



**Office of Professional Standards**  
**Investigation Summary**  
**Tracking # 303IA2022-001**

INVESTIGATION COMPLETED: February 16, 2022

TYPE OF REPORT: 303IA

DATE OF INCIDENT: December 24, 2021

MEMBER(S) INVOLVED: Officer Chris Valko, Officer Ian Drew-Bell

PREPARED BY: Sergeant [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

List of Allegations

Officer Chris Valko

Town of Parker Personnel Manual - 8.1 Disciplinary Action.

- Failure to comply with established departmental policies, procedures and directives; including but not limited to the Town of Parker General Operations Manual.

Parker Police Department Manual - Professional Conduct and Responsibility: 6.4.3 A. 2

- Examples of unsatisfactory performance include: a lack of knowledge of the application of laws to be enforced; an unwillingness or inability to perform assigned tasks; the failure to conform to work standards established for the Department member's rank; grade or position; the failure to take appropriate action concerning a crime, disorder or other condition deserving police attention; absence without leave or habitual tardiness; or a violation of the above policy. These examples are illustrative rather than inclusive.

Parker Police Department Manual - Arrests and Warrants: 3.4.3 F. 1.

- If a commissioned officer wishes to arrest a suspect inside a residence and appropriate consent to enter the residence is not obtained or exigent circumstances do not exist, the commissioned officer must first obtain an arrest warrant. If the residence belongs to the suspect, only an arrest warrant is required. The commissioned officer must have clear and articulable facts that the suspect is inside his or her residence. If the dwelling belongs to someone else, the commissioned officer must obtain a search warrant as well.

Parker Police Department Manual - Standards of Conduct, Obedience to Orders, Polices and Laws: 6.2.4 S

- Department members shall obey all constitutional, criminal and civil laws, both on and off duty.

Parker Police Department Manual - Use of Physical Force: 3.2.4 E

- Each situation is unique. Sound judgment and the circumstances of each situation will dictate the level of force the enforcement member deems necessary. Depending on the



circumstances, enforcement members may find it necessary to escalate or de-escalate the use of force. It is not the intent of this policy to require enforcement members to attempt to exhaust each lower level of force before moving to the next higher level, so long as the level of force used is reasonable and appropriate under the circumstances. Enforcement members are not required to retreat to avoid using force. However, commissioned officers, shall, when possible, apply nonviolent means before resorting to the use of physical force.

### Officer Ian Drew-Bell

#### Town of Parker Personnel Manual - 8.1 Disciplinary Action.

- Failure to comply with established departmental policies, procedures and directives; including but not limited to the Town of Parker General Operations Manual.

#### Parker Police Department Manual - Use of Physical Force: 3.2.5 B

- Additionally, commissioned officers shall intervene to prevent or stop another commissioned officer from using physical force that exceeds the degree of force permitted. A commissioned officer who fails to intervene commits a class 1 misdemeanor.

### Summary

On January 29<sup>th</sup>, 2022, the Office of Professional Standards (OPS) was notified through a department memorandum completed by Sergeant [REDACTED] [REDACTED] that a use of force incident stemming from Parker Case: [REDACTED] had occurred on December 24, 2021 with some concerns. Sergeant [REDACTED] stated in the memorandum, “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.” Sergeant [REDACTED] contacted Commander [REDACTED] [REDACTED] who reviewed the Body Worn Camera (BWC) and expressed the same concerns that Sergeant [REDACTED] identified. Based on the allegations, the decision was made for Internal Affairs to investigate the incident.

When staff members of the Parker Police Department are involved in a Use of Force (UOF) incident a review process of the incident starts after the officer who was involved in the UOF completes a UOF report via the Blueteam system. Each UOF incident that is created includes an initial BWC review. The Sergeant whom the officer reports to typically reviews the UOF report, approves the report if no corrections are needed. In some circumstances, such as this incident, the UOF report was reviewed, rejected for corrections by the patrol Sergeant who responded to the scene however, was not the supervisor who the reporting officer was directly assigned to. After the initial Sergeant review, the incident is then reviewed by a Subject Matter Expert (SME) who is a “lead instructor,” in the Krav Maga defensive tactics system that the Parker Police Department utilizes. Once the SME reviews the incident it is forwarded to the patrol Commander from which the responding officer is assigned to for a review before it is given to the Deputy Chief for final review.

Regarding this incident, Sergeant [REDACTED] the SME, identified observed concerns during his review on January 26<sup>th</sup> and immediately contacted his supervisor, Commander [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and the Office of Professional Standards was notified and an Internal Investigation was initiated.



The dates and timelines from this UOF incident review are as follows:

- **December 21, 2021:** Initial call for service. Domestic Violence investigation initiated (Parker Case #: [REDACTED]).
- **December 24, 2021:** Attempt to Contact / contact with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (UOF Incident occurs)
- **December 25, 2021:** Incident Report submitted and approved at 01:31
- **December 25, 2021:** UOF report is submitted at 01:43
- **December 26, 2021:** UOF report reviewed by Sgt. [REDACTED] and sent back to Ofc. Valko with corrections.
- **December 30-31, January 5:** Sgt. [REDACTED] is on [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
- **January 6, 2022:** Email sent from Sgt. [REDACTED] to Sgt. [REDACTED] regarding UOF still being assigned to Ofc. Valko in IAPro
- **January 6, 2022:** Email sent from Sgt. [REDACTED] to Sgt. [REDACTED] stating “he (Ofc. Valko) will submit it when he gets back from his [REDACTED] [REDACTED]”
- **January 5-9:** Ofc. Valko is on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] leave
- **January 12, 2022:** UOF report sent from Ofc. Valko to Sgt. [REDACTED]
- **January 14, 2022:** In Blueteam, UOF report sent from Sgt. [REDACTED] to Sgt. [REDACTED] stating “I’m sending this to you for your review since you know what needs to be in the summary. It still looks lacking to me”
- **January 15, 2022:** UOF report sent from Sgt. [REDACTED] to Ofc. Valko “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”
- **January 26, 2022:** Sgt. [REDACTED] sends email to Sgt. [REDACTED] reminding her about the UOF report in Blueteam.
- **January 26, 2022:** Ofc. Valko submits UOF report to Sgt. [REDACTED] who forwards it to Sgt. [REDACTED] for SME review. Sgt. [REDACTED] writes, “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 statements made. 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.”
- **January 27, 2022:** Sent to Sgt. [REDACTED] for SME review
- **January 27, 2022:** reviewed by Sgt. [REDACTED] as SME, stated concerns and forwarded to Commander [REDACTED]
- **January 29, 2022:** Commander [REDACTED] agrees with Sgt. [REDACTED] concerns
- **January 31, 2022:** Office of Professional Standards initiates discussions regarding investigation



- **February 3, 2022:** After communication with the 18<sup>th</sup> Judicial District about not moving forward with a criminal investigation, an Internal Investigation was started and Ofc. Valko was placed on administrative leave.

Interviews were completed from February 7<sup>th</sup> to February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2022 by Sergeant [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Based on interviews it was learned:

Officer Valko was in C1 phase of his training experience and Officer Drew-Bell was his assigned training officer. Officer Valko was hired with the Parker Police Department as a lateral officer from the Denver Police Department (DPD) where he was employed for approximately seven years. Officer Valko stated while at DPD, investigating domestic violence situations was, “a weekly if not daily occurrence.” In Officer Valko’s law enforcement experience, investigating domestic violence calls for service was common and he was comfortable with the process.

On December 23, 2021 Officer Chris Valko and Officer Ian Drew-Bell were dispatched to 18600 Lincoln Meadows Parkway (Parker Police Department) in response to a Domestic Violence call for service that occurred at [REDACTED]. The incident had occurred on December 21, 2021. Officer Valko and Officer Drew-Bell interviewed [REDACTED] who provided audio and photographic evidence connected to this call for service. Officer Valko and Officer Drew-Bell also interviewed [REDACTED] as well as the victim who described the incident. As a result of the interviews, audio and photographic evidence, Officers Valko and Drew-Bell believed they had reached the probable cause necessary to effect a physical arrest of the suspect. Officer Valko described at his previous agency, the Denver Police Department, his experience would consist of completing an arrest warrant at this point of the investigation due to establishing probable cause and not having the suspect immediately on scene for arrest.

Officers Valko, Drew-Bell, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] attempted to contact the suspect at the apartment. Prior to responding to the apartment, it was learned from police resources and previous contacts with the suspect that the contact could become physical. Discussions with the victim and her family also cautioned responding officers of a potential physical encounter or the possibility of the suspect fleeing from law enforcement. Conversations were had with responding officers of, “if we see him (suspect) we would grab him and if he runs out the back we put [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in the back there... if he takes off.” Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] responded to the rear of the apartment in the circumstance the suspect would flee. Officer Valko described the conversations prior to contact as primarily based on officer safety based on the narrowness of the outside hallway creating a, “fatal funnel.” The only training discussions regarding contact that occurred were that of, “if we see him we grab him and arrest him.” Officers Valko and Drew-Bell attempted contact at the door of the apartment. There was no contact made and an attempt to locate was entered into NCIC / CCIS requesting the suspect be detained if contacted by law enforcement.

Sergeant [REDACTED] [REDACTED] gave direction to Officers Valko and Drew-Bell that continued efforts of contacting the suspect were needed prior to submitting an arrest warrant to the 18<sup>th</sup> Judicial District. This knowledge is based on her experience as a Douglas County IMPACT detective as well as her experience as a general detective with the Parker Police Department investigations unit. Prior to the second attempt to contact, there were no formal briefings or directions given by



Sergeant [REDACTED] in the instance of the suspect answering the door or potential pitfalls of contacting a suspect in the doorway of their residence. Officer Valko described the potential officer safety concerns of multiple attempts for contact based on his experience with the Denver Police Department. Officer Valko expressed again that at his previous agency an arrest warrant would be completed. The only communication with supervision prior to responding was the information that an attempt to contact was going to occur.

On December 24, 2021 a second attempt to contact was completed. Officer Valko and Officer Drew-Bell responded the front door of the apartment and Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] responded to the rear of the apartment for the same concerns of the suspect possibly fleeing. Prior to attempting to contact the suspect, a brief breakdown of the original call for service was completed outside the apartment. When Officer Drew-Bell was asked if there was a trainer, trainee conversation prior to contact Officer Drew-Bell answered, "Not that I recall, I did kind of rely on him being a seven-year officer from another agency. He didn't display anything that concerned me. Thought he was great, still do." Officer Drew-Bell continued, "... and nothing that would lead me to believe that he would ever, like overstep in any way." Officer Valko and Officer Drew-Bell explained the call for service to Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and probable cause was established to arrest the suspect. A dossier photograph of the suspect was provided to educate the other officers on the description of the suspect in the circumstance the suspect would flee. Information was also passed of previous contacts with the suspect and information received detailed the possibility of a physical confrontation.

Officer Valko knocked on the front door of the apartment. Officer Valko was wearing a department issued patrol uniform, a department issued jacket as well as a department issued winter head cover. On the jacket was a Parker Police badge and on the winter head cover were the words, "Parker Police." Officer Drew-Bell was positioned as a cover officer in an outdoor hallway where he could view a window to the apartment behind Officer Valko as well as the second level window above. An adult male opened the door. The apartment door opens inward towards the inside of the apartment. Officer Valko stated he could clearly identify the adult male as the suspect based on research and photographs. The suspect was standing inside his apartment, in the "door frame." Officer Valko's initial concern was gaining control of the suspects hands based on officer safety and his experience at DPD with potential weapons near the front door of peoples residences. Officer Valko stated he, "did not think he did," when asked if he verbally identify himself as a police officer. Officer Valko stated he, "grabbed him," and earlier in the interview stated, "a struggle ensued and kind of got pulled into the apartment by the suspect." Officer Valko was asked if he reached into the apartment, he answered, "I'd say I'd probably, I probably did get into the door frame area, because I just remember thinking the hands were the most important thing..." Officer Valko stated, "the struggle and motion, brought me into the apartment." Officer Drew-Bell hears the knocking on the door and hears Officer Valko say, "Hey [REDACTED] can you step outside or [REDACTED] step outside or something like that," and heard what sounded like an altercation. From where Officer Drew-Bell was positioned he could not see the initial contact. Officer Drew-Bell comes forward and observes Officer Valko holding on to the suspects wrist or elbow. The suspect is holding on to the inside door handle. Officer Drew-Bell remembers the suspect saying, "I'm not [REDACTED] that's not my name." Officer Drew-Bell stated he was confident that the suspect at the door was in fact the suspect they were



attempting to contact based on the research completed prior to contact. Officer Drew-Bell stated he was not sure if the suspect was trying to shut the door or if the suspect tried to run inside the apartment because he did not witness the initial encounter at the doorway to the apartment. Officer Drew-Bell did not see the door open but only heard, “scuffling of gear or jacket,” to which he responded to assist Officer Valko. During Officer Drew-Bell’s interview, he said, “I don’t know if Officer Valko [REDACTED] the threshold, like walked inside and grabbed him or if he was trying to bring him outside from the outside of the threshold.” Officer Drew-Bell and Officer Valko both stated they did not have consent, exigent circumstances or a warrant (search or arrest) prior to or during the contact of the suspect. Officer Drew-Bell called to Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to assist at the front door via radio. Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] respond to the front and observe Officers Valko and Drew-Bell attempting to place the suspect into custody inside the apartment. The suspect is eventually placed into custody. Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was patrolling nearby at Walmart when he overheard on the radio that the suspect was resisting. Officer [REDACTED] responded to the apartment where he observed the officers inside the apartment. During the arrest, there were no hard empty hand techniques or intermediate weapons used. Officer [REDACTED] did state he had his department issued Taser deployed but it was never used.

Once the suspect was in custody, Officer [REDACTED] retrieved pants and shoes for the suspect prior to transport to the Douglas County Detentions Center. While completing a cursory search of the apartment, the victim was located hiding in the bathroom. A protection order was in place prohibiting contact between the suspect and victim listing the victim as the protected party. The suspect continued to be verbally combative. Sergeant [REDACTED] arrived on scene. While attempting to place the suspect in Officer Valko and Officer Drew-Bell’s police unit, the suspect [REDACTED]. As a result a Violent Transport system (VP200) was used to restrict the movement of the suspect in the rear seat of the marked police unit. Per Sergeant [REDACTED] evaluation of the use of the VP200, “The VP200 was properly attached.”

The call for service was completed after documentation was completed at Douglas County and the suspect was released to Douglas County staff. Officer Drew-Bell stated there was no training debrief after the call was completed. Officer Valko completed the trainee portion of the Coaching Training Report (CTR) specifically regarding this call for service however, Officer Drew-Bell has not completed the trainer portion.

The following documentation is from Officer Valko’s submitted CTR from C1 regarding this call for service. Excerpts of note include:

**Use of Force** core competency, Officer Valko writes, “During the arrest phase of this call the suspect engaged in active resistance. He attempted to retreat back into his apartment and to free himself from me when I went hands-on. Inside the suspect’s apartment was a large pit bull. While using strikes may have been justified, I was concerned that if the suspect and I ended up on the ground, I would have put myself in a position to be bit by the dog. Empty hand controls were used and no Blue Team was completed for the arrest, but due to the suspect’s escalated nature, unwillingness to get into the police car and [REDACTED], the decision was made to use the VP200 system. Due to the application of the VP200 a Blue Team report was



generated. While my previous agency used Blue Team to report UOF, the layout and the reporting requirements in the summary were different.”

**Local Procedures, Policies, Laws, Philosophies** core competency, Officer Valko writes, “At my previous agency, domestic violence charges often were filed directly into municipal court. Felony cases were assigned to a detective even if the suspect was taken into custody. Generally suspect apprehension would not occur for a felony case once the initial report was completed and assigned to a detective. The general thought was that a warrant would be issued if the detective found cause. I learned that even after the initial report is filed and several days have past (sp) that we will arrest. For municipal arrests, at my previous agency, charges the 18-6-800.3 and 18-6-801.6 did not apply. Furthermore, generally the only time those charges would be applied was on felony level cases.”

**Legal Authority** core competency, Officer Valko writes, “I had to be aware of what my legal authority was to enter the residence of the suspect. I had to make sure that I recognized the suspect from recent photographs. When the suspect initially answered the door, I recognized him as the suspect and addressed him by name. During the resistance the suspect stated that the name I addressed him by was not his name. I entered the house in good faith and took the suspect into custody in good faith but I eventually had to make a positive identification. Eventually the suspect identified himself as the suspect.”

**Individual Rights** core competency, Officer Valko again writes, “I had to be aware of what my legal authority was to enter the residence of the suspect. I had to make sure that I recognized the suspect from recent photographs. When the suspect initially answered the door, I recognized him as the suspect and addressed him by name. During the resistance the suspect stated that the name I addressed him by was not his name. I entered the house in good faith and took the suspect into custody in good faith but I eventually had to make a positive identification. Eventually the suspect identified himself as the suspect.”

During the interviews and review of the incident, many statements were made regarding the initial contact, documentation and understanding of the legal authority regarding entering the residence of a suspect. Sergeant ██████ stated, “I’ll be honest with you, like I didn’t see issues with even what happened with it, even just hearing what occurred, I haven’t seen the video, I don’t know the specifics and stuff but from what I heard, I was just like oh.. ok.” When Sergeant ██████ was questioned if she had concerns about the contact, she answered “The problem is, I didn’t, even based on the story I didn’t on that day. I didn’t have any concerns. It wasn’t until after Commander ██████ talked to me and we talked it out. And I still didn’t see an issue... and it wasn’t until I started researching on my own last weekend that now, looking back I see the issue.” When interviewing Officer Valko, the question was asked if there was training or discussion regarding the call for service and specifically the contact at the door of the residence. Officer Valko answered, “more congratulatory than anything ummm... like really glad we ended up getting him today.” Sergeant ██████ also stated, “My train of thought on this, and when they told me, and I was like ok yeah, you know we’re good, um was like he was at the door, you can see him you’re talking to him. This is why the DA’s send us out to go contact him on a shall arrest crime. So essentially, like he’s in the threshold and you can arrest him from the threshold



was what I thought at the time.” Sergeant ██████ concluded with, “I think we need a lot of training on that.”

Officer Valko was placed on paid administrative leave on February 3, 2022 and has been in contact with Sergeant ██████ ██████

**Disposition:**

The aforementioned facts and statements were discovered by the investigator during an official administrative investigation and determined the following alleged policy violation dispositions are:

**Officer Chris Valko**

Town of Parker Personnel Manual - 8.1 Disciplinary Action.

- Failure to comply with established departmental policies, procedures and directives; including but not limited to the Town of Parker General Operations Manual.

Sustained    Not Sustained    Unfounded    Exonerated    Clarification Only    Partially Sustained

Matrix Category: N/A

Parker Police Department Manual - Professional Conduct and Responsibility: 6.4.3 A. 2

- Examples of unsatisfactory performance include: a lack of knowledge of the application of laws to be enforced; an unwillingness or inability to perform assigned tasks; the failure to conform to work standards established for the Department member's rank; grade or position; the failure to take appropriate action concerning a crime, disorder or other condition deserving police attention; absence without leave or habitual tardiness; or a violation of the above policy. These examples are illustrative rather than inclusive.

Sustained    Not Sustained    Unfounded    Exonerated    Clarification Only    Partially Sustained

Matrix Category: B

Parker Police Department Manual - Arrests and Warrants: 3.4.3 F. 1.

- If a commissioned officer wishes to arrest a suspect inside a residence and appropriate consent to enter the residence is not obtained or exigent circumstances do not exist, the commissioned officer must first obtain an arrest warrant. If the residence belongs to the suspect, only an arrest warrant is required. The commissioned officer must have clear and articulable facts that the suspect is inside his or her residence. If the dwelling belongs to someone else, the commissioned officer must obtain a search warrant as well.

Sustained    Not Sustained    Unfounded    Exonerated    Clarification Only    Partially Sustained

Matrix Category: B



Parker Police Department Manual - Standards of Conduct, Obedience to Orders, Polices and Laws: 6.2.4 S

- Department members shall obey all constitutional, criminal and civil laws, both on and off duty.

Sustained    Not Sustained    Unfounded    Exonerated    Clarification Only    Partially Sustained

Matrix Category: E

Parker Police Department Manual - Use of Physical Force: 3.2.4 E

- Each situation is unique. Sound judgment and the circumstances of each situation will dictate the level of force the enforcement member deems necessary. Depending on the circumstances, enforcement members may find it necessary to escalate or de-escalate the use of force. It is not the intent of this policy to require enforcement members to attempt to exhaust each lower level of force before moving to the next higher level, so long as the level of force used is reasonable and appropriate under the circumstances. Enforcement members are not required to retreat to avoid using force. However, commissioned officers, shall, when possible, apply nonviolent means before resorting to the use of physical force.

Sustained    Not Sustained    Unfounded    Exonerated    Clarification Only    Partially Sustained

Matrix Category: C



**Officer Ian Drew-Bell**

**Town of Parker Personnel Manual - 8.1 Disciplinary Action.**

- Failure to comply with established departmental policies, procedures and directives; including but not limited to the Town of Parker General Operations Manual.

Sustained    Not Sustained    Unfounded    Exonerated    Clarification Only    Partially Sustained

Matrix Category: N/A

**Parker Police Department Manual - Use of Physical Force: 3.2.5 B**

- Additionally, commissioned officers shall intervene to prevent or stop another commissioned officer from using physical force that exceeds the degree of force permitted. A commissioned officer who fails to intervene commits a class 1 misdemeanor.

Sustained    Not Sustained    Unfounded    Exonerated    Clarification Only    Partially Sustained

Matrix Category: D