three people. Subject Officer tells the two males that they need to get their property and leave the premises. They inform the Subject female that she has a felony warrant and handcuffs are placed on her. Subject Officer asks Subject female if it is okay for the two males to keep her property and she agrees.

Subject Officer conducts a search of the Subject female with the other officers’ present as witnesses. Subject female informs officers that she is supposed to go to the hospital because she was not doing so well. One of the officers asks Subject female, you’re “not majorly sick, injured, or suicidal and obviously haven’t swallowed any drugs, right?” Subject female responds but her response is not clear on the body-worn camera audio. The Subject female is coherent, responsive, and moving well; it is not evident from her physical appearance or actions that she requires medical attention.

Officers walks Subject female to the patrol car. A female police officer arrives and conducts a more thorough search of the Subject female. After the search is complete, Subject Officer places Subject female in the patrol car. Subject Officer provides Subject female water when requested.

Subject Officer informs other officers that he will not charge her with paraphernalia since she already has a felony warrant for distribution. Subject Officer and another officer, possibly the FTO, drive Subject female to the jail.

Subject Officer says, “arrived at the jail, going off camera” and turns off BWC.

Finding

Officers appeared to comply with State statute, City code and Police Department Policy. Officers worked well together discussing decision-making based on policy. The senior officer provided professional, positive mentorship to the Subject Officer. Subject Officer was extremely respectful and empathetic with the Subject female.

Case No. 3

Summary

Subject Officer and another officer walk towards the Subject male, who is in a store parking lot. The Subject male is reporting that his vehicle has been vandalized and that the store has video recording of the incident but will not release it to him. Subject Officer documents damage on the Subject male’s vehicle, which has a broken rear window.

Subject Officer collects basic information from Subject male and informs him that he can depart, and the officers will speak with the store employees and get the video footage of the crime.

Officers walk into the store and meet with store employees to view the footage of the crime. Employees inform officers that there were two incidents with the same suspect — first, the suspect tried to steal a wallet while inside the store and then a few minutes later he rode his bike and broke the vehicle window of the Subject male’s vehicle. Officers watch both incidents and then provide the store employees with information on how to download the video footage to the Police Department.

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

Finding

Officers appeared to comply with State statute and City code. One of the officers appears to be in violation of Police Department policy by using profanity and unprofessional language while viewing the videos with the Subject Officer and store employees. Officers engaged all persons well and were empathetic to the Subject male and his wife, who were the victims of the crime.

Case No. 4

Summary

Subject Officer approaches a male sitting on a sidewalk that is accompanied by two police officers on bicycles. Subject Officer asks the male if he is on spice. He tells the

Subject male that if he can walk away, he should depart the area. The male departs the scene.

Subject Officer is called by another officer across the street. Subject Officer crosses the street and sees a second male who is laying on his back on the sidewalk. Subject male is not very responsive. Subject Officer tells another officer to call for medical. The officers help the Subject male sit up. Subject Officer leaves to get his patrol car.

As Subject Officer walks to his patrol car, he observes two persons, a male and a female, arguing loudly. Subject Officer attempts to de-escalate the situation. Subject Officer then sees a third male who appears to be intoxicated and orders him to sit down. The male walks away and Subject Officer follows the male and again tells him to sit down because he is intoxicated in public. The male sits down on the sidewalk. Subject Officer returns to the two people who are arguing and observes one of the police officers is placing handcuffs on the female (Subject female). Subject female says that she has warrants.

Subject Officer informs another officer that he is citing one of the males. Subject Officer returns to the third male who is sitting on the sidewalk and gives him a citation.

Subject Officer approaches a fourth male who is nodding (as in falling asleep) while standing up. Subject Officer asks him if he is ok and gets his identification information. Subject Officer returns to the fourth male after a warrant check and informs him that he looks intoxicated and recommends that he go somewhere to get sober but that it was good that he is not causing trouble. Subject Officer allows the fourth male to leave.

Subject Officer informs another officer that a female officer is coming to search the Subject female. Female officer arrives and searches Subject female.

Subject Officer returns to patrol car where Subject female has already been placed in the back seat. Subject Officer and another officer conduct a custody search on the Subject female’s property.

Subject Officer gets into patrol car and departs to the jail. Subject Officer arrives at the jail, assists Subject female out of car, and walks her to the jail door.

Subject Officer says “ending” and turns off BWC.

Finding

Officer appeared to comply with State statute and City code. The Subject Officer appears to commit a minor violation of Police Department policy by using some limited profanity when engaging a male who is not complying with his commands to sit down. Subject Officer was firm and directive, yet for the most part still respectful toward everyone at the scene. The officers conducted triage professionally in a scene that was extremely chaotic with multiple, unrelated persons potentially involved in criminal activity

or in unhealthy situations. Officers discussed Police Department policies to guide decision-making.

Case No. 5

Summary

Subject Officer arrives at a home where another police officer is walking in front of the home with a male, who is the complainant and the landlord of the home. The other officer asks the complainant if anybody is supposed to be in the house and he replies “no”. The other officer asks the complainant to move away from the door and then knocks on the door several times and nobody answers.

Subject Officer asks the complainant if the occupant had died and male says “yes”. The other officer was able to open the door and several times states “police, come on out.” Officers go into the house and dogs can be heard barking in the background.

A male, Subject male, came out of a room and informs the Subject Officer that his father was the occupant and died. A female comes out of another room in the home and the other officer engages her. The officers inform the Subject male that the landlord said that nobody was supposed to live in the home. The Subject male is irate and tells the officers that they need to leave the premises. Subject Officer explains the situation to the Subject male, and he calms down.

The other officer speaks with the complainant and explains why the Subject male and female are allowed to be in the house as they need to clean out the home. Subject male says rent for the present month is paid.

Officers speak separately to both the complainant and the Subject male to further explain the situation.

Subject Officer informs the other officer that he was going to check on some information regarding the situation. Subject Officer states, “muting for supervisor conversation” and mutes audio. Subject Officer takes out his phone, sits in his patrol car and conducts research on the laptop.

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

Finding

Subject Officers appeared to comply with State statute and City codes. The Subject Officer committed a minor violation of Police Department policy by using profanity when engaging the Subject male and showing empathy for the situation. Both officers were calm and explained to both parties the situation which helped with de-escalation. The officers also informed both parties that the case is a civil matter and that there is a court process.

CONCLUSION

In one of the five cases that were reviewed, the audit found that police officers appeared to comply with City code, State law, and Police Department policies. In two cases, the audit found that officers committed minor violations of policy by using profanity. In the two remaining cases, the audit found violations of the profanity policy. In one case, the audit found additional violations of policies regarding interrogations and BWC recording.