

**Audits of Body Worn Camera Footage
Salt Lake City Police Department
Pursuant to City Code 2.10.200
May 2026**

SUMMARY

This memorandum constitutes a random audit, pursuant to City Code 2.10.200.E, of body worn camera recordings for the month of May 2026. 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 5,261 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 is driving the patrol car and parks at an apartment parking lot. Subject Officer approaches two persons, a Subject female and male, who are speaking with another police officer.

The Subject Officer takes the Subject female aside to speak to her while the other officer stays with the male, who is the Complainant. Subject female informs the Subject Officer that another male threatened her with a crowbar. As the Subject female provides a description to the Subject Officer, other officers arrive at the scene.

Subject Officer asks Subject female if she is willing to write a statement. Subject female says "yes" and the Subject Officer provides her with the documents to write her statement. Subject Officer asks the Complainant male if he would be willing to write a witness statement, but he says, "No, not at this time."

Another officer tells the Subject Officer that the Complainant male informed her that he had cashed a check. As he was walking with the money, his uncle and other persons began running at him and attacked him with a metal bar and a knife. (The uncle is referred to hereafter as Suspect #2.) The officer reported that the primary assailant was described as the uncle, Suspect #2. After a tussle, the Complainant male ran away.

The Subject female completes the witness form. Subject Officer informs the Subject female and the Complainant male that they are waiting for crime lab to arrive. Subject female and Complainant male inform the Subject Officer that there is blood from the assault on the bushes and a gate.

A male walks by and the Subject female and Complainant male inform the Subject Officer that he is one of the individuals that attacked the Complainant male. Subject Officer informs the Suspect male, who appears to take a step back to leave, that he is being detained while they are doing an investigation but that he is not being arrested. The other officer places the Suspect male in handcuffs and has him sit in the back of her patrol car with the door open while she conducts an interview.

Subject Officer walks away and speaks to another male, a friend, that was walking with Suspect male and asks him about the situation. The male friend says he was not there during the incident but that the Suspect male told him what happened. The Subject Officer asks the friend to describe what he was told. According to the friend, the Complainant male was fighting with the Suspect male and reportedly the Subject male's dad (Suspect #2) came to defend Suspect male. Reportedly, Suspect #2 put a knife to the Complainant's

neck and said he was going to kill him. Suspect #2 is the father of the Suspect male and the uncle of the Complainant male.

The male friend states that the Suspect male is a good kid and is just scared. The male friend had told the Suspect male when he was approached by the officers to calm down and cooperate with the officers.

Subject Officer informs the male friend that he is not being detained and is free to leave if he wishes. The male friend says he will stick around and that he came back to the scene to look for the Suspect male's phone. The officers and the male friend look for the phone of the Suspect male.

The Subject female and Complainant male state that the Suspect male is a good person but Suspect #2, the Suspect male's father, is a bad influence on him.

Subject Officer explains to Suspect male, who is emotional and crying, the situation and the Suspect male states he understands. The Suspect male asks if police are looking for his father (Suspect #2) and Subject Officer says yes. Suspect male states that his father will probably go to jail because he has warrants, was recently in jail, and did not go to his court appointment.

Another officer explains to Subject male that the Complainant male stated that they were both just "doing your own thing and his father hopped in and just took it way above." The officer informs the Suspect male that he is free to go but that the Complainant male wants to hug him because he feels bad that "you got roped into this". The Suspect male and the Complainant male hug.

Subject Officer says, "Going off. End of contact." and turns off the BWC.

Finding

The officers appear to comply with State statute, City code and Police Department policy. The officers explained the situation several times to all involved to reduce emotional reactions. Officers were respectful and empathetic with all the parties involved.

All officers coordinated well with each other to manage their busy schedule and navigate realistic outcomes.

Case No. 2

Summary

Subject Officer is next to another officer who begins searching the Subject female who is in handcuffs. After the search, the other officer places the Subject female into a patrol car.

Subject Officer goes to another vehicle that is parked in front of the police car that has the driver's side door open. There is a male sitting in the passenger seat. Another officer asks the passenger, "You don't have the license. How far you need to walk?" and allows the male to leave the scene.

Subject Officer states that the vehicle is getting impounded, and officers state that an inventory needs to be conducted. Subject Officer begins to conduct the inventory and discovers a small container in the driver's side door compartment and asks another officer if she has a meth kit because he thinks there is meth in the small container. Subject Officer asks if he should continue to inventory the vehicle, and one of the officers says, yes. Subject Officer continues conducting a thorough inventory.

Subject Officer gives another officer the vehicle keys for the tow truck. An officer asks Subject Officer to mute BWC and after stating "muting for consultation" he mutes audio. Officers are then seen searching the vehicle. It appears that the Subject Officer forgot to unmute audio. An officer gives the Subject Officer an evidence bag and the Subject Officer views it.

Subject Officer unmutes audio and says, "End contact. Going off." and turns off the BWC.

Finding

The officers appeared to comply with State statute and City code. Subject Officer appears to have committed a technical violation of Police Department policy by not unmuting the BWC audio after consultation.

Case No. 3

Summary

Subject Officer is walking to the front door of a house where he meets a female. The Subject female walks out of the house, and the Subject Officer asks for her basic information (name, DOB, contact info). Subject female states that on the previous day she was doing yardwork, when a car pulls up and she and the driver wave to each other. The car then parks on the street in front of her house and remains there for a lengthy period of time. Subject female finally approaches the car and asks the driver, the Subject male, if he

is looking for something. Subject male states he is looking for an apartment and then asks if she lives alone and says that he will return to visit her. She says “no” and he left. As she was working in the yard again, she sees Subject male driving slow and he waves; she goes back inside the house.

Subject female called a SLCPD police officer that she knows from the Sugar House Community Council. The police officer looked up the license plate of the Subject male’s car and informed her that she needs to contact police and make a formal report because the Subject male has a history of stalking behavior. In addition to the initial contact, Subject female tells the Subject Officer that the Subject male drove by the day before and again today. Subject Officer asks if she can describe the vehicle. She gets her laptop and shows him a picture of the car. Subject Officer asks for the description of the Subject male, and she provides a general description. Subject female also provides Subject Officer the plate number of the Subject male’s car.

Subject Officer informs the Subject female that the Subject male does have a history of stalking, but it does not appear that it was violent or never seemed to “escalate to anything.” Subject Officer provides the Subject female some general safety strategies.

Subject Officer informs the Subject female that the definition of stalking is hard to prove but trespassing may be something she could document by taking a video of Subject male on her property and of her telling him to leave the property. If the Subject male returns to her property, she should video him returning and then the police can act on the trespassing and arrest him.

Subject Officer receives a phone call and is speaking to someone that may be related to the case. Subject Officer ends the call and states that the Subject male lives in the area. Subject Officer states that he is going to try to talk to the Subject male, see if he can get any kind of information, and discourage him from further contact with the Subject female.

Subject Officer informs the Subject female how to familiarize herself with legal Utah code for stalking so she can recognize it and document signs of it.

Subject Officer states, “Going off, end of contact” and turns off BWC.

Finding

Officers appeared to comply with State statute and City code. It appears that the Subject Officer violated the Police Department policy by not providing the Subject female the “blue victim information card.”

Case No. 4

Summary

Subject Officer and another officer walk towards a corner of a house appearing to look for someone. Another police car parks across the street and two other officers approach the Subject Officer. The officers ask each other if they “hear anything.” Finally, the officers hear a female crying loudly from inside a home. Subject Officer informs other officers that the female may have a TBI and “she can’t regulate emotions.”

Subject Officer knocks on the door and the Subject female, who is crying, says she is fearful of police, so the officers stay outside of the house. Subject Officer speaks to the Subject female from outside the house through the closed screen door. The Subject female states that she is upset that her autism diagnosis is taking so long.

Subject female states that she is receiving a phone call from the organization that is setting up her appointment. Subject Officer asks the Subject female if he can also speak with the person calling and she says “yes.” Subject Officer asks if officers can come into the home and she says yes. Subject female speaks with the person on the phone and received information about doing the virtual appointment. Subject Officer then listens to her patiently; she says she has a mental health disorder, and it is so hard. Subject female gets frustrated with trying to manage her appointment on her mobile phone, and Subject Officer assists her. The Subject female is beginning to calm down but is still crying. The Subject female is now speaking with her doctor via video on her phone. Doctor asks if anybody is with her, and she states the police are with her and the Subject Officer briefly speaks to doctor. The Subject female states that her boyfriend is on his way home from work. Subject Officer ensures that it is safe to leave the home by having both the Subject female and doctor state yes.

Subject Officer states “Going off. End of contact” and turns off BWC.

Finding

Subject Officer appeared to comply with State law, City code and Police Department policy. Subject Officer was extremely empathetic towards the Subject female by using effective crisis reduction strategies on Subject female.

Case No. 5

Summary

Subject Officer parks in a parking lot of a bus station and approaches another officer who is with a Subject male that is in handcuffs leaning on a patrol car. Subject Officer appears to be holding the Subject male steady while the other officer searches him.

After searching the Subject male, the officer places him in the patrol car. The officer informs Subject Officer that the Subject male has felony warrants and then describes the present situation. Officer states that a bag with some powder was next to the Subject male on the ground and that he also has similar powder inside his pocket. Subject Officer searches the Subject male's bag and finds paraphernalia. The other officer is searching other property that belongs to the Subject male.

Subject Officer gives the officer what appears to be a "drug testing kit" and the officer states that he will test it later.

Subject Officer shakes some pellets out of a yo-yo and places the pellets into an evidence bag. Subject Officer informs officer that he has meth testing kits but not for fentanyl and then provides him with evidence bags.

Officer states that the test kit came out negative but will submit it to the lab for additional testing. Subject Officer places the Subject male's property in a bag and places it in his patrol car. Subject Officer sits in his patrol vehicle and appears to be writing up a report.

The officers begin a discussion about how to handle the suspected drug powder and the Subject Officer states, "muting for consult." Subject Officer unmutes moments later. He states, "Going off. End of contact," and turns off BWC.

Finding

Subject Officer appeared to comply with State statute, City code, and Police Department policy. The officers worked well together on the case. Both were courteous to the Subject male while explaining what they were doing.

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. There were two cases that appeared to violate Police Department policies.