

BlueTeam chain routings

Dec 25, 2021 01:43: Sent from OFFICER Chris Valko [2113] to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] SERGEANT [REDACTED]

Instructions:

Please review

Reviewed by SERGEANT [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] on Dec 26, 2021 at 03:22

Decision:

Reviewer comment:

Please add Officer [REDACTED] as a witness as well. Please describe the resistance in a bit more detail outside of the car as far as not complying with getting into the car and the statements he made.

Dec 26, 2021 03:22: Sent from SERGEANT [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to Valko, Chris OFFICER [2113]

Instructions:

Please add Officer [REDACTED] as a witness as well. Please describe the resistance in a bit more detail outside of the car as far as not complying with getting into the car and the statements he made.

Reviewed by OFFICER Chris Valko [2113] on Jan 12, 2022 at 17:09

Decision:

Reviewer comment:

Information added per request.

Jan 12, 2022 17:09: Sent from OFFICER Chris Valko [2113] to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] SERGEANT [REDACTED]

Instructions:

Please review

Reviewed by SERGEANT [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] on Jan 14, 2022 at 11:09

Decision:

Reviewer comment:

[Forwarded by SERGEANT [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Jan 14, 2022 11:09: Sent from SERGEANT [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] SERGEANT [REDACTED]

Instructions:

Im sending this to you for your review since you know what needs to be in the summary. It still looks lacking to me.

Reviewed by SERGEANT [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] on Jan 15, 2022 at 18:37

Decision:

Reviewer comment:

Please explain the continued resistance to getting in the patrol car after the subject was in custody as that was also a driving factor for the decision to apply the VP2000. Thanks.

Jan 15, 2022 18:37: Sent from SERGEANT [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to Valko, Chris OFFICER [2113]

Instructions:

See previous

Reviewed by OFFICER Chris Valko [2113] on Jan 26, 2022 at 23:26

Decision:

Reviewer comment:

Please review

Jan 26, 2022 23:26: Sent from OFFICER Chris Valko [2113] to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] SERGEANT [REDACTED]

Instructions:

Please review

Reviewed by SERGEANT [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] on Jan 27, 2022 at 01:32

Decision:

Reviewer comment:

Sgt [REDACTED] was on scene when the VP200 was applied to the subject. As stated the subject was verbally and passively non-compliant. The subject expressed his desire to not be arrested and was not cooperative while walking to the patrol car. Once there he was told to get into the car and he refused. A struggle began and a break was taken to explain to the subject that he was not going to be released no matter what he said. Verbal de-escalation was attempted however the subject still refused to get into the vehicle on his own. The subject then [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. The decision was made to apply the VP200 to keep the subject safe based on his actions and [REDACTED]. Once the VP200 was applied, the subject immediately calmed down and even apologized for his actions. This reviewer finds that the use of force was within Parker Police Policy as well as Colorado Revised Statutes.

Jan 27, 2022 01:32: Sent from SERGEANT [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] SERGEANT [REDACTED]

Instructions:

Please review for use of VP200

Reviewed by SERGEANT [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] on Jan 29, 2022 at 15:02

Decision:

Reviewer comment:

I (Sgt. [REDACTED] as a certified Krav Maga Instructor, have reviewed the reports and body worn camera of this incident. In his report (December 23, 2021), Officer Valko notes meeting with several witnesses and the victim in this case. Through his investigation, Officer Valko believes that he reaches probable cause to arrest the adult male suspect (stemming from an incident that reportedly occurred on December 21, 2021). As a result, he attempts to reach the suspect but is not initially able to contact him. On December 24, 2021, at 1915 hours, Officer Valko and the above listed officers attempt contact at the suspect at [REDACTED].

In my opinion, the contact/arrest that occurs at the front door (including the entry into the apartment) is in question. I believe that further investigation for potential Constitutional and case law issues may be necessary. (Please see full UOF review attached)

If by further investigation it shows the initial entry/contact/arrest is lawful, it appears that the force used by Parker Police Officers during this incident was reasonably objective and appropriate under the totality of circumstances. It also appears that the force used was within Colorado Revised Statutes (CRS), SENATE BILL 20-217, and Parker Police Department Policy and Procedures.

Jan 29, 2022 15:02: Sent from SERGEANT [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] COMMANDER [REDACTED]

Instructions:

UOF review

Reviewed by COMMANDER [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] on Jan 29, 2022 at 20:41

Decision:

Reviewer comment:

I agree with Sgt. [REDACTED] and his review. The UOF was appropriate if the arrest was proper and lawful. The arrest was based on probable cause for a domestic violence and restraining order violation from an incident that occurred on Dec 21, 2021 and reported on December 23, 2021. The arrest occurred on December 24, 2021. It is unclear from the BWC if the suspect ever steps out of his apartment, and it appears he remained in the home. In my opinion there was not exigent circumstances nor articulation of any exigent circumstances, and ID of the suspect although it appears Officer Valko knew it was him. In addition, a "threshold arrest" has conflicting case law but in general it appears it has been ruled protected and part of the home regardless of a suspect opening the door. Officer Valko was in PTO at the time, and I am waiting for the Coaching and Training report to see if the issue was already addressed in PTO. I am requesting further review of this incident.