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Introduction

In conjunction with our core values of integrity, honor and duty, the Aurora Police Department strives for professionalism in the performance of our duties. We encourage positive behavior in our employees using awards and commendations. We also encourage our employees and citizens to report any perceived misconduct by our employees. We investigate every complaint and concern reported to the Department and take appropriate action, protecting the rights of the citizen and the Department member. This report reflects our commitment to openness and transparency to the community we serve.

The Department has four methods to manage complaints and discipline which are: The Automated Complaint and Commendation System; District / Bureau Discipline; Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreement Process; and Formal Internal Investigations and Discipline.

Automated Complaint and Commendation System

The Aurora Police Department created the Automated Complaint and Commendation System in 2006 to manage and record all allegations and investigations of complaints and commendations received on both sworn and non-sworn members of the Department. Regardless of how received, all complaints and commendations are entered into the automated system.

Citizens can enter their complaint or commendation directly online through the City’s website. If the Department receives a complaint or commendation in person, on the telephone, or in writing, the receiving employee enters the information into the system. Once entered in the automated system, the complaint is forwarded to the Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) Commanding Officer. Once the Internal Affairs Commanding Officer or designee has reviewed the case, if they determine the case is an allegation that can be investigated at the District / Bureau level, they will send the case to the appropriate Commanding Officer. The Commanding Officer will assign the case to an appropriate supervisor in the District / Bureau and a preliminary investigation will be completed. If during the preliminary investigation the investigator believes the allegation should not be handled at the District / Bureau level, a request for investigation by the IAB will be completed and forwarded through the complaint management system to the subject member’s Division Chief.

Safeguards built into the system include the following: no one can delete the complaint or commendation; only one supervisor can work on the complaint at a time (following the chain of command); supervisors can add information but cannot remove it; all information inserted into the system is saved, documenting the date and time submitted and by whom; supervisors can search the system to determine if the officer has similar complaints and or commendations.

The system records all the information and produces statistical information. Police managers use the information to determine future training needs as well as to decide an appropriate level of discipline.
District/Bureau Discipline
Cases that result in corrective measures (training versus discipline) are recorded in the Automated Complaint and Commendation System. A police department supervisor or manager investigates all District / Bureau discipline cases. The supervisor obtains all the necessary information and reports their findings to their supervisor. The employee’s chain of command reviews the investigation. If any supervisor in the chain of command determines that the employee violated a Department Directive(s) and decides the appropriate level of discipline is a Written Reprimand, they will make that recommendation to the Chief of Police or designee. If the Chief concurs with the findings, a Written Reprimand is prepared, reviewed, and approved by the Chief. The Chief of Police may personally issue and serve the Written Reprimand on the employee or delegate this duty to a command officer within the employee’s chain of command. The Written Reprimand is part of the employee’s permanent discipline file.

Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreement Process
When an internal or external complaint is entered into the automated complaint system, it is immediately routed to IAB for review. The IAB Commander or designee will review the complaint to determine if it should be assigned to IAB for a full IAB investigation or reassigned to the subject member’s Commander for either Preliminary Investigation or an NDSA (Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreement). The IAB Commander or designees will add notes to the automated complaint system indicating the matter is eligible for the NDSA process. The tracking note will include a range of discipline based on the comparable discipline for prior similar policy violations resulting in a 40-hour suspension or less. The purpose of the NDSA process is to provide efficient resolution of Departmental Directives violations requiring limited formal discipline without the necessity of a formal Internal Affairs investigation. Generally, the NDSA is the end result of a complaint or an Internal Affairs Investigation.

Formal Internal Investigations and Discipline
The Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) Commanding Officer or designee receives allegations of misconduct. The IAB Commanding Officer determines whether the allegation of misconduct necessitates an IAB investigation or be sent to the District for investigation. If a formal investigation is warranted, the IAB will seek authorization from the Chief of Police. The IAB completes the investigation and will notify the subject member/members’ Division Chief(s), and District / Bureau Commander Officer(s) that the case is available for review. Once the involved Chiefs and Commanding Officers have reviewed the case, the Deputy Chief, on behalf of the Chief of Police, will convene a Chief’s Review Board (CRB). The CRB will review the case and discuss the recommendation of finding from the IAB Commander. If the CRB determines a finding of sustained for any allegation of misconduct, or noncompliance for any compliance review, the CRB will make a recommendation of discipline to the Chief of Police. The Chief of Police will inform the member of recommended discipline. Additionally, critical incidents (i.e. police shootings, use of force resulting in serious injuries or death, serious traffic accidents involving officers, etc.) may result in a formal investigation regardless of whether there is any evidence or accusation of misconduct.
Perspective Statistics

The Department provides the following statistical information for the purpose of perspective. The Department currently employs 744 sworn officers, 147 non-sworn employees, and 91 non-sworn public safety communication employees (total 982). During 2020, the Department answered a total of 486,170 calls for service from the public. This includes a total of 251,138 calls to 9-1-1 and 235,032 Non-Emergency calls. There were also 729 text to 9-1-1 calls for 2020.

The Department arrested 4,916 suspects, issued 4,577 criminal summonses (non-custodial arrests) and issued 22,448 traffic citations (this excludes parking tickets and General Offense related traffic summonses).

The statistics for this report were impacted by challenges stemming from the Coronavirus pandemic. Due to public health orders and efforts to reduce the risk of spreading the virus, arrest procedures were modified including, at times, not being allowed to physically take individuals into custody. These modifications ultimately impacted the data shared in this report.

As noted in detail in the following sections, the Department received a total of 384 complaints involving 480 sworn members and 16 non-sworn members. There were 44 commendations submitted for sworn members and 1 commendation received for a non-sworn member.
Automated Complaint and Commendation Report

The Automated Complaint and Commendation System accepts and records all submissions. The Department designed the system to manage the complaints and commendations reported on Department personnel. The system has a drop-down menu giving the person an option to describe themselves.

During 2020, there were 101 complaints received online or entered by a Police Department member. City Officials submitted 6 complaints, and 199 complaints were received from individuals who identified themselves as members of the community or surrounding areas. Complaints involved 480 sworn members and 16 non-sworn members. *(Please note: some complaints may include several members).*

Additionally, 44 commendations were received for sworn officers and 1 commendation for a non-sworn member of the Department.

![2020 Automated Complaints and Commendations Pie Chart]

- Sworn Complaints (480)
- Non-Sworn Complaints (16)
- Sworn Commendations (44)
- Non-Sworn Commendation (1)
Automated Complaints by Type

The Automated Complaint System categorizes the submissions for the Department to analyze, determine trends and provide instruction if needed.

The system categorized the complaints received during 2020 as follows: There were 8 reports of neglect of duty, 34 reported violations of court issues or missed court, 15 reported violations of constitutional rights, 41 allegations of unsatisfactory performance, 25 allegations of racial profiling, 7 reports of excessive use of force, 67 complaints of improper or incomplete investigations, 68 for other directives or standard operation procedures not captured under the other types and 120 complaints of rudeness or professionalism issues. There were no allegations of an illegal search. Note this reflects the number of allegations and some complaints may have more than one allegation or pertain to more than one member.
Automated Complaints by Validity

In each of the complaint submissions received, the officer’s supervisor has investigated the complaint. The officer’s chain of command has reviewed the investigations before closing them.

The Department has reviewed each of the complaints and ascertained the validity of the complaint. From these there were 180 sustained, 126 not sustained, 149 complaints that were unfounded, 49 complaints exonerating the member, and zero complaints with an unknown validity.
Automated Complaints: Results

The Automated Complaint System records any corrective action taken by the Department as a result of the investigation. The results range from “none justified” to an order by the Chief for the Internal Affairs Bureau to formally investigate the complaint. Careful study and comparison of this information will reveal that more incidents result in some form of correction than incidents that are found to be invalid. This is because the complaint may not be valid considering the Department Directives, but the supervisor may determine the officer needs some degree of instruction to help them do a better job.

The results of the complaints submitted are as follows, in descending order of severity. The Chief of Police ordered the Internal Affairs Bureau to formally investigate 54 members in 44 separate cases (Please note: some employees may be involved in more than one IAB case. See page 21 for results of formal investigations). The Department sent 7 cases through the Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreement (NDSA) process. The Department issued 22 Written Reprimands for violations of Department Directives. A Written Reprimand is permanent discipline that remains in the officer’s file for their entire career. The Department issued 38 Corrective Action Reports instructing the officers to change their behavior. The Corrective Action Report is not discipline but a notice or warning to modify behavior. The Corrective Action Report remains in the officer’s file for one to two years, depending on their evaluation date and cycle. It is documentation of past problems and corrective measures taken to correct the behavior. Forty-two (42) Performance Appraisal Entry (PAE) reports for member performance were recorded. The supervisors use the PAE reports as documentation to be included in the officers’ annual evaluations. On 20 occasions, the supervisors verbally counseled the officers. Mediation was recommended in two (2) cases. Final discipline department-wide included 24 suspensions, 9 terminations and 1 demotion. Thirteen (13) members resigned prior to final discipline being issued.
Automated Complaints: Follow Up Contact Method

At the conclusion of the investigation the supervisor is required, if possible, to contact the complainant and explain the findings. This is captured in the Automated Complaint System.

The supervisor contacted the complainant by telephone in 177 of the cases. The supervisor used e-mail 23 times. The supervisor met the complainant in person 32 times. In 118 cases, the supervisor could not contact the complainant (anonymous complaint or attempted but unable to contact).
Automated Commendations by Type

The system categorized the commendations received during 2020 as follows:

Nineteen (19) citizen submissions expressed appreciation or thanks for the member. Eleven (11) others reported a job well done. Ten (10) submissions stated the officer was professional. Five (5) reported the officer went above and beyond expectations.
Automated Complaint and Commendation System: Miscellaneous Information on People Reporting

The automated complaint and commendation system allows the submitting person the opportunity to provide information about themselves. The system has a drop-down menu giving the person a choice of options to describe themselves; 163 of the people submitting a complaint or commendation indicated they were a citizen of Aurora; 76 indicated they were a non-resident; 104 said they were an employee member of the Department; and 7 indicated they were a government official.

Source of Commendations or Complaints

- Resident (163) 46%
- Non-Resident (76) 22%
- APD Member (104) 30%
- City Official (7) 2%
Gender of People Submitting Complaints

- Male (209) - 59%
- Female (112) - 32%
- Unknown (31) - 9%

Reported Ethnicity of People Submitting Complaints

- White (159) - 45%
- African American (59) - 29%
- American Indian (3) - 6%
- Latino (20) - 17%
- Asian (8) - 1%
- Other/Unknown (102) - 2%
Gender of People Submitting Commendations

- Male (25) - 56%
- Female (19) - 42%
- Unknown (1) - 2%

Reported Ethnicity of People Submitting Commendations

- White (26) - 58%
- Black (2) - 4%
- Latino (2) - 4%
- Asian (2) - 5%
- American Indian (2) - 5%
- Unknown (11) - 24%
Case Summary Disclaimer

Chief Wilson and the Aurora Police Department recognize members of the Aurora Police Department have a right to privacy in the contents of their personnel files, including the results of formal investigations and incidents of discipline, and expect the contents of these files will be held in confidence by their employer. This expectation and right to privacy flows from the United States Constitution, the Colorado Constitution, the Colorado Open Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes § 24-72-201, et. seq., the Colorado Criminal Justice Records Act, Colorado Revised Statutes, § 24-72-301, et. seq., the City of Aurora Personnel Policies and Procedures, and the Aurora Police Department Directives. While there is little, if any, public interest in investigations stemming from allegations relating to purely administrative matters such as the use of equipment, abuse of leave and the like, these matters are nonetheless provided below.

Further, the City of Aurora also maintains the right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. The following summaries are included with these privileges of confidentiality in mind. The inclusion of the following summaries does not constitute a waiver of either the individual employee’s expectation of privacy in the contents of their personnel file, nor waiver of the city of Aurora’s right to withhold its deliberative process as confidential. In an effort to balance the privacy and confidentiality rights of the individual officers, retaining the deliberative process privilege associated with the decision making detailed below, while at the same time providing our citizens with sufficient information to evaluate the adequacy, thoroughness and impartiality of the Aurora Police Department’s internal investigation and disciplinary process, the following information is provided.

District and Bureau Discipline Report

During 2020, the Department completed and finalized 40 District / Bureau investigations that resulted in the Chief of Police ordering a Written Reprimand as discipline for the violation of one or more Department Directives. A Written Reprimand is permanent discipline that remains in the employee’s file for their career. Note that some Written Reprimands included more than one policy violation.

The Department has categorized these Written Reprimands as follows: Six (6) cases involved members not following the Department Directive for vehicle operations and/or the Department’s Directive on emergency response. Ten (10) allegations involved issues of professional conduct. Three (3) cases involved attendance issues. Seven (7) cases involved department equipment. Five (5) cases involved the handling of investigations, evidence and/or property. Two (2) involved court issues. Eight (8) cases involved unsatisfactory performance. Three (3) cases involved supervisor responsibilities. One (1) case involved body worn camera operation.

The 40 District/Bureau Written Reprimands involved four (4) civilians, seven (7) sergeants, one (1) lieutenant, four (4) recruit officers, and 24 officers.

These matters that resulted in Written Reprimands are summarized with more detail below.

1) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.2.11, Constitutional Requirements, and 6.11.2, Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations. Another sworn member was sustained for violating Department Directive 1.4.11, Supervisor Responsibility – Accountability for Performance of Subordinates.
A sworn member drafted an arrest affidavit with the incorrect address and lacking critical details resulting in an innocent party being arrested. Another sworn member failed to provide proper direction to the officer during this call.

2) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 10.9.6, Supervisory Responsibility.

This sworn member failed to report another employee’s concerns of sexual harassment as required by department policy.

3) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming.

This sergeant made unwelcome physical contact with another member on several occasions, despite being told that the contact was unwelcome.

4) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.2.1, Scheduled Leave, 14.2.13, Neglect of Duty, and 14.2.15, Unsatisfactory Performance.

An officer was sustained on allegations after a complaint of spending duty time sitting in parking lots for personal business and failing to work scheduled shifts without prior notification.

5) The Department sustained a recruit officer for violating Department Directive 14.2.5, Unsatisfactory Performance.

This recruit officer had multiple unsatisfactory test scores during Academy Training.

6) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.6, Issuance of Equipment, Badges and ID Cards.

This officer’s wallet containing their official Police ID Card was lost or stolen.

7) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.04, Police and City Owned Vehicle Collisions.

While operating a city-owned vehicle, an officer made contact with the rear of a civilian vehicle and was found to be the at-fault driver of the accident. This officer had two prior motor vehicles accidents within a 24-month period of time.

8) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive Model Traffic Code 1007(1c), Lane Usage – Failed to Drive in Designated Lane.

While driving an unmarked police vehicle, an officer struck another parked unmarked police vehicle, causing slight to moderate damage to both vehicles.

9) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.6.5, Use of Department Equipment.
This member was sustained for leaving their personal wallet on the roof of an assigned patrol vehicle, resulting in the loss of his Police Badge and Police ID card.

10) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.2.15, Unsatisfactory Performance.

This member was found sleeping in an assigned patrol car while working an off-duty assignment.

11) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.2.13, Neglect of Duty.

This sworn member fell asleep while on duty, placing themselves in a situation jeopardizing their safety and possible scrutiny on the department.

12) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.2.15, Unsatisfactory Performance.

This sworn member failed to follow directions provided to them regarding an open complaint against an officer with a pending evaluation.

13) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3, Court.

This officer missed a scheduled court appearance for the second time in a two-month period.

14) The Department sustained an officer for violating Department Directive 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming.

This officer responded to a call and displayed a lack of professional behavior demonstrated by their tone of voice and volume spoken to the victims.

15) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.2.21, Police-Community Relations.

An officer working in an off-duty capacity contacted an uncooperative and out of control subject and failed to remain professional or take measures to protect themselves, further escalating the situation with the subject.

16) The Department sustained a recruit officer for violating Department Directive 14.2.15, Unsatisfactory Performance.

This recruit officer failed tests while on academic probation and in training at the Academy.

17) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.9.3, Depositing Evidence and Other Property.

A sworn member failed to properly safeguard personal property collected from a suspect.

18) The Department sustained a recruit officer for violating Department Directive 14.2.15, Unsatisfactory Performance.
This recruit officer failed multiple exams while in training at the Academy.

19) The Department sustained a civilian member for violating Standard Operating Procedures in the Public Safety Communications Center.

This civilian member failed to report for a duty assignment on two occasions.


While driving a marked police car, this officer struck a parking lot barrier resulting in damages to the vehicle.

21) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.3, Court.

A sworn member failed to appear for a scheduled court hearing.

22) The Department sustained a civilian member for violating Standard Operating Procedures in the Public Safety Communications Center.

This member failed to arrive for a scheduled duty shift without prior notification to the supervisor and arrived late for a duty assignment on two occasions.

23) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.6.5, Use of Departmental Equipment.

A sworn member lost their wallet containing their department-issued building access card and Police ID Card.

24) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.9.3, Depositing Evidence and Other Property.

This officer failed to properly secure an arrestee's property, resulting in the loss of a cell phone.

25) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 4.6.5, Use of Departmental Equipment.

A sergeant damaged an MDC screen in a vehicle while utilizing the touch screen feature, resulting in cracks to the screen.

26) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.2.21, Police-Community Relations.

A sworn member responded unprofessionally in an email to a citizen.

27) The Department sustained an officer for violating Department Directive 16.4.10, Retention, Storage and Duplication.
An officer downloaded a video from body-worn camera footage involving a juvenile suspect to their personal cell phone, added music to the video and shared the video with other members of the Department.

28) The Department sustained an officer for violating Department Directive 4.6, Issuance of Equipment, Badges and ID Cards.

This officer lost their department issued Police Badge and ID card.


This sergeant contacted Records Department staff and requested that a license plate check be conducted. It was later learned that the vehicle in question belonged to the sergeant.

30) The Department sustained an sworn member for violating Department Directive 16.4.1, Body-Worn Camera Operation.

This officer failed to activate their body-worn camera during a vehicle pursuit where the suspect intentionally rammed a marked patrol vehicle with emergency lights and siren activated.

31) The Department sustained an sworn member for violating Department Directives 4.1.2, Seat Belts and 4.2.2, Adherence to Law During Emergency Response.

This member was involved in a motor vehicle accident while driving an unmarked patrol unit, entering an intersection against a red light and striking another vehicle, causing serious injuries to both vehicles and serious bodily injuries to both the member and the other driver.

32) The Department sustained a non-sworn member for violation of Department Directive 14.2.15, Unsatisfactory Performance.

This non-sworn member failed to review assigned policies in a timely manner and by specified deadlines.

33) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming, and 14.2.14, Conduct Towards Superior and Subordinate Officers and Associates.

During a briefing and in the presence of several other people, this sworn member made inappropriate comments involving other members which were unprofessional and disrespectful.

34) The Department sustained a non-sworn member for violation of Department Directive 14.2.15, Unsatisfactory Performance.

This non-sworn member failed to complete assigned cases correctly and technically, raising concerns regarding the accuracy and the integrity of the casework completed.

35) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 4.6.5, Use of Departmental Equipment.
A camera that was issued to this member was inadvertently left in a patrol car, but the member was unable to locate and return the camera later.

36) The Department sustained a recruit officer for violation of Department Directive 10.9, Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Harassment.

This recruit officer made inappropriate comments about a protected class of persons, resulting in an EEOC investigation.

37) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 8.20, Restraining Orders.

In response to a Domestic Violence call, a sworn member arrested a male for violation of a protection order, holding the male in custody for over six hours. It was later learned that the male was the protected party of the protection order.

38) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 4.6.5, Use of Departmental Equipment.

A member caused damage to an MCD unit in a marked patrol vehicle after spilling water onto the unit.

39) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directive 1.4.11, Supervisor Responsibility – Accountability for Performance of Subordinates.

This sworn member approved police reports lacking legal requirements after two sworn members arrested and detained a suspect involved in a trespassing incident.

**Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreement**

During 2020, the Department completed and finalized seven (7) Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreements. Each resulted in the Chief of Police ordering a Written Reprimand or a suspension as discipline for the violation of one or more Department Directives. The Written Reprimand summaries are also found in the previous section.

The Department has categorized these cases as follows: two (2) cases involved issues of professional conduct, one (1) case involved obedience to a lawful order, and four (4) cases involved investigation issues. *(Please note: some Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreements may involve more than one allegation.)*

The 7 Negotiated Disciplinary Settlement Agreements cases involved one (1) sergeant and six (6) officers.

1) The Department sustained an agent for violating Department Directive 14.2.15, Unsatisfactory Performance. This member received a Written Reprimand. *This NDSA is associated with Item 10 under ‘District and Bureau Discipline Report’.*

This sworn member was found sleeping in a marked patrol vehicle while working an off-duty assignment.
2) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.1.1., Lawful Orders. This case was ultimately transferred to Internal Affairs and the officer received a 10-hour suspension. *This NDSA is associated with Item 2 under ‘Formal Investigations and Discipline Report’.*

The member failed to complete the conditions of a Return to Duty agreement.

3) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 6.11.2, Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations. This case was transferred to Internal Affairs for investigation and the member received a 10-hour suspension. *This NDSA is associated with Item 21 under ‘Formal Investigations and Discipline Report’.*

This member responded to a call involving domestic violence and possible sexual assault and failed to conduct a thorough investigation or contact the suspect despite victim and witness statements.

4) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 6.11.2, Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations. This member received a 10-hour suspension.

This member responded to a call involving domestic violence and possible sexual assault and failed to conduct a thorough investigation or contact the suspect despite victim and witness statements.

5) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 6.11.2, Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations. The member received a 10-hour suspension.

This officer responded to a call involving domestic violence and possible sexual assault and failed to conduct a thorough investigation or contact the suspect despite victim and witness statements.

6) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 1.4.11, Supervisor Responsibility: Accountability for Performance of Subordinates. This case was transferred to Internal Affairs for investigation and the member received a 10-hour suspension. *This NDSA is associated with Item 21 under ‘Formal Investigations and Discipline Report’.*

This member responded to a call involving domestic violence and possible sexual assault. While responding officers failed to conduct a thorough investigation, this member failed to provide the direction and coordination necessary for this case to be properly investigated.

7) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming, and received a Written Reprimand. *This NDSA is associated with Item 14 under ‘District and Bureau Discipline Report’.*

While responding to a call of a family dispute, this officer’s tone and volume of voice while speaking to the victim and reporting party was unprofessional in nature.
Formal Internal Investigations and Discipline Report

The Department conducted 44 formal Internal Affairs investigations in 2020 involving 53 department members. The members consisted of five (5) civilians, one (1) recruit officer, 34 officers, three (3) agents, four (4) sergeants, four (4) lieutenants, one (1) captain and one (1) deputy chief. (Please note: some employees may be involved in more than one Internal Affairs case or have more than one allegation). The discipline included 12 suspensions without pay, 13 written reprimands, ten (10) corrective actions and one (1) demotion. Seven members resigned or retired before discipline was issued. Four members were terminated. The Department cleared 12 members of any wrongdoing. Five cases have not reached final discipline and therefore are not included.

1) The Department investigated a sworn member for allegations of 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming, 14.2.2, Making a False or Untruthful Declaration, 14.2.5. Associations, 17.9, Social Media, 17.9.2 Use of Department Emblems and Images, and 17.9.5, Personal Use. It was alleged that the member posted photographs to Facebook showing the member displaying gang signs and associating with individuals known to be involved in gang activity. The member was not sustained on any allegations.

2) The Department investigated and sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.1.1, Lawful Orders. The member received a 10-hour suspension. The member was not sustained on the allegation of 14.2.15, Unsatisfactory Performance. The member failed to complete the conditions of a Return to Duty agreement.

3) A sworn member was investigated for allegations of 14.1.5, Conformance to Law, 14.3 Professional Conduct and Responsibility, and 14.3.1, Unsatisfactory Performance. This member was sustained on 14.3 and 14.3.1 and found not sustained on 14.1.5. The member retired prior to final discipline.

It is alleged that this member failed to initiate an Administrative Internal Investigation when another sworn member was suspected of being under the influence of alcohol while on duty and in uniform.

4) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.12.13, Requirements/Limitations of Sworn Members Engaged in Secondary Employment, 8.2.1, Scheduled Leave, 8.2.3, Request for Leave, and 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming. The member was sustained on 8.12.13 and 8.2.1 and received a 10-hour suspension.

This member worked an off-duty assignment within 24 hours of calling in sick to a regularly scheduled duty assignment.

5) The Department sustained a non-sworn employee for 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming and 14.2.5, Associations. This member was terminated.

It is alleged that stolen vehicles and vehicle parts were located on property owned by the member and the member’s spouse. The spouse and a renter on the property were ultimately charged with crimes in relation to the stolen items.
6) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.2.21, Police-Community Relations, and 5.4.2, Incidents that Require Notification and Reporting. The member received a 40-hour suspension.

This member was on duty and parked in a marked police car when a business owner arrived. The member exited his vehicle and confronted the business owner with profanity and held the business owner at gun point. This member failed to document the interaction.

7) The Department investigated a sworn member for allegations of 14.1.5, Conformance to Law and 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming. This member was not sustained on any allegations.

It was alleged that this sworn member was involved in multiple physical domestic disputes with an ex-spouse, resulting in a criminal investigation by another law enforcement agency. After investigation and review by the outside agency, criminal charges were not filed.

8) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.1.5, Conformance to Law, and 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming. The member was not sustained on any charges.

It was alleged that the member became involved in a confrontation with personnel at an assisted living facility when the member refused to allow a temperature check as part of the protocol for COVID-19. It was also alleged that the member displayed her department issued firearm and badge to personnel in a threatening manner.

9) The Department terminated a probationary officer for sustained violations of Department Directives 14.1.5, Conformance to Law, and 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming.

This member was arrested by another law enforcement agency after being involved in a motor vehicle accident while under the influence of alcohol.

10) The Department sustained a non-sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.1.1, Lawful Orders and 14.2.2, Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. This member resigned in lieu of termination. Allegations on a second non-sworn member of 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming, and 14.2.15, Unsatisfactory Performance were unfounded.

This member failed to follow the conditions of a Return to Duty agreement and was untruthful when requesting emergency leave.

11) The Department sustained a non-sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming, and 14.2.2, Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. This member was not sustained on allegations of 14.1.5, Conformance to Law. This member resigned in lieu of termination.

This non-sworn employee reported being the victim of a sexual assault. After an extensive investigation, it was determined that this member made false or untruthful statements regarding the incident, which did not occur.
12) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.3, Professional Conduct and Responsibility, and 14.3.5, Neglect of Duty. This member received a 20-hour suspension.

It was alleged that this member took sexually explicit photographs and videos of themselves while on duty and in uniform and then sent them to their ex-spouse with a request for sexual favors.

13) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.2.3, Abuse of Position and 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming. These charges were not sustained.

It was alleged that this sworn member used their position in charge of Secondary Employment/Off Duty to assign off-duty jobs to themselves or others in a preferential manner.

14) The Department terminated a recruit officer for violating Department Directives 14.1.5, Conformance to Law, and 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming.

This recruit officer was arrested by another law enforcement agency on charges of stalking, criminal trespass of property, harassment, obstructing peace officers and domestic violence.

15) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 4.11, Take-home and On-call Vehicles, 4.6.5, Use of Department Equipment, 14.1.2, Unlawful Orders, 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming, 14.2.3 Abuse of Position, 14.2.13, Neglect of Duty, and 14.2.2, Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. The sworn member was sustained on 4.11, 14.1.2, 14.2.1 and 14.2.3, and received a 10-hour suspension. A second sworn member was investigated for violating Department Directives 10.2.18, Supervisor Responsibilities, 10.2.19, Individual Members’ Responsibilities, and 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming. This member retired prior to discipline.

While on duty, this sworn member used a department truck to move personal items from their home to their office and requested two subordinates to assist. During the moving process the truck experienced a mechanical issue requiring repairs to the vehicle. The sworn member notified their supervisor of this matter. The supervisor later informed a division chief about the situation but did not disclose the earlier knowledge of this incident.

16) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.2.2, Making a False or Untruthful Declaration and 14.2.15, Unsatisfactory Performance. The lieutenant was sustained on 14.2.15 and received a 12-hour suspension.

While being interviewed as a witness in an Internal Affairs Investigation, this member made statements that were believed to be untruthful.

17) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 4.4, Police and City Owned Vehicle Collisions and 4.4.1, Member Responsibility, 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming, 14.2.2, Making a False or Untruthful Declaration, and 14.1.5, Conformance to Law. This member resigned in lieu of termination.

While on duty and driving a marked police car, this member struck a pole while leaving a parking spot, failed to record the damage in the vehicle log book, failed to report the accident to a
supervisor and did not generate an accident report. This member later denied being in an accident.

18) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directive 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming. The member was not sustained on this charge.

It was alleged that while on duty working a protest event, this officer responded to a citizen’s questions in an unprofessional manner.

19) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directive 6.11.2, Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations. This officer received a 10-hour suspension. A supervisor was sustained for violating Department Directive 1.4.11, Supervisor Responsibility – Accountability for Performance of Subordinates and received a 10-hour suspension.

An officer responded to a call involving domestic violence and possible sexual assault, and failed to conduct a thorough investigation or contact the suspect despite victim and witness statements. The on-scene supervisor failed to provide direction and coordination to facilitate a proper investigation.

20) The Department investigated a complaint received from a citizen that officers struck him in the head with a projectile during a protest in Denver. After a thorough investigation, evidence of policy violations made by Aurora Police Officers could not be found.

21) The Department sustained four sworn members for violating Department Directive 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming. Three members were terminated and one member resigned prior to termination.

Three on-duty sworn members took inappropriate selfie photographs at the memorial site of a deceased citizen, and then sent the photograph in a text message to another member, who responded to the text message but failed to report the photograph or the incident to his supervisor.

22) The Department sustained a recruit officer for violating Department Directives 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming, and 14.2.2, Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. This officer resigned prior to discipline.

This recruit officer provided misinformation regarding a domestic violence call to avoid having to make an arrest, told his supervisor that he had not written an affidavit when he had, and made untruthful statements about having viewed his body worn camera footage.

23) The Department sustained a sworn member on allegations of 6.11.2, Responsibility for Preliminary Investigation and 14.2.15, Unsatisfactory Performance. This member resigned prior to discipline.

It was alleged that a sworn member responded to a burglary call, failed to generate a police report or complete a follow-up investigation despite evidence at the scene, witness statements and a video of a potential suspect.
24) The Department sustained a non-sworn member for violating Department Directives 10.4.2, Access to Internal Affairs Files and 14.2.15, Unsatisfactory Performance. This member received a 1-day suspension.

Body-worn camera video footage was released to a citizen on one ongoing Internal Affairs investigation and information provided to the news media on another open Internal Affairs investigation.

25) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directive 5.3.1, Use of Physical Force. A second sworn member was investigated for violating Department Directives 14.1.1, Lawful Orders, 5.3.1, Use of Physical Force, and 14.2.15, Unsatisfactory Performance. Member 1 was not sustained on Use of Physical Force. Member 2 was sustained on 5.3.1 and 14.2.15 and received a 20-hour suspension.

A sworn member assisted with a call for service, entered the residence at the direction of a supervisor and used OC spray on a suspect in a manner that is inconsistent with Department policies. The supervisor used force on the suspect that is not in accordance with Department policies and made entry into the residence after earlier being advised by a supervisor not to do so.

26) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 5.3, Use of Physical Force, 5.8.10, Taser, 14.2.15, Unsatisfactory Performance, and 16.4.3, Body Worn Camera Operation.

While assisting on a call of a combative subject, an sworn member initiated four closed fist strikes to the subjects ribs, used a taser on the subject five times and did not activate his body worn camera until after the fist strikes were initiated.

27) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming, and 14.2.14, Conduct Towards Superior and Subordinate Officers and Associates. This member received a written reprimand.

This sworn member made inappropriate comments of a sexual nature about another sworn member during a briefing.

28) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 5.3, Use of Physical Force, 16.4.3, Body Worn Camera Operation, and K-9 SOP 3.1.14, Procedures for K-9 Utilization. This sworn member was not sustained on K-9 SOP 3.8.2, Procedures – E-Collar. The member received a 40-hour suspension.

During an incident involving a stolen vehicle, it was alleged that a sworn member’s tactical measures were not appropriate and the force used against the suspect not in accordance with Department policies. This member did not have the proper equipment affixed to his K-9 and failed to properly activate his body worn camera in accordance with Department Directives.

The Department investigated two sworn members for violating Department Directives 14.2.11, Constitutional Requirements, and 8.10.4, Supplemental Reports. Member 1 was sustained on 14.2.11 and retired prior to discipline. Member 2 was sustained on 8.10.4 and received a Corrective Action.
Sworn members responded to a welfare check on a female for mental health concerns. A male at the location, reported by the female to be a guest at the residence, was subsequently arrested with minimal force for a trespass. The cover officer failed to write a supplemental report.

29) The Department investigated a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.2.15, Unsatisfactory Performance, 14.3, Professional Conduct and Responsibility, and 6.11.2, Responsibility for Preliminary Investigations. This officer received a 40-hour suspension.

A sworn member was investigated for failing to accept subpoenas or return phone calls and emails from the District Attorney’s Office, appearing late for court appearances, and poor performance while testifying in court on a child abuse case involving a tender-age victim. Additionally, after a preliminary investigation by the officer, the victim was left with the alleged abuser despite obvious signs of severe abuse, malnutrition and trauma, requiring intervention by a Health and Human Services worker.

30) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 8.2.3, Request for Leave, 14.2.15, Unsatisfactory Performance, and 14.2.2, Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. The officer was terminated.

It is alleged than an officer on light duty left work on several occasions without prior approval and did not enter their time correctly into the staffing system. It is also alleged that the officer made an untruthful statement to their supervisor.

31) The Department sustained a sworn member for violating Department Directives 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming, 14.2.21, Police-Community Relations, and 17.9.2, Use of Department Emblems and Images. The officer was found not sustained on 14.2.2, Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. This officer resigned prior to discipline.

It is alleged that an officer shared a video clip from their body-worn camera video on social media websites despite denying this accusation to supervisors, displayed images of themselves in full uniform on an on-line dating website, provided their personal telephone number to others for personal reasons while acting in a professional capacity, and displayed unprofessional behavior during a call that escalated a suspect’s behavior.

32) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directives 14.2.21, Police-Community Relations, and 14.2.15, Unsatisfactory Performance. This member received a 40-hour suspension.

While working at the front desk, this officer took a phone call from a citizen who was upset about trash in the alleyway of her home. This officer failed to handle the call or the citizens’ concerns in an appropriate manner, failed any attempt to assist the citizen in finding a solution for the problem and made disparaging comments to the citizen about a councilmember.

33) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directives 14.2.15, Unsatisfactory Performance and 14.2.13, Neglect of Duty. The member was not sustained on the allegation of 14.2.2, Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. This officer received a 20-hour suspension.
A sworn member failed to conduct a thorough investigation into a felony assault case or complete any follow-up in a timely manner. On a separate incident involving a shoplift, this member failed to intervene when another sworn member was assaulted by the suspect resulting in injuries to the member.

34) A sworn member was not sustained on the allegation of 5.3, Use of Physical Force.

This sworn member was involved in a Tier 3 Use of Force that was reviewed by the Force Review Board, who required additional investigation to determine if the use of force were within Department Directives.

35) The Department investigated a member for violation of Department Directives 14.2.15, Unsatisfactory Performance, 16.4.3, Body-Worn Camera Operation, 14.2.1. Conduct Unbecoming, and 14.2.21, Police-Community Relations. This member was sustained on 14.2.15 and 16.4.3 and received a Written Reprimand.

While responding to an incident and speaking to witnesses, a sworn member turned off his body-worn camera and provided incorrect information to witnesses regarding legal remedies available to them.

36) The Department sustained a sworn member for violation of Department Directives 14.2.1, Conduct Unbecoming, 14.2.3, Abuse of Position, and 14.2.2, Making a False or Untruthful Declaration. This officer resigned prior to discipline.

While working an overtime shift, this officer went to a local hospital in full uniform and told hospital staff they were conducting official business. It was later learned that they were there to visit a relative in violation of COVID 19 restrictions. During the Internal Affairs Interview, the officer made untruthful statements regarding the incident.