

**AGENDA**  
Baltimore City Civilian Review Board  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
Thursday, December 17, 2020  
Place: Enabled by Cisco WebEX  
6:00-8:00 pm

- I. Welcome & call to order.
- II. Review and approval of agenda.
  - Present:
    - Mel Currie - Southwestern District
    - Levi Zaslow - Northwestern District
    - Tiera Hawkes - Chair, Northeastern District
    - Natalie Novak - Secretary, Northern District
    - Amy Cruice - ACLU Representative
    - Cedric McCray - Acting Director of OECR
    - Evangula Brown - CRB Supervisor
    - Tyler Salley - Southeastern District
    - Keirra Wells - OECR
    - Sergeant Eric Mox - BPD
    - John Milton Wesley - OECR
    - Tiffany Jones - CRB Investigator
    - Jill Muth - CRB Investigator
- III. Review and approval of minutes from:
  - November 19, 2020 - Regular meeting
    - Approved
- IV. Director's Report
  - OECR hosted a compassion-fatigue training for OECR staff.
  - OECR's monthly Can We Talk session was dedicated to discussing upcoming legislation.
  - Keirra Wells, AmeriCorps vista, working with OECR was introduced.
- V. New Complaints:**
  - A. **CRB 2020-0069:** Complaint filed 12/14/2020. BPD was called to a hospital because of a patient who was threatening staff people with violence. The responding BPD officers questioned the Complainant in a back hallway. The officers told the Complainant that she signed up for this kind of incident when she took this job—it's part of the territory. One officer asked her to speak into the camera, which made the Complainant uncomfortable. The officers were rude and stated that they had more important places to be. The Complainant feels intimidated by the officers, who regularly respond to incidents at the hospital, and was hesitant about filing a complaint. The officers blocked their badges from the Complainant; one officer claimed not to know the name of the other officer.
    - Voting:
      - Southwestern District - CRB Investigation
      - Northern District - CRB Investigation
      - Northwestern District - CRB Investigation
      - Northeastern District - CRB Investigation

**VI. Completed Cases:**

**AGENDA**  
Baltimore City Civilian Review Board  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
Thursday, December 17, 2020  
Place: Enabled by Cisco WebEX  
6:00-8:00 pm

- A. **CRB2020-0001/PIB2020-0467**: Allegations: False Arrest, Harassment; Complaint filed on 1/8/2020. The complaint alleges that on 12/11/2019 two officers knocked on the Complainant's door. She was in the shower, so when he answered the door she was not fully dressed. The officers showed her a mug shot and asked her if she could identify the individual in the photo. The Complainant told the officers that it was her daughter's father, but she hadn't seen him in a while. The officers asked the Complainant for her driver's license or state ID, and the Complainant complied. After reviewing her ID, the officers told her she was being arrested on a warrant from 2004. The Complainant asked several questions about the warrant and wanted to know how a warrant that was so old was just being acted on. One of the officers told the Complainant that he would have to accompany her upstairs while she got dressed; this made the Complainant uncomfortable. When the Complainant was cuffed, she told the officer that the cuffs were too tight and that she has a wrist injury; the officer did not seem to care. At Central Booking, there was confusion about the warrant; the name and date of birth on the charging document was different from the Complainant's name and DOB. After about 3 days, she was released from Central Booking on pretrial release. Since that time, she has received a summons for the other name that was on the charging document. The BWC confirms a lot of the Complainant's statement. The BWC also shows that the 2004 warrant was related to a domestic violence incident with her and her daughter's father. Further, it shows that the officers told the Complainant that the clothing she changed into would have to be searched, but she would get privacy to change. They searched the clothing and then she changed in the bathroom with the door closed, but cracked open a little. PIB provided BWC and its case file.
- Southwestern District: If fumbling fell into our jurisdiction then this complaint might be sustained, but it doesn't. It is ridiculous how old the warrant is. Our criminal justice systems are lousy, but it's not misconduct.
    - Vote: Not sustain
  - Northern District: Concerned that the warrant was so old. And the officers seemed to be gathering information/interrogating the Complainant on the sly with the intent to arrest her, but based on the information, not misconduct.
    - Vote: Not sustain
  - Northwestern District: It's hard to determine whether the complaint is within our jurisdiction, but the warrant is very old. So, for fifteen years nobody did anything to apprehend the Complainant or act on the warrant—she was easily findable. Then out of nowhere she gets a knock on the door from the police with the warrant. It doesn't seem like there was abusive language, the officers were patient. If the CRB doesn't sustain the allegation, we should consider issuing a letter to PIB addressing our concerns—either she's a dangerous person with a warrant out for her arrest and it's concerning because she's been on the loose for fifteen years or they are acting on a very old, stale warrant—either way it is concerning.
    - Vote: Not sustain, with an accompanying letter that addresses our concerns
    - Southwestern District: We have written letters to PIB in the past about concerns.
  - ACLU Representative: This kind of issue—very old warrants being executed—should be flagged and monitored by the CRB.

**AGENDA**  
Baltimore City Civilian Review Board  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
Thursday, December 17, 2020  
Place: Enabled by Cisco WebEX  
6:00-8:00 pm

- Northeastern District: Maybe the CRB can include these concerns in the letter we already send to PIB after our monthly regular meetings. Requests Levi Zaslow draft a paragraph and send it to the Secretary and we will include it in the letter.
  - Vote: Not sustain
  
- B. **CRB2019-0206/PIB2020-0219**: Allegations: Harassment; Complaint filed 12/27/2019. The complaint alleges that on 11/15/2019 a BPD helicopter followed the Complainant and his wife home from religious services. They began to document the helicopter following them every day. The Complainant thinks he is being harassed because of an EEOC complaint he filed against BPD. In 2009 the Complainant was assigned to US Marshals Warrant Task Force, which caused a dispute between him and his sergeant regarding his hair cut. Due to a medical condition he has, shaving his head causes him medical issues, but his sergeant demanded that he shave his head. The EEOC case settled. Because of this, the Complainant believes the BPD is harassing him. He first noticed being followed by drone in 2019. An evidence request was made to PIB on February 10, 2020 to obtain drone flying/aerial surveillance activity. PIB denied having any such information.
  - Southwestern District: The Complainant is not credible; the first time he noticed the harassment he was in Connecticut, which seems implausible.
    - Vote: Not sustain
  - Northern District: No additional evidence whatsoever confirming any aspect of the allegation.
    - Vote: Not sustain
  - Northwestern District:
    - Vote: Not sustain
  - Northeastern District: Insufficient evidence
    - Not sustain
  
- C. **CRB 2018-0138/PIB2018-0760**: Allegations: Harassment, Abusive Language; Complaint filed 7/20/2018; Expired. The complaint alleges that on 2/2/2018, officers entered her home and searched it pursuant to a search warrant. During the search, the Complainant told the officers that she has a heart condition and she needed her medication from her purse. In response, one of the officers accused the Complainant of lying about her medical condition. One of the officers did get the Complainant's pills from her purse for the Complainant. After the search, the officers asked if the Complainant wanted a paramedic, to which she finally agreed. However, when the paramedic arrived, the officers would not allow the Complainant to go to the hospital until she was cleared. The Complainant was finally taken to the hospital, her discharge papers were provided to the CRB Investigator. The BWC does not appear to show an officer stating that the Complainant was lying about her medical condition.
  - Northern District: The body-worn camera footage did not support the allegations.
    - Vote: Not sustain
  - Southwestern District: BWC seemed to show the officers being rather solicitous to the Complainant.
    - Vote: Not sustain
  - Northwestern District:
    - Vote: Not sustain
  - Northeastern District: The officers genuinely wanted to ensure the Complainant was not ill.
    - Vote: Not sustain

**AGENDA**  
Baltimore City Civilian Review Board  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
Thursday, December 17, 2020  
Place: Enabled by Cisco WebEX  
6:00-8:00 pm

- D. **CRB 2018-0159/PIB2018-0555:** Allegations: False Arrest; Complaint filed 10/18/2018; Expired. The complaint alleges that on 9/18/2018, the Complainant was driving his commercial vehicle when he stopped to talk to a woman who offered him sex for \$20.00. The Complainant alleges that he declined, but was arrested for soliciting prostitution. The woman was an undercover BPD detective. The charges against the Complainant were *not* proessed. The BWC footage did not capture the exchange between the Complainant and the undercover detective. The detective gave a statement to PIB indicating that the Complainant asked her for sex for money. PIB completed this case.
- Southwestern District: This sort of policing is a waste of resources. The undercover officer should have been recording the incident with BWC. However, the incident is acceptable police conduct. It might have helped the analysis if the Complainant had talked with our investigators
    - Vote: Not sustain
  - Northwestern District: Voting to not sustain, but closer than you'd think given that the Complainant didn't respond at all to the CRB Investigator. The complaint alleges that he denies any type of solicitation at all, which could make it a false arrest if the Complainant never made that offer to the undercover officer. But we can't determine that because the Complainant never responded to CRB staff. The Complainant didn't pursue complaint with CRB, and without more it is not sustained.
    - Vote: Not sustained
  - Northern District: The charges were not proessed, but that's not enough to sustain the allegations. Insufficient evidence.
    - Vote: Not sustain
  - Northeastern District: It could be that the undercover officer misconstrued the exchange between her and the Complainant to get charges on the Complainant, and the charges were not proessed, but that's not enough information to sustain the complaint and the CRB Investigator recommended administrative closure.
    - Vote: Not sustain
- E. **CRB 2018-0154/PIB2018-0655:** Allegation: Harassment; Complaint filed 3/13/2018; Expired. The complaint alleges that on 9/21/2018, around 3:00 AM, BPD officers came to his restaurant and live music establishment and shut the business down for the night because the Complainant does not have a late night business license in order to operate at 3:00 AM. The officers continuously shut down his business at midnight; civil citations are issued. The issue of his late night business license has been in court for years. Records show that the Complainant may have had a late night business license previously, but did not have such a license during the time of the complaint. PIB completed this case.
- Northern District: The summaries on the agenda are a little conclusory, apologizes.
  - Northwestern District: This is an ongoing civil suit, more appropriate for a civil court case than a police misconduct complaint.
    - Vote: Not sustain
  - Southwestern District:
    - Vote: Not sustain
  - Northern District:
    - Vote: Not sustain
  - Northeastern District: A CRB complaint is not the proper channel for this issue. Understands why the Complainant filed a complaint with the CRB, but the CRB is not the correct venue to resolve this issue.

**AGENDA**  
Baltimore City Civilian Review Board  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
Thursday, December 17, 2020  
Place: Enabled by Cisco WebEX  
6:00-8:00 pm

- Vote: Not sustain

VII. Public Comment

- ACLU Representative: As a nonvoting member of the CRB, I don't get to see the case files and am happy to provide feedback regarding what to include in the summaries on the agenda.

VIII. Old Business

- Evangula Brown: Please send any comments about the format of the CRB Final Case Reports to the Chair or Secretary or any requested changes.

IX. New Business

- ACLU Representative: Annapolis has convened a panel to study civilian review boards and civilian oversight. The panel will be convening over the next few months. Annapolis will be calling on the CRB to provide a board member to speak to the panel. The panel will be looking to the CRB to see what, if any, aspects should be replicated. Might be helpful for the CRB to document the impact the CRB has had on Baltimore, even within the limitations imposed on the CRB, to show why it's better to have a CRB—even with limitations—than not have one.
- Acting Director of OECR: CRB Investigator Tiffany Jones was recognized by the Mayor for her public service.
- John Wesley: Wants the Chair to do an OECR Can We Talk.

X. Adjournment