

001A003

Colorado State Patrol Investigative Services Section

Case Number	Connecting Case #	Report Type
00 IS 0001		Administrative Investigation
Date	Time	Location
01-10-00	12:30 p.m.	CSP Headquarters, 700 Kipling Street, Lakewood CO

SYNOPSIS:

Requested to conduct an internal investigation into allegations of sexual impropriety by Cadet Aaron LAING with a community corrections client prior to his hire date (01-10-00). See also: Background Investigation Follow-up Memorandum from [redacted] attached.

NARRATIVE:

LAING became a state employee effective today as a Patrol Intern. Prior to his hire, he was employed by Mesa County Community Services (MCCS) as a Corrections Officer in a structured residential work-release facility. He was so employed from early November 1999 through January 5, 2000.

I spoke with LAING for just under an hour in the Interview Room at Headquarters. I told him that I had been assigned to investigate an allegation from a client (inmate) at MCCS. He told me he understood and had met with [redacted] on January 7th. I assured LAING that this was an internal matter and we would not generate a criminal complaint from this information; nor would we disclose any information to his prior employer; nor would we enter it into his personnel file. During the course of this discussion, LAING seemed concerned, but cooperative and I elected not to have him complete the formal Garrity Warning.

I asked LAING to confirm my understanding of a situation involving himself, another teammate and a media personality riding in a limousine in St. Louis with two young females. LAING told me that the girls had complained about sexual advances. He also told me that they were about 16 years old in his estimation although they, of course, claimed to be older. While left unattended in a recorded interview room, the District Attorney overheard one of the girls comment about what she would do with the money she got from this. The DA immediately dismissed their claim and declined to bring charges. LAING listed this situation in his Supplemental Employment Application and thoroughly discussed it with [redacted] during the background investigation and with [redacted] during his pre-hire polygraph. Prior to this interview I reviewed LAING's polygraph charts and [redacted] report. I concur with [redacted] assessment that LAING showed "no significant physiological response" to the relevant issues.

I asked LAING to confirm my understanding of an allegation that he observed female inmate [redacted] showering at the MCCS facility. He told me this was not true. He added that he was conducting routine headcounts of the rooms and was checking [redacted] room when she came out of the common bathroom across the hall wearing only a towel (contrary to facility rules). He re-asserted that he did not follow her down the hall as her room is directly across (estimated 6') from her own sleeping room. He told me that he corrected her in the hallway and that she was known to wear tight, revealing clothing

Date of Report	Investigator/IBM#	Supervisor/IBM#	Page
1/10/2000	[Signature]	CAPT. J. T. [Signature]	1 of 3

OK
all
1-137

and used her appearance/dress purposefully. This incident was resolved prior to LAING's separation from MCCS via videotape review and other staff/inmate witnesses.

I asked LAING to describe the supervisory structure and inter-relations of his immediate supervisors. He told me that he got along fine with [REDACTED]. He commented that [REDACTED] would sometimes be his immediate supervisor when supervisory on-call rotated around. He told me that many staffers did not get along with her and were surprised that she got to be a supervisor despite her surly demeanor. LAING told me that [REDACTED] confronted him in a harassing manner and seemed upset that he had not yet resigned after she found out he was well into our hiring process. LAING ultimately took his concern to the next-level supervisor. While [REDACTED] and LAING resolved their differences, he continues to show a lack of respect for her professional skills.

I asked LAING to explain the situation surrounding similar allegations by [REDACTED] against co-worker [REDACTED]. After LAING's return from a trip to Denver, [REDACTED] told him that he [REDACTED] was being questioned regarding sexual activity with [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] had brought up LAING's name as well. They discussed this in a joking manner as both were aware of [REDACTED] prior attempts to get employees in trouble. This history was also confirmed by supervisor [REDACTED]. LAING suggests additional evidence of [REDACTED] behavior by her attempt to wriggle out of her original sentence by unsuccessfully attempting to influence the judge in a sexual manner.

LAING told me that he was angry upon hearing his name referred to and he woke [REDACTED] up and got her out of bed and told her that he would cite her (in-house) for lying to staff if she claimed anything about him again. He told me "I was pretty forceful with her." I find it interesting that [REDACTED] has not brought forward any claim of excessive force or impropriety stemming from this scolding.

LAING told me that [REDACTED] and her roommate did not get along and repeatedly tried to be reassigned. Despite these ploys, both inmates had been told by facility supervision that would not happen. This points to additional motivation by [REDACTED] to bring the allegations.

The final allegation which was not resolved by MCCS revolves around [REDACTED] accusation that LAING asked her if they could get together (again sex was implied) after she completed her sentence. [REDACTED] alleged that he asked her this during a transport from a doctor's appointment back to the facility. MCCS supervision requested LAING take a polygraph to be used as a basis for charging [REDACTED]. I find LAING's rationale for refusing to be reasonable. He also astutely asked, "Shouldn't she be the one to take a polygraph first?"

While MCCS supervision expressed their curiosity to [REDACTED] of how the information got to CSP, LAING feels that [REDACTED] discussed the situation with her husband whom LAING believes is/was employed by the Mesa County Sheriff's office. He feels [REDACTED] husband may have forwarded the information to retired [REDACTED].

Finally, I explicitly asked LAING if he asked [REDACTED] out, if he asked for any sexual favor, or said or did anything inappropriate. Each time, he answered "No." He answered in a straightforward manner, looked

Date of Report	Investigator/IBM#	Supervisor/IBM#	Page
1/10/2000	NTM		2 of 3

me in the eye and displayed no behavioral indicators of deception.

Based upon my interview with LAING, the information contained in [REDACTED] memorandum, and MCCS staff's awareness of [REDACTED] prior and continuing behavior, I find this last, "unresolved allegation" to be unfounded as well. I see no violation of Colorado law. MCCS did not pursue any corrective or disciplinary action against LAING reference this accusation.

[REDACTED] informs us that MCCS staff is not disposed to any further interviews based upon the recommendation of their in-house counsel. It is unlikely they would allow CSP to interview inmate [REDACTED] and, if so, it is unlikely she could provide any verifiable, reliable information. As a result, I recommend no further action.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

One VHS video cassette of this interview retained in file.

Date of Report	Investigator/IBM#	Supervisor/IBM#	Page
1/10/2000	MTM		3 of 3