

NOTICE OF HEARING

1. This Notice is served to Tim Harrison, delivered by
NAME
Lt. G. Beddies in the following manner personally.
NAME

2. You are hereby notified that a Disciplinary Hearing
DISCIPLINARY - INVESTIGATORY
will be held in the office of Chief Kelly at 10:30 A.M.
NAME TIME &
8-31-89.
DATE

3. Should you desire, you may have a steward or an officer of your bargaining unit present at this Hearing.

4. Any member of the Safety Department who has made allegations, or a supervisor of the Safety Department who has received such allegations, shall also be present at this Hearing.

5. Specific allegations which shall be the subject of this Hearing are as follows:
 1. Violation of General Order #1.
 2. Violation of General Order #2.
 3. Violation of General Order #25.
 4. Violation of General Order #44.

These allegations arise from a complaint filed by a Marra
Wollpart whom you cited for NSSS on 8-15-89 and for which
an Investigatory Hearing was conducted on 8-24-89.

6. Discipline may result from these allegations.

DEPT. of SAFETY
MEMO

TO- _____ Regarding- _____
FROM- _____
DATE- _____

MARRA STATED THAT SHE DID EXPECT A TICKET TO BE ISSUED BECAUSE SHE COULD NOT SATISFY PTE WARRISON WITH A ANSWER THAT HE WANTED TO HEAR, MARRA ALSO STATED THAT WHEN SHE TRIED TO TALK WITH HIM ABOUT THE TICKET HE ADVISED HER THAT HE DID NOT WANT TO TALK TO HER ABOUT THE TICKET AND SHE COULD TALK TO SOMEONE ELSE.

IN REGARDS TO HER TOUCHING HIS ARM, SHE ADVISED THAT SHE PROBABLY DID AS SHE IS A TOUCHY BY NATURE.

IN REGARDS TO HEARING A ERRATED VOICE, SHE STATED NOT AT ANY TIME DID I HEAR A TONE OF VOICE THAT SOUNDED ERRATED.

IN REGARDS TO THE 2ND OFFICER, PTE HARRISON INDICATED THAT PTE MANKINSLEY WAS ON THE SCENE AND PROBABLY HEARD HIS CRAM TONE OF VOICE, MARRA STATES THAT THE 2ND OFFICER WAS IN NO POSITION TO HEAR ANY CONVERSATION. PTE MANKINSLEY ALSO INDICATED THAT HE DID NOT HEAR ANY CONVERSATION BETWEEN HARRISON AND MARRA.

3

DEPT. of SAFETY
MEMO

TO- _____ Regarding- _____
FROM- _____
DATE- _____

MORAN DENIES THE FACT THAT SHE WROTE OFF
FOR A FIRST MATTER.

SHE ALSO DENIES STATING THAT SHE WAS A
MISTAKE GOING INTO OAKWOOD, SHE DRIVES INTO

OAKWOOD PROBABLY 4 OR 5 TIMES A WEEK AS SHE
PUTS GOOR AT ICE, WORKS IN OAKWOOD

AND ALSO IS IN A CARPOOL AT HOLY ANGELS.
SHE ALSO DENIES THE FACT WOULD BE

EXPERIENCE STATE THAT HE HAD TO ASK HER
SHEARD THAT FOR LICENSE, AS SHE AS HE

ASKED SHE GAVE IT TO HIM.
IN SUMMARY AFTER MY INTERVIEW, WIFE ASKED

ANOTHER CITIZEN COMPLAINT AND IN PIZ INTERVIEW
STATEMENT THEY ARE SIMPLY NOT TRUST HIS

ENTIRE MATTER, AS WAS HE HAD BEEN THIS VIOLATION
IS NOT APPROPRIATE FOR CAR POOLING MATTERS

NOTICE OF HEARING

1. This Notice is served to Pt1, Tim Harrison, delivered by
Lt. Vaughn in the following manner In Person.
Delivery was made on March 4, 1988.
DATE

2. You are hereby notified that a Investigatory hearing
DISCIPLINARY - INVESTIGATORY
will be held in the office of Capt Edwards at this time
NAME
1000 hrs March 4, 1988.
TIME & DATE.

3. Specific allegations which shall be the subject of this hearing
are as follows:

1. General Order 5 Reporting for Duty
General Order 7 Fictitious Illness or Injury Report

2. _____

3. _____

4. Discipline may result from these allegations.

NOTICE OF HEARING

1. This Notice is served to PTL. HARRISON, delivered by
LT. VAUGHN in the following manner PERSONNALLY.
Delivery was made on MARCH 10, 1988.
DATE

2. You are hereby notified that a DISCIPLINARY hearing
DISCIPLINARY - INVESTIGATORY
will be held in the office of CAPT. EDWARDS at this time
NAME
NOON MARCH 10, 1988.
TIME & DATE.

3. Specific allegations which shall be the subject of this hearing
are as follows:

1. GENERAL ORDER # 5
GENERAL ORDER # 7

2. _____

3. _____

4. Discipline may result from these allegations.

**DEPT. of SAFETY
MEMO**

TO- Chief Kelly
FROM- Lt. Vaughn
DATE- March 10, 1988

Regarding- Ptl. Harrison-Investi-
gation of sick leave
usage.

After both an investigatory and disciplinary hearing the following

conclusions are made:

1.) During both processes Ptl. Harrison has been reasonably consistant
in his response to questions and issues brought about for discussion,
A debate took place as to his response at the investigatory hearing,
however the bottom line is the response was similar, although not
exactly as my notes of the meeting reflect. Again, this meeting
not taped, so responses are debatable or interpretive.

2.) Given the note Ptl. Harrison left on his fence, his reported effort
to see a doctor, witnesses to that fact, etc.,etc. I see no proof of
this officer abusing his sick leave, or ficticiously reporting same.

3.) I continue to be concerned for his sick leave usage and shall continue
to investigate future usage until such time there is an improvement in
his sick leave absence.

NOTICE OF HEARING

1. This Notice is served to Ptl. T.Harrison, delivered by
Capt Edwards in the following manner In Person.
Delivery was made on 3-10-88.
DATE

2. You are hereby notified that a Disciplinary hearing
DISCIPLINARY - INVESTIGATORY
will be held in the office of Capt Edwards at this time
NAME
1545 March 10, 1988.
TIME & DATE.

3. Specific allegations which shall be the subject of this hearing
are as follows:

1. Possible violation of General Order 2 and General 25

2. _____

3. _____

4. Discipline may result from these allegations.

NOTICE OF HEARING

1. This Notice is served to Ptl. Harrison, delivered by
Capt Edwards in the following manner In Person.

Delivery was made on March 7, 1988.
DATE

2. You are hereby notified that a Investigatory hearing
DISCIPLINARY - INVESTIGATORY

will be held in the office of Capt Edwards at this time
NAME

1230 hrs March 7, 1988.
TIME & DATE.

3. Specific allegations which shall be the subject of this hearing
are as follows:

1. You may be in violation of General Order 2 Unbecoming Conduct
and General Order 25 Courtesy.

This stems from a citizen complaint while you were off duty.

2. _____

3. _____

4. Discipline may result from these allegations.

NOTICE OF HEARING

1. This Notice is served to P.H. T. Harrison, delivered by
NAME
Lt. W. Thompson in the following manner Personally.
NAME
2. You are hereby notified that a Investigatory Hearing
DISCIPLINARY - INVESTIGATORY
will be held in the office of Lt. W. Thompson at 1800 hrs.
NAME TIME &
8-24-89.
DATE
3. Should you desire, you may have a steward or an officer of your bargaining unit present at this Hearing.
4. Any member of the Safety Department who has made allegations, or a supervisor of the Safety Department who has received such allegations, shall also be present at this Hearing.
5. Specific allegations which shall be the subject of this Hearing are as follows:
 1. You violated General Order #1 (Violation of Orders) as reported to me by Chief Kelly.
 2. You violated General Order #2 (Unbecoming Conduct) as reported to me by Chief Kelly
 3. You violated General Order #25 (Courtesy) as reported to me by Chief Kelly.
6. Discipline may result from these allegations.

1

DEPT. of SAFETY
MEMO

TO- Capt. Edwards **Regarding-** Ptl. Harrison's
FROM- St. Thompson Investigatory
DATE- 8-24-89 Hearing

On 8-24-89 at 1800 hrs., I held an investigatory hearing involving a citizen complaint against Ptl. Harrison. Ptl. Andrews was his Lodge Representative. I attempted to contact the complainant (Mrs. Wollpert) before the hearing, however, she was not at home, and according to Mrs. Wollpert's husband, she would not be home until around 2400 hrs. Therefore, I proceeded with the investigatory hearing based on the written complaint from Mrs. Wollpert.

At the hearing, this letter of complaint was read to Ptl. Harrison. Ptl. Harrison had quite a different view on this matter. However, there was some agreement on this incident. Both parties agree that Ptl. Harrison ask Mrs. Wollpert if she knew why she was stopped. Both parties disagree on the first reply by Mrs. Wollpert. Mrs. Wollpert states, she guessed she was stopped because she coasted thru a stop sign. Ptl. Harrison said her reply was, "I didn't do a damned thing wrong!" Ptl. Harrison then told Mrs. Wollpert, "If you can tell me what you did wrong, I will not write you a citation!" Ptl. Harrison claims he uses this approach on minor moving violations & that Judge Harlaments agrees with this type of approach. I think

DEPT. of SAFETY
MEMO

TO- _____
FROM- _____
DATE- _____

Regarding- _____

Ptl. Harrison used poor judgement in that type of approach which may cause a person to feel they are receiving an "attitude ticket." Ptl. Harrison then denies making any statements to Mrs. Wollpert about applying her brakes. Ptl. Harrison denies telling Mrs. Wollpert he was a nice guy. Both parties agree that Ptl. Harrison stated something about not writing a ticket if Mrs. Wollpert admitted her violation. Ptl. Harrison denies playing God, but admits that he would not have written this citation if Mrs. Wollpert would have admitted her violation initially. Ptl. Harrison stated, Mrs. Wollpert said she was getting this ticket because she made a mistake and drove through Oakwood. Ptl. Harrison admitted saying he was not giving her this ticket, that she had earned this ticket. This statement about earning the ticket was improper + probably made an angry violator more angry.

Ptl. Harrison said Ptl. Tankersly was parked near this traffic stop location and may have heard parts of this conversation. Ptl. Tankersly was off sick, so I was unable to question him today (8-24-89).

DEPT. of SAFETY
MEMO

TO- _____
FROM- _____
DATE- _____

Regarding- _____

I ~~checked~~^{then} checked Mrs. Wollpert's driving record & found she had 3 prior citations since 1981 (2 of these priors were written by Oakwood Officers - Hannigan & myself).

Overall, I think Ptl. Harrison was very honest about this incident. I also think Mrs. Wollpert was an angry violator possibly because of 3 citations from 3 Oakwood Officers. However, Ptl. Harrison used poor judgement by telling Mrs. Wollpert she would not get a ticket if she could tell him what she did wrong - possibly implying that if she said the right thing she would be off the hook. Poor judgement used by telling Mrs. Wollpert she "earned" the ticket.

Before a final decision is made, I feel a statement should be obtained from Ptl. Tankersly. Mrs. Wollpert's written complaint was pretty descriptive & I don't feel much would be gained by recontacting her before a decision is reached.

Based on the evidence at this time, I feel a ^{verbal} reprimand is in order for violating General Order #2 (Unbecoming Conduct) by acting in a manner that reflected unfavor-

