

# LITTLE ROCK POLICE DEPARTMENT SUPERVISORY EVALUATION FORM

Citizen Complaint  
 Administrative Investigation

Case # 2019-022984

Involved Employee(s): Officer Charles Stark's # 34308 Officer [REDACTED]  
 Complainant or Type Incident: Officer Involved Shooting  
 Date of Complaint: 02-22-2019 Date of Incident: 02-22-2019

**EVALUATION & RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Charge / Allegation	1. <u>Use of Force G. O. 303.II.E2 (Starks)</u> 2. <u>Use of Force G. O. 303 III.J [REDACTED]</u> 3. _____ 4. _____ 5. _____ 6. _____	Disposition	1. <u>E</u> 2. <u>E</u> 3. _____ 4. _____ 5. _____ 6. _____
---------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------

DISPOSITION	
S	Sustained
NS	Not-Sustained
E	Exonerated
U	Unfounded
MC	Misconduct Not Based on Orig. Compliant
W	Withdrawn

DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION		
<input type="checkbox"/> Counseling	<input type="checkbox"/> Oral Reprimand	<input type="checkbox"/> Written Reprimand
<input type="checkbox"/> Suspension - _____ Days	<input type="checkbox"/> Demotion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None
<input type="checkbox"/> Termination		

**Comments:** On Wednesday, April 24, 2019 at approximately 1500 hours, I received the Internal Affairs File regarding the use of Deadly Force during the incident date. I was directed to prepare a Supervisor's Evaluation Form based on the listed allegations and recommend disciplinary action based on Officer Stark's actions.

On Friday, February 22, 2019, at approximately 11:09 am, Officer C. Starks (1Y61) responded to a request to stop a stolen vehicle from Detective William High who is assigned to the Special Investigations Division. Detective High was monitoring a device that locates stolen vehicles by their license plate. Officer C. Starks located the vehicle not moving, backed into a parking space located at 7305 W-12<sup>th</sup>. There was a wall immediately behind the suspect vehicle. Officer C. Starks stopped his unit in front of the suspect vehicle, however, there was still enough room to steer around the unit. Officer C. Starks approached the suspect vehicle with his weapon drawn and began giving verbal directions for 45 seconds to the suspect, Mr. Blackshire, without success. Officer C. Starks observed Mr. Blackshire put the vehicle in gear and reach down to his leg to where it was unknown what he was reaching for. Officer C. Starks noticed that Mr. Blackshire was attempting to drive away. Officer C. Starks stated that he moved closer towards the left front fender away from the driver's door. Officer C. Starks was aware that the suspect vehicle had to turn towards him to get around his unit. Officer C. Starks continued with verbal directions to stop. Officer C. Starks also continued to transmit over his radio. The suspect vehicle began to roll and turn to the left to get around the police unit while Officer C. Starks walked beside the suspect vehicle. The vehicle then bumps Officer C. Starks' left leg that he felt was deliberate. Officer C. Starks immediately fired his service weapon three (3) times into the windshield into the direction of Mr. Blackshire. The vehicle stopped momentarily and Officer C. Starks then attempted to move across the front of the suspect vehicle in an attempt to move to his unit to have a better position of cover in the possibility that Mr. Blackshire was armed. Officer C. Starks was exposed due to the parked position of Mr. Blackshire's vehicle. There was no position of cover to the south of Officer C. Starks either.

\*\*\*\*CONTINUED\*\*\*\*

Sgt. Harold A. [Signature]  
 Supervisor #16705

MAY 3, 2019  
 Date



Supervisory Evaluation Form

Page 2

Case # 2019-022984

Comments Cont'd: The only tactical move that Officer Starks felt he could make was to get to his unit and cross in front of Mr. Blackshire's vehicle. He feared that Mr. Blackshire may have been armed, Mr. Blackshire's vehicle then began moving again striking Officer Starks a second time causing him to be on the hood of the car. Officer C. Starks sustained a knee injury as a result. Officer Starks fired his weapon eleven (11) more times into the windshield of the vehicle. Officer [REDACTED] arrived on scene and observed Officer Starks on the hood of the vehicle and heard gunshots. Fearing that Officer C. Starks was in jeopardy of being run over by Mr. Blackshire, Officer [REDACTED] made the decision to ram the suspect vehicle with his unit in an attempt to stop the threat and help Officer C. Starks. The vehicle came to a stop. In this deadly force encounter, Officer Simpson deviated from the deadly force section of General Order 303. General Order 104 III.B authorizes officers to deviate from General Orders if reasonable exigent circumstances exist. Officer [REDACTED] and Officer C. Starks then handcuffed Ms. Clarke. Officer D. Herring and Officer Van Schoyck arrived on scene began to render first aid to Mr. Blackshire until MEMS arrived.

Allegation 1 G.O. 303.II.E.2 : which states, "Officers will not voluntarily place themselves in a position in front of an oncoming vehicle where deadly Force is the probable outcome. When confronted by an oncoming vehicle, officers will move out of its path, if possible, rather than fire at the vehicle".

Officer C. Starks made a conscious decision based on his training to attempt to move to his unit for better cover across the front of the suspect vehicle in case Mr. Blackshire was armed. In his initial contact with Mr. Blackshire there was no cover whatsoever. Upon being struck the first time Officer C. Starks fired three (3) times towards the windshield in fear of his life. Upon being struck a second time by the vehicle he ended up on the hood, Officer C. Starks fired an additional eleven (11) times. On the MVR, the danger of the incident is apparent on Officer C. Starks face. Officer C. Starks could not make it to his unit because of Mr. Blackshire's actions alone. In this incident, at that moment, I believe that Officer C. Starks began to experience Tache Psyche Syndrome. It deals with sudden Physical and Psychological effects of sudden stress. In this instance he was faced with "Fight or Flight". Officer C. Starks says he felt as if he blacked out during the incident at some point. Upon Officer [REDACTED] unit striking Mr. Blackshire's car, Officer C. Starks is observed in an injured, confused state after sliding off the suspect's car. Officer C. Starks stated in his interview with Sergeant Jarrod McCauley on Monday, February 25, 2019, that he felt a space of time or he blacked out. (Interview Page 8-15) The MVR clearly shows the look on Officer C. Stark's face that shows he was clearly affected physically, psychologically, and emotionally. When an encounter with "Tache Psyche" occurs the body can suffer from "Auditory Exclusion" (Diminished Sound) and Tunnel Vision (Observing a Threat Through a Cylinder). The effect of Tache Psyche should be taken into consideration while evaluating Officer C. Stark's decisions and actions in this incident. Upon evaluating the available investigative file and the evidence within, I have recommend that Officer C. Starks receive no disciplinary action.

Officer [REDACTED] is overheard using profanity while giving verbal commands. While using profanity is a violation of Rules and regulations 1/4001.9, the incident was stressful in nature and recommend that Officer [REDACTED] be informally counseled about the use of profanity.

Sgt. Harold S. Smith  
Supervisor #16705

May 3, 2019  
Date



## LITTLE ROCK POLICE DEPARTMENT SUPERVISORY EVALUATION FORM

Citizen Complaint

Administrative Investigation

Case # 2019-022984

Involved Employee(s): Officer Charles Starks #34308 and Officer [REDACTED]

Complainant or Type Incident: Officer Involved Shooting

Date of Complaint: \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Incident: 02/22/2019

**EVALUATION & RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Charge / Allegation	1. <u>G.O. 303.II.E.2 (Starks)</u> 2. <u>G.O. 303.III.B [REDACTED]</u> 3. _____ 4. _____ 5. _____ 6. _____	Disposition	1. <u>E</u> 2. <u>E</u> 3. _____ 4. _____ 5. _____ 6. _____
---------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------

DISPOSITION	
S	Sustained
NS	Not-Sustained
E	Exonerated
U	Unfounded
MC	Misconduct Not Based on Orig. Compliant
W	Withdrawn

**DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION**

<input type="checkbox"/> Counseling	<input type="checkbox"/> Oral Reprimand	<input type="checkbox"/> Written Reprimand
<input type="checkbox"/> Suspension - _____ Days		<input type="checkbox"/> Demotion
<input type="checkbox"/> Termination		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None

**Comments:** Sir, On February 22<sup>nd</sup> at approximately 1110 Officer Charles Starks and Officer Michael Simpson were involved in a shooting that caused the death of Brandon Blackshire. Below are my recommendations:

Disciplinary Recommendation for Charge/Allegation 1.) Sgt. James Stephens of the Internal Affairs Unit has recommended we review G.O. 303.II.E.2 which states "Officers will not voluntarily place themselves in a position in front of an oncoming vehicle where deadly force is the probable outcome. When confronted by an oncoming vehicle, officers will move out of its path, if possible, rather than fire at the vehicle" in reference to Officer Starks' actions. Starks says in his interview that he was moving back toward his police unit for cover and protection once he realized Mr. Blackshire was going to flee. He also said he could not move to the south fearing Blackshire had a weapon and there was no cover available, a credible judgment call based on what was found in the car. He can be seen being struck by the car, gathering his feet and stepping in the direction of his police unit across the path of the stolen Nissan which was turning into him. Officer Starks does in fact violate the letter of this policy but with the intent to reach what he feels is his best position of cover as he sees it, not with the intent of forcing a deadly force encounter, which is what the above policy was written to prevent. He has already been struck by the car and if he had fallen instead of keeping his feet under him then would have at least been run over by the rear tires of the Nissan.

I concur with Sgt. Scratch and recommend this Starks' actions be exonerated and no discipline be levied based on G.O. 104.III.B which authorizes officers to deviate from policy if circumstances require.

**Continued on Page Two**

Lt Dana Jackson  
Supervisor

May 2, 2019  
Date



Little Rock Police Department  
Supervisory Evaluation Form

Page 2

Case # 2019-022984

Comments Cont'd: Recommendation on Charge/Allegation 2.) As Officer Simpson arrives he sees Officer Starks on the hood of a moving vehicle and firing into the car as it travels across a parking lot. He has seconds to observe this incredible scene and act upon what he is confronted with. In his statement Officer Simpson admits to purposely striking the black Nissan to prevent further serious injury to Officer Starks. Officer Simpson violates G.O. 303 III.J which states "Officers will not attempt to deliberately collide with other vehicles or to use police vehicles to force any vehicle of the roadway". Subsequent to the collision Officer Starks is able to get off of the hood and fall to the parking lot relatively unharmed. I concur with Sgt. Scratch that Simpson's actions be exonerated and no discipline be assigned based on G.O. 104.III.B which authorizes officers to deviate from policy if circumstances require. No further action is recommended.

Policy Change Recommendation-(302.IIF8.B). Reviewing Officer Stark's statement, it became obvious to me that he felt that once he had gotten the Nissan blocked off with his police unit, he could approach the car and take the driver into custody. He could get him into custody and this would be done. There would be no pursuit and there was nothing else that was going to take place. These phrases are what he was using in his statement on page 70 and allow us insight into his mindset. I think the fact that he had the car blocked and thought no pursuit was going to ensue led to his less desirable initial positioning on the traffic stop/arrest. He also crossed in front of the Nissan on his way to its driver's side, putting him between it and the police unit momentarily.

This policy, which allows us to box in unaware suspects operating vehicles to prevent a pursuit, leads to a false sense of security and when suspects flee after all, striking cars and possible bystanders and officers, it almost guarantees an officer involved shooting. By our policy Starks was allowed to physically block with his police unit an occupied stolen car which I think is unwise in this day and time. The policy is not necessarily bad as is it just does not take into account the increasing number of people who will not submit to lawful arrest. As I write this recommendation, I can think of three officer involved shootings involving blocking cars including this one in the past four years. Two of them fatal. I recommend this policy be considered for revision by the Office of the Chief of Police and any accompanying training be promulgated through the Training Division.

Finally, I recommend a review of danger signs that may be present at traffic stops where the operator of the vehicle may flee/not comply. Two I saw in this file were the doors locking and the engine starting. Officers should be trained through realistic replication drills to get away from such vehicles, not reach in and grab the driver or stay in proximity too long. I believe that if Officer Starks had not been able to block the Nissan and he knew there was a possibility the Nissan could be driven right in front of his unit while fleeing he would never have gone to the driver's side door like he did. This concludes my recommendation.


Lt. Dana Jackson  
Supervisor


May 2nd, 2019  
Date






## MEMORANDUM

TO: Hayward Finks, Assistant Chief of Police 

FROM: Captain Heath Helton, Northwest Division Commander 

RE: Captain's Recommendation-II2019-0005

DATE: May 1, 2019

On Wednesday, April 24, 2019, I received Internal Affairs Investigation case file #II2019-0005 from Sergeant J.B. Stephens, which is related to the officer involved shooting that occurred on February 22, 2019, involving Officer Charles Starks #34308 and Officer . Upon reviewing the contents of the administrative file, the following allegations were cited by Sergeant Stephens and consideration for disciplinary action is to be determined by the involved officer's chain of command:


Officer Charles Starks #34308

### LRPD General Order 303.II.E.2

*Which states, "Officers will not voluntarily place themselves in a position in front of an oncoming vehicle where deadly force is the probable outcome. When confronted by an oncoming vehicle, officers will move out of its path, if possible, rather than fire at the vehicle."*

The listed allegation was cited for Officer Starks and sustained by Sergeant Stephens, with concurrence by Assistant Chief Alice Fulk.

Upon reviewing the facts contained within this file, I do not concur with the sustained violation. I believe it is important to address certain facts of this incident before a recommendation is made concerning the actions of Officer Starks. A summary of the facts is as follows:

Officer Starks was answering a request made by Detective  in locating a stolen vehicle that was observed pulling into the parking lot located at 7305 W. 12<sup>th</sup> Street. Officer Starks located the vehicle, which was described by Detective High, backed into a parking space (one space over to the left of an SUV). Officer Starks parked his marked police vehicle (blue lights activated) directly in front of the vehicle being driven by Mr. Blackshire, but there was enough space that would allow Mr. Blackshire to turn to the left and drive around the police vehicle, which is the only way he could leave.

Officer Starks was authorized to block in the vehicle driven by Mr. Blackshire and he was acting within the scope of his official duties when he approached the vehicle occupied by Mr. Blackshire and Ms. Desaray Clarke (passenger), while his weapon was drawn for officer safety. Video camera footage from the All Pro Styles Barbershop, located at 7305 Kanis, shows Officer Starks went between the driver's side of the patrol unit and the front of the vehicle operated by Mr. Blackshire. Lawful verbal commands were immediately issued to the occupants by Officer Starks. Over a 30-35 second period, Mr. Blackshire was told a total of 12 times to get out of the car, in which he refused to comply.

Ms. Clarke provided a statement to investigators that verified Officer Starks was providing verbal commands to Mr. Blackshire. She further described that Mr. Blackshire had one hand on the steering wheel and was reaching in his jacket pocket with his other hand making a "digging motion" like he was looking for something. Ms. Clarke believed Mr. Blackshire was looking for a small .380 revolver that he carried and thought he was looking for the gun in order to shoot the officer. Officer Starks said he saw Mr. Blackshire move his hand down on the shifter to put the car in gear and said something. He then advised Mr. Blackshire moved his hand from the gear shifter down to the side of his right leg.

It is clear from the video surveillance that as Officer Starks is ordering Mr. Blackshire out of the vehicle, it begins to move forward and to the left towards Officer Starks who is stepping backwards before any shots are fired and before the vehicle's left front quarter panel makes contact with him. After being bumped by the vehicle, Officer Starks fires his duty weapon at least three times from the previously identified position, only to crossover to a position that placed him in front of vehicle that was turning left towards him. Even though the vehicle was moving towards Officer Starks very slowly, he and the vehicle crossed paths resulting in the vehicle hitting Officer Starks in the lower legs, causing him to fall onto the hood of the vehicle and him continuing to fire.

Officer Starks explained his movement was in an attempt to get to the patrol unit for cover which could prevent him from being struck by the vehicle or provide cover should the driver produce a firearm and begin firing. In his statement to investigators, Officer Starks stated he was terrified and that if Mr. Blackshire had a firearm, he believed the only safe place for him to take cover was behind his vehicle. He further explained on several occasions that he is trying to stay squared up to Mr. Blackshire; therefore, allowing for maximum protection of his body armor from any possible gun fire.

It is clear that Officer Starks was forced to make a split-second judgement in a situation that was tense, uncertain and rapidly evolving. The entire incident from the time Mr. Blackshire made the decision to bump Officer Starks to the time Officer Simpson rams the vehicle operated by Blackshire was approximately 5 seconds. Further analyzing the DVR footage shows that less



than 1 second passes between Officer Starks getting bumped by the vehicle, and the vehicle continuing towards Starks, and Starks firing the first shot. He further acknowledged the vehicle was not violently accelerating, but it did strike him and struck him again after he tried backing away. Officer Starks stated when he was hit again that is when he felt an extremely sharp pain in his right leg and felt he was going to be ran over and killed. Even though the DVR gives the impression that the incident unfolds slowly, from the perspective of Officer Starks it was definitely a split-second judgement that he was making when he decided to use deadly force.

I believe Officer Starks' positioning at the left front quarter panel of the vehicle, then him moving to the front of it was one continuous event of the deadly force that had occurred after Officer Starks was initially bumped by the vehicle. Officer Starks voluntarily placed himself in a position at the front of the vehicle; however, this was not done in a negligent manner with the intent of forcing a deadly force situation; instead, he (by his own admission) was attempting to move to a position of cover where he knew his patrol unit to be, but was hit a second time by the vehicle.

While some might question the tactics used by Officer Starks during his initial contact with Mr. Blackshire (i.e. blocking of the vehicle, walking between the patrol unit and the stolen vehicle, or Starks decision to position himself on the driver's side of the stolen car), I do not believe his intent was to create a dangerous situation that would leave him with no choice but to use deadly force. Several lawful orders were provided to Mr. Blackshire to exit the vehicle as well as Officer Starks trying to open the driver's side door, only to have it locked by Mr. Blackshire. Officer Starks was simply attempting to stop and detain Mr. Blackshire, who he reasonably believed to be driving a stolen vehicle.

Therefore, I recommend classifying Officer Starks actions as **Exonerated** and recommend that no disciplinary action be taken concerning the listed allegation by Sergeant Stephens as it relates to this incident.

Officer [REDACTED]

#### LRPD General Order 303.III.J.

Which states, "*Officers will not attempt to deliberately collide with other vehicles or to use police vehicles to force any vehicle off the roadway.*"

Officer [REDACTED] was cited for this violation; however, Sergeant Stephens believed Officer [REDACTED]'s decision to utilize his patrol unit to collide with the vehicle being operated by Mr. Blackshire was based on what he saw and perceived when upon arriving at the scene to assist Officer Starks. Additionally, the patrol unit was the only option at his immediate disposal that was capable of stopping Blackshire's vehicle from moving. General Order 104.III.B authorizes officers to deviate from policy if circumstances require. Based upon the statement provided by Officer Simpson and the DVR footage, I believe his actions were objectively reasonable and justified a deviation from the cited allegation from General Order 303. Therefore, I concur with

Re: Captain's Recommendation- II2019-0005  
Date: May 1, 2019

Sergeant Stephens, Sergeant Scratch and Lieutenant Jackson's recommendation to classify Officer Simpson's use of force with the police vehicle as **Exonerated**.

In addition to the listed allegation against Officer Simpson, it was noted in the file and observed on DVR footage that Officer ~~Simpson~~ used profane language during the incident, which is a violation of LRPD Rules and Regulations 1/4001.09. The use of such language, while inappropriate, is not uncommon during high stress incidents/situations. I concur with the reviewing supervisors as well as Sergeant Stephens regarding this violation be addressed with informal counseling.





MEMORANDUM

TO: Keith Humphrey, Chief of Police

FROM: Hayward Finks, Assistant Chief of Police *HF*

RE: Internal Affairs Investigation II2019-0005

DATE: May 3, 2019

---

Upon reviewing and evaluating Internal Affairs file II2019-0005, I agree with the unanimous recommendation of Sgt. Harold Scratch, Lt. Dana Jackson, and Capt. Heath Helton that the alleged violation of G.O.303.II.E.2 should be classified as "Exonerated". All three supervisors have done a thorough job of critiquing the case file. G.O.303.II.E.2 states:

*"Officers will not voluntarily place themselves in a position in front of an oncoming vehicle where Deadly Force is the probable outcome. When confronted by an oncoming vehicle, officers will move out of its path, if possible, rather than fire at the vehicle."*

The intent of this policy is to deter officers from positioning themselves in front of moving vehicles and intentionally creating a life threatening situation resulting in the need to use deadly force. I do not believe that Officer Starks intentionally nor voluntarily stepped in front of the vehicle driven by Mr. Blackshire. It appears that the actions of Mr. Blackshire forced Officer Starks to seek cover and move towards his patrol vehicle for cover out of fear that Mr. Blackshire was going to shoot at him. This is supported in the letter from Prosecuting Attorney Larry Jegley which states:

*"But according to Starks, even though he had not seen a gun, he was afraid of getting shot. The reasonableness of his belief that he might get shot are confirmed by several things: 1) Starks said that Mr. Blackshire put his hand down on the shifter and refused to show it, 2) Ms. Clarke said that Mr. Blackshire was fishing around in his pocket where he usually kept his gun, 3) live .45 caliber cartridges were found in two of Mr. Blackshire's pockets, 4) a loaded .45 caliber handgun with a round in the chamber and 8 rounds in the magazine was located in the Blackshire vehicle after the shooting, and 5) Ms. Clarke believed that Mr. Blackshire was going to shoot Starks because he had told her he had shot at the police on a previous occasion. Because Starks believed he was going to be shot he attempted to go to his unit to seek cover from gun fire and that is what put him in the path of Mr. Blackshire's vehicle."(pp.5-6)*

Officers Starks initially went to the driver's door of the vehicle and attempted to remove Mr. Blackshire from the vehicle and place him under arrest. It appears that Officer's Starks' mindset



at that time was that he had adequately blocked the stolen vehicle in and it could not move. It was not until the actions of Mr. Blackshire forced Officer Starks to seek cover that Officer Starks began moving towards his patrol unit. My decision to recommend that this case be "Exonerated" is due to the lack of intent by Officer Starks to intentionally position himself in front of the vehicle solely to prevent it from moving.

In analyzing the actions of Officer Starks, records reveal that he has been involved with 4266 police incidents since being employed by the Little Rock Police Department. His involvement included him making 266 arrests from a wide variety of both misdemeanor and felony charges. The encounter with Mr. Blackshire is the only time that Officer Starks has resulted in utilizing deadly force in making an arrest. In assessing what was different in this situation as opposed to the other 266 individuals arrested by Officer Starks, I believe that it was the unfortunate, but yet deliberate, actions of Mr. Blackshire.



**Little Rock Police Department  
Administrative Evaluation Form  
(Final Recommendations Only)**

DISPOSITION	
S	Sustained
NS	Not Sustained
E	Exonerated
U	Unfounded
MC	Misconduct Not Based On Orig. Complaint
W	Withdrawn

Citizen Complaint      Formal Complaint  
 Administrative Investigation       Yes  No      Case # 112019-0005

Involved Employee(s): Officer Charles Starks #34308 & Officer [REDACTED]  
 Complaint or Type Incident: Use of Deadly Force (Officer Involved Shooting)  
 Date of Complaint: \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Incident: 02/22/2019

**DIVISION REVIEW – EVALUATION & RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Allegation or Charge		Disposition	
1.	G.O. 303.II.E.2. (Starks)	1.	<u>E</u>
2.	G.O. 303.III.J. ([REDACTED])	2.	<u>E</u>
3.	_____	3.	_____
4.	_____	4.	_____
5.	_____	5.	_____
6.	_____	6.	_____

DISCIPLINE	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None
<input type="checkbox"/>	Counseling
<input type="checkbox"/>	Oral Reprimand
<input type="checkbox"/>	Written Reprimand
<input type="checkbox"/>	Suspension _____ Hours
<input type="checkbox"/>	Demotion
<input type="checkbox"/>	Termination

Comments/Recommendations: See attached memorandum.

[Signature]  
Division Commander

05-03-19  
Date

**BUREAU REVIEW – EVALUATION & RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**FINDINGS & DISPOSITION:**

Concur       Do Not Concur

Allegation or Charge		Disposition	
1.	<u>As sited above Starks</u>	1.	<u>E</u>
2.	<u>[REDACTED]</u>	2.	<u>E</u>
3.	_____	3.	_____

DISCIPLINE	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	None
<input type="checkbox"/>	Counseling
<input type="checkbox"/>	Oral Reprimand
<input type="checkbox"/>	Written Reprimand
<input type="checkbox"/>	Suspension _____ Hours
<input type="checkbox"/>	Demotion
<input type="checkbox"/>	Termination

Comments/Recommendations: See attached memorandum for Starks. Simpson's actions were justified and proper under the unique conditions.

[Signature]  
Assistant Chief

5-3-2019  
Date

**CHIEF OF POLICE – FINDINGS & DISPOSITION – IF APPLICABLE –**

Concur With:       Assistant Chief       Division Commander       Do Not Concur

Allegation or Charge		Disposition	
1.	<u>G.O. 303. II. E. 2 (starks)</u>	1.	<u>S</u>
2.	<u>G.O. 303 III. J ([REDACTED])</u>	2.	<u>E</u>
3.	_____	3.	_____

DISCIPLINE	
<input type="checkbox"/>	None
<input type="checkbox"/>	Counseling
<input type="checkbox"/>	Oral Reprimand
<input type="checkbox"/>	Written Reprimand
<input type="checkbox"/>	Suspension _____ Hours
<input type="checkbox"/>	Demotion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Termination

Comments/Recommendations: Officer Starks terminated for violation of G.O. 303.II.E.2.

[Signature]  
Chief of Police

5-3-19  
Date