Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT POLICE MONITOR
CASE REVIEW: CR2026-0001
OIPM Tracking Numbers: CC2025-0019
Public Integrity Bureau Case Tracking Number: 2025-0190-P, 2025-0213-P, 2025-0228-P

The Office of the Independent Police Monitor (OIPM) is an independent branch of city government responsible for providing oversight to the New Orleans Police Department (NOPD). The OIPM provides transparent assessments of the NOPD's work, progress, and obstacles. Based on those assessments, the OIPM provides the NOPD with detailed recommendations on policy, practice, and monitors the department's continued adherence to constitutional policing standards now that the Federal Consent Decree has concluded. Most importantly, at the center of the OIPM's work is the community. The OIPM is responsible for issuing public reports to the people of New Orleans and the NOPD regarding the state of policing in New Orleans. This case review is one such example and is created in conformity with the Memorandum of Understanding between the NOPD and the OIPM executed on November 10, 2010; as well as being consistent with La. R.S. § 40:2531 Chapter 25 and Municipal Code of Ordinances, Part II, Chapter 2, Article XIV Section 2-1121.

The purpose of case reviews is to examine the misconduct investigations conducted by the Public Integrity Bureau (PIB) of the NOPD to ensure they are compliant with law and internal policies, including Chapter 52.4: Adjudication of Misconduct and Suspensions of Members, Chapter 52.5: Disciplinary Matrix / Penalty Schedule, and Chapter 52.1: Complaint Intake and Investigation.

PIB CASE TRACKING NUMBER (CTN): 2025-0190-P, 2025-0213-P, 2025-0228-P

OIPM TRACKING NUMBERS: CC2025-0019

PIB COMPLAINANT: D[redacted] G[redacted]

OIPM COMPLAINANT: D[redacted] G[redacted]

DATE OF INCIDENT: April 6, 2024

INVOLVED NOPD EMPLOYEES:

Named in Formal Disciplinary Investigation (FDI):

Police Officer Calvin Thompson (CTN 2025-0190-P)
Sergeant Perrin Gaines (CTN 2025-0190-P)
Lieutenant Ernest Luster (CTN 2025-0190-P)

Police Officer Calvin Thompson (CTN 2025-0213-P)
Senior Police Officer Joshua Diaz (CTN 2025-0213-P)
Senior Police Officer Christopher Jennings (CTN 2025-0213-P)
Sergeant Perrin Gaines (CTN 2025-0213-P)
Sergeant Kimera Woods Dufeal (CTN 2025-0213-P)
Lieutenant Ernest Luster (CTN 2025-0213-P)

Police Investigative Specialist Dwight Richards (CTN 2025-0228-P)

Involved but Not Named in Formal Disciplinary Investigation (FDI):

Police Officer Roberto Alfonzo (No longer employed by NOPD at time of FDIs)

INVESTIGATING OFFICER:

CTN 2025-0190-P:

Police Investigative Specialist Dwight Richards, PIB

CTN 2025-0213-P:

Sergeant Willie Jenkins III, PSAB

CTN 2025-0228-P:

Sergeant Travis Johnson, PSAB

IPM Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

ALLEGATION FINDINGS BY PIB:

CTN 2025-0190-P		
OFFICER / EMPLOYEE	**ALLEGATION**	**INVESTIGATING OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**
Police Officer Calvin Thompson	***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 6. Failing to comply with instructions, oral or written, from any authoritative source; to wit NOPD Chapter 82.1 - Report Preparation, Paragraph 8***	UNFOUNDED (CBC)
Sgt. Perrin Gaines	***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 1. Failing to take appropriate and necessary police action.***	UNFOUNDED (CBC)
Lt. Ernest Luster	***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (b) Supervisory Responsibilities***	UNFOUNDED (CBC)

CTN 2025-0213-P		
OFFICER / EMPLOYEE	**ALLEGATION**	**INVESTIGATING OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**
Police Officer Calvin Thompson	***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 6. Failing to comply with instructions, oral or written, from any authoritative source; to wit NOPD Chapter 82.1 - Report Preparation, Paragraph 8*** ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 6. Failing to comply with instructions, oral or written, from any authoritative source; to wit NOPD Chapter 41.3.10 - Body-Worn Camera ("BWC"), Paragraph 11(a)***	UNFOUNDED (SUSTAINED VIA COVER LETTER) UNFOUNDED

IPM Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

Sgt. Perrin Gaines	***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (b) Supervisory Responsibilities*** ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 6. Failing to comply with instructions, oral or written, from any authoritative source; to wit NOPD Chapter 41.3.10 - Body-Worn Camera ("BWC"), Paragraph 11(a)***	EXONERATED SUSTAINED
SPO Joshua Diaz	***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 1. Failing to take appropriate and necessary police action.***	UNFOUNDED
Sgt. Kimera Woods Dufeal	***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (b) Supervisory Responsibilities*** ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 6. Failing to comply with instructions, oral or written, from any authoritative source; to wit NOPD Chapter 41.13 - Bias-Free Policing, Paragraph 3***	EXONERATED UNFOUNDED
SPO Christopher Jennings	***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 3: Devoting Entire Time to Duty*** ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 6. Failing to comply with instructions, oral or written, from any authoritative source; to wit NOPD Chapter 41.3.10 - Body-Worn Camera ("BWC"), Paragraph 11(a)***	UNFOUNDED UNFOUNDED
Lt. Ernest Luster	***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (b) Supervisory Responsibilities***	EXONERATED

IPM Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

CTN 2025-0228-P		
OFFICER / EMPLOYEE	**ALLEGATION**	**INVESTIGATING OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**
Police Investigative Specialist Dwight Richards	***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 8. Failing to thoroughly search for, collect, preserve, and identify evidence in an arrest or investigative situation;***	UNFOUNDED

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS / TERMS

Complainant	Person who filed the misconduct complaint
Ofc.	Officer
SPO	Senior Police Officer
Det.	Detective
Sgt.	Sergeant
Lt.	Lieutenant
OIPM	Office of the Independent Police Monitor
NOPD	New Orleans Police Department
Capt.	Captain
PIB	Public Integrity Bureau
PSAB	Professional Standards and Accountability Bureau
BWC	Body Worn Camera
CBC	Cleared by Camera
FDI	Formal Disciplinary Investigation
ICC	In-Car Camera
EPR	Electronic Police Report

IPM Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED BY OIPM FOR CASE REVIEW

CTN 2025-0190-P and accompanying exhibits	CTN 2025-0213-P and accompanying exhibits
CTN 2025-0228-P and accompanying exhibits	D-05248-24 Electronic Police Report
D-05314-24 Electronic Police Report	D-05314-24 Electronic Police Report, Supplemental (6/17/2024)
D-05315-24 Electronic Police Report, Supplemental (8/19/2025)	OIPM Complaint Referral Letter CC2025–0019
Body-Worn Camera Footage, NOPD Item No. D-05248-24	Body-Worn Camera Footage, NOPD Item No. D-05315-24

SUMMARY OF THE FACTS

Initial Incident – April 5–6, 2024

On April 5, 2024, D[redacted] G[redacted] ("G[redacted]") contacted the Civil District Court Constable to evict his tenant, J[redacted] S[redacted] ("[redacted]"), from his rental property located at [redacted]. According to NOPD Electronic Police Report (EPR) D-05248-24, the Constable declined to execute the eviction after contacting a judge from Section C of Civil District Court, who advised that S[redacted] should not be removed because G[redacted] had accepted rent payment. S[redacted] informed responding personnel that a court hearing regarding the matter was scheduled for Monday (April 8, 2024).

On April 6, 2024, G[redacted] contacted the New Orleans Police Department (NOPD) and reported that S[redacted] had cut a padlock to the property's electrical box at [redacted]. According to G[redacted], G[redacted] was the one who installed the padlock onto the property's electrical box.

While officers were present at the location in response to that call, a third party, R[redacted] C[redacted] ("C[redacted]"), arrived at the scene. According to G[redacted], C[redacted] was armed with a firearm in his waistband and engaged in a verbal dispute with G[redacted]. This encounter was documented under NOPD Item D-05248-24.

In a recorded statement provided to the Public Integrity Bureau (PIB) on April 24, 2025, G[redacted] alleged that:

- C[redacted] arrived armed and threatened him in the presence of officers;
- The threats were not accurately or fully documented in EPR D-05248-24;
- C[redacted] was not arrested at the scene despite the EPR reflecting that he was; and
- Body-worn camera footage shows that C[redacted] was not taken into custody.

IPM Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

Later on April 6, 2024, a second encounter occurred between G[redacted] and C[redacted]. That event was documented under NOPD Item No. D-05315-24. The investigative record reflects two materially conflicting accounts of the same roadway encounter. According to G[redacted]'s statement to PIB, after leaving [redacted], G[redacted] was traveling on Hayne Boulevard when C[redacted] pulled alongside his vehicle in a black Jeep. G[redacted] stated that C[redacted] pointed a black rifle at him from the passenger side window. G[redacted] reported that he fled the area and returned toward Henley Street, where G[redacted] located Police Officer Calvin Thompson near Wales Avenue and Henley Street and reported the incident.

According to NOPD Item No. D-05315-24, C[redacted] provided a different account to responding officers. C[redacted] stated that G[redacted] followed him while driving and pointed a firearm at him. C[redacted] reported that he retrieved a firearm because he feared for his life. C[redacted] further stated that approximately 30 minutes after returning home, he observed G[redacted] driving at a high rate of speed down his street.

Officers later searched C[redacted]'s residence and recovered a black Glock handgun. Based on the conflicting statements provided by both parties, arrest warrants were issued for both C[redacted] and G[redacted]. G[redacted] was arrested on June 17, 2024, after surrendering at his residence.

FORMAL DISCIPLINARY INVESTIGATION – CTN 2025-0190-P

CTN 2025-0190-P was initiated on April 24, 2025, following G[redacted]'s complaint regarding the April 5–6, 2024 incident. Investigator Dwight Richards was assigned to the matter. On April 24, 2025, Richards conducted and recorded G[redacted]'s intake interview at PIB. Two recordings were created because G[redacted] requested to provide additional information after the initial recording concluded.

During the course of the investigation, Investigator Richards:

- Reviewed Electronic Police Report D-05248-24;
- Reviewed body-worn camera footage from Sergeant Perrin Gaines, Police Officer Calvin Thompson, and Police Officer Roberto Alfonzo related to D-05248-24;
- Contacted Entergy regarding G[redacted]'s attempts to cancel S[redacted]'s energy account at [redacted].

After reviewing the evidence, Investigator Richards reached the following findings:

<u>Police Officer Calvin Thompson</u>

Allegation: ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 6. Failing to comply with instructions, oral or written, from any authoritative source; to wit NOPD Chapter 82.1 – Report Preparation, Paragraph 8***.

Finding: UNFOUNDED.

Investigator Richards concluded that Thompson interviewed all parties and authored an Electronic Police Report that was thorough and corroborated by body-worn camera footage.

Sergeant Perrin Gaines

Allegation: ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 1. Failing to take appropriate and necessary police action***.

Finding: UNFOUNDED.

Investigator Richards concluded that the dispute was civil in nature and that officers lacked authority to execute an eviction.

Lieutenant Ernest Luster

Allegation: ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (b) Supervisory Responsibilities***.

Finding: UNFOUNDED.

Investigator Richards determined that body-worn camera footage corroborated the report under Item D-05248-24 and supported supervisory approval.

On May 2, 2025, Investigator Richards issued Form 308 Notices of Completed Investigation and classified CTN 2025-0190-P as "Cleared by Camera (CBC)."

FORMAL DISCIPLINARY INVESTIGATION – CTN 2025-0213-P

On May 5, 2025, D[redacted] G[redacted] filed a second complaint, initiating CTN 2025-0213-P. Investigator Cornell Manuel conducted the intake investigation of CTN 2025-0213-P. After interviewing G[redacted] Investigator Manuel identified the following allegations and potential policy violations:

- Allegation that Police Officer Calvin Thompson authored a false report under NOPD Item D-05315-24 which misrepresented the details of the incident, including indicating that Richard Carter was arrested when he was not.

  Potential Violation: ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 6. Failing to comply with instructions, oral or written, from any authoritative source; to wit NOPD Chapter 82.1 – Report Preparation, Paragraph 8***.
- Allegation that Police Officer Calvin Thompson, Sergeant Perrin Gaines, and Senior Police Officer Christopher Jennings failed to activate their body-worn cameras throughout the duration of NOPD Item D-05315-24.

  Potential Violations: ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 6. Failing to comply with instructions, oral or written, from any authoritative source; to wit NOPD Chapter 41.3.10 – Body-Worn Camera ("BWC"), Paragraph 11(a)***.

IPM Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

- Allegation that Sergeant Perrin Gaines released R[redacted] C[redacted] despite a warrant being issued for his arrest.

  Potential Violation: ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (b) Supervisory Responsibilities***.
- Allegation that Detective Joshua Diaz approved G[redacted]'s arrest without investigation.

  Potential Violation: ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 1. Failing to take appropriate and necessary police action***.
- Allegation that Lieutenant Ernest Luster approved an inaccurate Electronic Police Report.

  Potential Violation: ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (b) Supervisory Responsibilities***.
- Allegation that Sergeant Kimera Woods Dufeal signed off on an Affidavit for Arrest Warrant for G[redacted]'s arrest.

  Potential Violation: ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (b) Supervisory Responsibilities***
- Allegation that Sergeant Kimera Woods Dufeal engaged in bias-based policing during NOPD Item J-05422-24.

  Potential Violation: ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 6. Failing to comply with instructions, oral or written, from any authoritative source; to wit NOPD Chapter 41.13 – Bias-Free Policing, Paragraph 3***.
- Allegation that Senior Police Officer Christopher Jennings did not devote his entire time to the investigation under NOPD Item D-05315-24.

  Potential Violation: ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 3: Devoting Entire Time to Duty***.

G[redacted] additionally filed a complaint directly with the OIPM concerning the above-described allegations. Complaint referral letter CC2025-0019 was generated as a result, raising suggested violations against the involved officers. CC2025-0019 was submitted to PIB on May 7, 2025 as a supplemental complaint. The OIPM requested CC2025-0019 be provided to the assigned investigators of CTN 2025-0190-P and CTN 2025-0213-P for use in their investigations.

Sgt. Willie Jenkins III was assigned to the CTN 2025-0213-P FDI on June 3, 2025. He interviewed G[redacted] on June 17, 2025 and interviewed the named officers between July 7 and July 30, 2025. Additional supervisory interviews were conducted in early August 2025.

On August 13, 2025, Sgt. Jenkins issued findings and recommendations, including Supervisory Feedback Logs (SFLs) and counseling where applicable. His findings included sustained, exonerated, and unfounded determinations across the various allegations. Deputy Superintendent Jonette Williams authored a cover letter on August 18, 2025, recommending one violation against Police Officer Calvin Thompson, ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated***

Acts/Omissions; 6. Failing to comply with instructions, oral or written, from any authoritative source; to wit NOPD Chapter 82.1 – Report Preparation, Paragraph 8, be sustained after Sgt. Jenkins initially recommended the violation be unfounded.

FORMAL DISCIPLINARY INVESTIGATION – CTN 2025-0228-P

The CTN 2025-0228-P formal disciplinary investigation was initiated after G[redacted] alleged that Investigator Dwight Richards compromised CTN 2025-0190-P by notifying the accused officers of the complaint.

Sergeant Travis Johnson was assigned to investigate the complaint on June 4, 2025. The alleged violation was ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 8. Failing to thoroughly search for, collect, preserve, and identify evidence in an arrest or investigative situation***.

Sgt. Johnson conducted interviews in July 2025, including interviews of Sergeant Perrin Gaines, Police Officer Calvin Thompson, and Investigator Dwight Richards.

On July 25, 2025, Sgt. Johnson issued a Form 308 Notice recommending that the allegation be unfounded.

IPM Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

Timeline

April 5, 2024

Source: G[redacted]'s PIB Audio Statement Pt.; G[redacted] PIB taped statement.

Constable came to [redacted] and declined to evict J[redacted] S[redacted] from the property.

April 6, 2024

Source: PIB referral in 019 Complaint Folder; G[redacted] PIB taped statement

D[redacted] G[redacted] called the police on his tenant J[redacted] S[redacted] for allegedly cutting his padlock to his property's electrical box at [redacted] This incident is classified under NOPD item no. D-05248-24.

April 6, 2024

Source: PIB referral in 019 Complaint Folder; EPR D05315-24

Incident between D[redacted] G[redacted] and R[redacted] C[redacted]on at Hayne Blvd. and Read Blvd. which resulted in NOPD item no. D-05315-24.

June 17, 2024

Source: NOPD Supplemental Report D-05315-24 from 6/17/24

D[redacted] G[redacted] was arrested for aggravated assault under item number D-05315-24.

March 25, 2025

Source: PIB referral in 019 Complaint Folder

G[redacted] contacts OIPM resulting in OIPM Complaint No. CC2025-0019.

April 24, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0213-P

Investigator Dwight J Richards of PIB interviews G[redacted] at PIB initiating the investigation for PIB CTN 2025-0190-P. Investigator Richards records two interviews with G[redacted] on this day.

April 25, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0190-P

Richards reviews EPR for D-05248-24.

April 25, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0190-P

Richards reviews the BWC of Ofc. Roberto Alfonzo from 4/6/24 under item no. D-05248-24

April 30, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0190-P

Richards reviews BWC for Ofc. Calvin Thompson from 4/6/24 under item no. D-05248-24.

May 1, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0190-P

Richards reviews second BWC for Ofc. Calvin Thompson from 4/6/24 under item no. D-05248-24.

Richards contacts Entergy to ask about the status of the electricity at 7820 Henley around 4/6/24.

Richards concludes all allegations against the officers in this case were 'Unfounded.'

IPM Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

May 2, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0190-P

Richards submits recommended dispositions for the investigation under 2025-0190-P, recommending all allegations against the officers be "Unfounded". The investigation was classified as "Cleared by Camera." Richards emailed a notice of a Completed Investigation (form 308) to each: Ofc. Calvin Thompson and supervisor, Lt. Ernest Luster and his supervisor, and Sgt. Perrin Gaines and his supervisor.

May 5, 2025

Source: Intake Files for CTN 2025-0213-P; Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0213-P

Gentry files a complaint with Investigator Cornell Manual at PIB alleging that PO Calvin Thompson wrote a false report for item no. D-05315-24 and alleging that Richard Carter assaulted G[redacted] on April 6, 2024. This initiated PIB CTN 2025-0213-P.

May 7, 2025

Source: OIPM PIB Referral Letter CC2025-0019

OIPM submits complaint supplementary letter to PIB to supplement PIB Cases 2025-0190-P and 2025-0213-P.

May 8, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0228-P

G[redacted] files a complaint with PIB against Investigator Dwight Richard which is assigned to CTN 2025-0228-P.

June 3, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0213-P

Sgt. Willie Jenkins III is assigned to the administrative investigation under CTN 2025-0213-P.

June 5, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0213-P

Sgt. Jenkins requested an extension for the investigation related to CTN 2025-0213-P.

June 10, 2025

Source: OIPM Supplemental Complaint Narrative in CC2025-0047 Folder

Gentry contacts OIPM regarding his previous complaint, CTN2025-0228-P, to request OIPM submit a supplemental complaint concerning Investigator Dwight Richards.

June 11, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0213-P

Sgt. Jenkins sent G[redacted] the initial contact letter via email for the investigation related to CTN 2025-0213-P.

June 13, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0213-P

Sgt. Jenkins learned of the previous investigation under CTN 2025-0190-P.

June 17, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0213-P

Sgt. Jenkins spoke with G[redacted] by phone. On this call G[redacted] detailed his complaint and alleged assault by R[redacted] C[redacted]

June 25, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0213-P

Sgt. Jenkins returned a missed call from G[redacted] and records their conversation.

OIPM Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

July 1, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0213-P

Sgt. Jenkins learned that his extension request was granted by the City's Civil Service Commission.

July 7, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0213-P

Sgt. Jenkins interviewed Officer Calvin Thompson.

July 8, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0213-P

Sgt. Jenkins interviewed Officer Joshua Diaz.

July 10, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0213-P

Sgt. Jenkins interviewed Sgt. Perrin Gaines.

July 16, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0213-P

Sgt. Jenkins conducted a follow-up interview with Sgt. Perrin Gaines.

Sgt. Jenkins conducted another interview with Officer Joshua Diaz because of technical issues with the previous interview's audio.

July 21, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0213-P

Sgt. Jenkins interviewed Sgt. Kimera Woods Dufeal.

July 30, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0213-P

Sgt. Jenkins interviewed Officer Christopher Jennings.

August 4, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0213-P

Lt. Travis Brooks interviewed Lt. Ernest Luster about his approval of an EPR for D-05315-24.

August 5, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0213-P

Lt. Brooks conducted a follow-up interview with Officer Calvin Thompson to ask about witness interviews related to the matter under D-05315-24.

August 13, 2025

Source: Signed Investigation CTN 2025-0213-P

Sgt. Jenkins sent the completed Signed Investigation for CTN 2025-0213-P to Chief Kirkpatrick.

August 18, 2025

Source: letter from Jonette Williams to Chief Kirkpatrick

Chief Jonette Williams sent a letter to Chief Kirkpatrick concurring with all of Sgt. Jenkins recommendations except for the recommendation regarding Officer Calvin Thompson's violation of Rule 4...Neglect of Duty. Chief Williams recommends that violation be "sustained" due to the omission of a witness statement.

August 19, 2025

Source: NOPD Supplemental Report D-05315-24 from 8/19/25

Officer Calvin Thompson spoke to L[redacted] B[redacted] who is the neighbor of R[redacted] C[redacted], B[redacted] confirmed he observed a vehicle following C[redacted] as he arrived home. No date is mentioned in this supplement.

IPM Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

METHODOLOGY FOR COMPLAINT REVIEW

In conducting its review, the OIPM utilized a matrix of first and second-level reviewers. This matrix contained 73 questions designed to evaluate the quality, completeness, and findings of the completed investigation, including whether the discipline imposed was justified and appropriate in light of the surrounding circumstances, the employee's disciplinary history, and current department disciplinary standards. The matrix separated the investigation into the following eight categories for review: Complaint Administration; Complaint Processing; Complaint Classification; Investigation; Interviews; Adjudication & Discipline/Training; Disciplinary History; and Risk Management & Liability Issues.

The purpose of this case review is to review both the actions taken at the scene by the responding officer (the accused officer) and the actions taken by the Investigating Officer of the misconduct investigation. In the case review, the OIPM will identify missed opportunities or strengths of the misconduct investigation, additional allegations that could have been raised, constitutional or legal concerns, training and policy recommendations, and present unanswered questions.

A summary of our review of the investigation is as follows:

OIPM ANALYSIS

I. Are there disciplinary charges not included in the PIB investigations which the OIPM asserts could have been brought?

A. Failed to Check if Bystander Can Legally Carry a Concealed Firearm – Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 1. Failing to take appropriate and necessary police action.

The complainant, D[redacted] G[redacted], expressed in his first CTN 2025-0190-P statement to Investigator Dwight Richards that a bystander, R[redacted] C[redacted], was present on scene during the initial incident while carrying a concealed firearm.[1] The complainant said to Investigator Richards that the officers on scene: "didn't even check to see if he had a concealed weapon license."[2] This allegation was stated by G[redacted] briefly during the complainant's initial interview. Additionally, the presence of the concealed weapon was raised at several points in the complainant's written statement provided to PIB on April 24, 2025.[3]

The complainant again raised the allegation that officers failed to verify if C[redacted] was legally carrying a concealed weapon during the May 5, 2025, CTN 2025-0213-P intake statement, taken by Investigator Cornell Manuel. In his statement, G[redacted] stated:

---

[1] CTN 2025-0190-P, G[redacted] First Audio Statement, at 7:53.
Note: The CTN 2025-0190-P investigation was Cleared by Camera, and as such does not have a defined "Exhibits List" as required in a standard formal disciplinary investigation. As such, throughout this case review the OIPM will cite to the specific documents and files contained in the full CTN 2025-0190-P case, referring to each specific document / file by name.
[2] *Id.* at 7:55.
[3] CTN 2025-0190-P, G[redacted] 4/24/2025 Typed Statement, ¶¶ 6, 22, 31.

IPM Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

"They [the officers] didn't check to see if he [C[redacted]] had a concealed weapon license, which is what's required at the time."[4]

This allegation was also formally recommended in the OIPM complaint, CC2025-0019. The OIPM raised the allegation of ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 04: Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 1. Failing to take appropriate and necessary police action*** against Officer Thompson and Sgt. Perrin Gaines, stating:

"According to the complainant, the accused officer should have verified if a bystander on scene during NOPD incident #D-05248-24 had a valid permit for their concealed firearm after the individual disclosed the presence of the firearm to officers."[5]

Despite the allegation being raised by the OIPM in CC2025-0019 and expressed by the complainant during both the CTN 2025-0190-P and CTN 2025-0213-P investigations, this allegation was never investigated in either CTN 2025-0190-P or CTN 2025-0213-P.

On April 6, 2024, carrying a concealed gun in New Orleans was governed by Municipal Code § 54-341 and state law La. R.S. 14:95. Louisiana later allowed concealed carry without a permit statewide, but New Orleans kept its permit requirement until August 2024. Therefore, at the time of the incident, a person carrying a concealed firearm in Orleans parish had to have a valid permit.[6]

Here, the gun carried by C[redacted] appears to fit the legal definition of a concealed firearm. A firearm does not have to be completely hidden to be considered concealed, seeing part of a gun does not mean it was

---

[4] CTN 2025-0213-P, Exhibit L, at 8:17.
[5] OIPM Complaint Referral Letter CC2025-0019.
[6] The codes read as follows prior to the August 2024 changes:
Municipal Code § 54-341
(a) It shall be unlawful for any person to commit the crime of illegal carrying of weapons. Illegal carrying of weapons is the intentional concealment or attempted intentional concealment on one's person of any firearm or other instrumentality customarily used or intended for probable use as a dangerous weapon.
(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to duly appointed law enforcement officers or any other person duly authorized to carry concealed weapons.
(c) Whoever commits the crime of illegal carrying of a weapon shall be subject to a mandatory sentence of not less than three nor more than six months in jail and, at the discretion of the court, a fine of $500.00. The mandatory jail term shall not be suspended. The clerk of the municipal court shall keep a separate log or registry of the disposition and explanations for disposition of all prosecutions for violation of this section and shall report thereon to the city council and the superintendent of police on a quarterly basis.
(Code 1956, § 42-56)

La. RS 14:95 - Illegal carrying of weapons
A. Illegal carrying of weapons is any of the following:
(1)(a) The intentional concealment of any firearm, or other instrumentality customarily used or intended for probable use as a dangerous weapon, on one's person.
(b) The provisions of this Paragraph shall not apply to a person with a valid concealed handgun permit issued pursuant to R.S. 40:1379.1.1, 1379.3, or 1379.3.2 nor shall it prohibit a person with a valid concealed handgun permit issued pursuant to R.S. 40:1379.1.1, 1379.3, or 1379.3.2 from carrying a concealed firearm or other instrumentality customarily used or intended for probable use as a dangerous weapon on his person unless otherwise prohibited by this Section.

carried openly.[7] Courts look at the facts of each case, including how the gun was carried and whether the person appeared to be trying to hide it.[8] In this situation, during the verbal encounter, C[redacted] told Officer Thompson that he was carrying a firearm. On Officer Thompson's body-worn camera, C[redacted] can be heard stating that he was "strapped."[9] The investigator also noted that part of the firearm was visible protruding from C[redacted]'s right pants pocket.[10] Because the firearm was only partially visible and remained inside his clothing, the facts suggest the gun was probably unknown to officers until C[redacted] announced its presence.

Because New Orleans still required concealed carry permits at the time, responding officers were required to check whether C[redacted] had a valid permit and was legally allowed to carry a gun, under Municipal Code § 54-341 and La. R.S. 14:95. NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 contains no indication that Officer Thompson, Sgt. Gaines, or Officer Alfonzo requested a permit, checked C[redacted]'s eligibility, or conducted any required legal checks according to the law.

Although the complainant raised this concern in both CTN 2025-0190-P and CTN 2025-0213-P, and the OIPM formally raised the allegation in CC2025-0019, PIB classified the complaint in CTN 2025-0190-P as "Cleared by Camera (CBC)" and PSAB did not investigate the allegation in CTN 2025-0213-P. A CBC classification does not give an investigator the opportunity to evaluate whether an officer actions complied with law or policy. As a result, neither PIB or PSAB analyzed, in either CTN 2025-0190-P or CTN 2025-0213-P, whether the officers failed to take required police action when they did not verify that C[redacted] could legally carry a concealed weapon.

Because the CTN 2025-0190-P investigation was limited to a CBC investigation, it did not investigate whether officers complied with ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4(c)(1)***. This omission, as well as the complete omission of this allegation in CTN 2025-0213-P, prevented any meaningful administrative review of whether officers neglected their duty under ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4(c)(1)***, and allowed a potentially serious legal and safety violation to go unexamined.

B. Bias Allegation

G[redacted] raised concerns that the officers' response to NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 and their reporting afterwards showed preferential treatment and favoritism towards J[redacted] S[redacted] and C[redacted]. G[redacted] similarly raised concerns that C[redacted] received preferential treatment throughout NOPD Item No. D-05315-24. G[redacted] stated he believed officers treated C[redacted] more favorably by releasing C[redacted] at the scene and not immediately arresting C[redacted]. G[redacted] said these actions amounted to bias or preferential treatment. However, both the CTN 2025-0190-P and CTN 2025-0213-P investigations did not clearly define or analyze potential officer bias during either incident under NOPD policy.

---

[7] *See State v. Dyer*, 388 So. 2d 374, 376–77 (La. 1980).
[8] *See State v. Fluker*, 311 So. 2d 863, 865–66 (La. 1975).
[9] Calvin Thompson BWC, at 11:40. Title: 7721 MILL ST, ID: D-05277-24/D-05248-24. Serial: X60AC722A, Model: Axon Body 3.
[10] CTN 2025-0190-P, Public Integrity Bureau Intake Investigation/Determination, Page 6.

NOPD Chapter 41.13 defines bias-based policing as an inappropriate reliance, to any degree, on a protected characteristic such as race, ethnicity, gender, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, economic status, age, disability, housing status, or other identifiable group, when making a law enforcement decision.[11] A bias violation requires that a protected characteristic influenced the officer's actions.

Throughout G's first intake interview for CTN 2025-0190-P, G repeatedly states that officers were biased against him (G) during their response to NOPD Item D-05248-24. G cited omissions in the EPR, officers allegedly standing by and letting C threaten G, and not arresting S as evidence of the bias against G and the preferential treatment towards C and S.

Additionally, in G's written statement for CTN 2025-0190-P, G alleges at several points that officers were biased against him. G's written statement for CTN 2025-0190-P did not reference any protected characteristic but does specifically request review of whether officers complied with NOPD chapters regarding Bias-Free Policing.

During G's first intake interview for CTN 2025-0190-P, Investigator Richards acknowledged these concerns and noted that such conduct, while still possibly being in violation of ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty***, may not meet the NOPD's definition of bias. Investigator Richards further provides G with a summary of bias as defined in NOPD policy, stating "bias is him being racially based, culturally biased, anything like that."[12] G immediately states "gender bias" may be present, suggesting that G believed officers were biased against him because of his gender.[13] This would have been an opportunity to ask G follow-up questions for G to explain why he believed officers were biased due to his gender and if it was appropriate to raise the allegation of ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c)(6) to wit NOPD Ch. 41.13 Bias-Free Policing, Par. 3.*** However, that did not occur.

G raised similar allegations in CTN 2025-0213-P. In that investigation, Sgt. Kimera Woods Dufeal was investigated for an alleged violation of ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c)(6) to wit NOPD Ch. 41.13 Bias-Free Policing, Par. 3***. The investigation determined that allegation was unfounded. G's allegations in CTN 2025-0213-P were largely the same as those G previously made in CTN 2025-0190-P, alleging the officers were biased because the officer omitted information from their police reports and decided not to arrest C. G's written statement in CTN 2025-0213-P also alleges bias at several points without identifying a protected characteristic and requests a review of the involved officers' compliance with NOPD Bias-Free Policing policies.[14]

[11] NOPD Chapter 41.13: Bias-Free Policing, 7/10/2016.
[12] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 1, at 10:57 – 11:03.
[13] *Id*.
[14] CTN 2025-0213-P, Exhibit B, Page 8, 10 – 11.

In G[redacted]'s recorded intake statement in CTN 2025-0213-P, G[redacted] did identify a protected characteristic. Specifically, in reference to Sgt. Woods Dufeal, he stated, "I think she's very biased based on my economic statute."[15] G[redacted] goes on to explain that he believes Sgt. Woods Dufeal may have been biased due to his status as a landlord and made statements about him being "uppity". The CTN 2025-0213-P investigation determined that Sgt. Woods Dufeal's referenced conduct occurred during NOPD Item No. J-05422-24, which is unrelated to the other two incidents occurring in April 2024. The investigator ultimately determined that the allegation against Sgt. Woods Dufeal was unfounded.

The OIPM raised suggested allegations of ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c)(6) to wit NOPD Ch. 41.13 Bias-Free Policing*** against Officer Thompson and Sgt. Gaines in their complaint referral letter submission to PIB (CC2025-0019).[16] However, neither officer was investigated for potential violations of Chapter 41.13. CC2025-0019 specifically noted that the complainant alleged that the officers were biased against the complainant during both NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 and NOPD Item No. D-05315-24, noting that the complainant referenced his gender and economic status as the reason for this bias, including the complainant's assertion that officers may have felt pity for S[redacted] for being unable to pay her rent on time, therefore favoring her over G[redacted], her landlord. [17]

Preferential treatment, by itself, is not automatically bias under policy. To evaluate a bias-based policing allegation, investigators must determine whether enforcement decisions were influenced by a protected characteristic. CTN 2025-0190-P referenced bias but did not apply the Chapter 41.13 framework or analyze whether any protected characteristic was implicated. Instead, the allegation was largely reframed as a neglect-of-duty issue. CTN 2025-0213-P did not conduct a bias investigation (except for Sgt. Woods Dufeal, concerning a separate incident) and did not evaluate the allegation under the policy definition. As a result, the investigations did not clearly determine:

- Whether a protected characteristic was alleged;
- Whether any evidence supported such an allegation; or
- Whether the Bias-Free Policing policy was implicated at all.

Because the allegation was not investigated under Chapter 41.13, OIPM cannot substantively assess whether the policy was violated.

This does not mean that a complainant's perceptions of unfair treatment should be dismissed. Perceived unequal treatment can affect community trust. However, under the policy definition, a bias finding requires evidence that a protected characteristic influenced the officer's decision-making.[18] The investigator did not conduct that investigation despite the complainant raising such allegations at multiple

[15] CTN 2025-0213-P, *supra* note 4, at 25:57 – 26:02.
[16] CC2025-0019, *supra* note 5, Page 3 - 4.
[17] *Id*.
[18] NOPD Chapter 41.13, *supra* note 11.

times, and despite the OIPM's complaint referral letter specifically raising a bias allegation against Officer Thompson and Sgt. Gaines, pointing out the complainant's allegation related to two protected characteristics. Due to the complainant's repeated allegations of bias, as well as the OIPM raising such allegations formally, the OIPM asserts that the CTN 2025-0213-P investigation should have investigated Officer Thompson and Sgt. Gaines for potential violations of ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c)(6) to wit NOPD Ch. 41.13 Bias-Free Policing, Par. 3*** for their conduct during NOPD Item Nos. D-05248-24 and D-05315-24.

C. Missing and Incorrect Information in the Police Reports – Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 6. Failing to comply with instructions, oral or written, from any authoritative source; to wit NOPD Chapter 82.1 - Report Preparation

Before addressing the reporting issues below, it is important to explain what each investigation reviewed. Although both investigations investigated whether the involved officers failed to properly document information in their reports, each investigation focused on only one specific issue. As a result, they did not address the full scope of the complainant's concerns about the officers' report writing. While some of the allegations could have been combined into a single policy violation for review, the investigations remained limited in scope and did not examine all the complainant's allegations related to report writing.

In CTN 2025-0190-P the investigator reviewed both body-worn camera footage as well as the electronic police report (EPR) in NOPD Item No. D-05248-24. Officer Calvin Thompson was investigated for potential violations of ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c)(6), to wit NOPD Chapter 82.1 (Report Preparation) Paragraph 8***. This investigation focused on the allegation that the report was "inaccurate" and that statements and allegations made on scene were not documented within the report. The investigator ultimately determined that the allegation was unfounded, stating "The EPR under item # D-05248-24, was thorough and reflected the facts of the investigation and was corroborated by BWC. Officer Calvin Thompson did not violate policy relative to report preparation."[19] This investigation, which was classified as Cleared by Camera, failed to capture the full scope of the complainant's allegations regarding report writing which are discussed below.

Similarly, ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c)(6), to wit NOPD Chapter 82.1 (Report Preparation) Paragraph 8*** was raised in CTN 2025-0213-P against Officer Calvin Thompson. However, that allegation was limited to Officer Thompson's failure to document a material witness during the D-05315-24 investigation.[20] It did not address the other reporting concerns discussed in this section below.

[19] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 10, Page 8.
[20] CTN 2025-0213-P Signed Investigation, Page 14.

a. Failure to Document Firearm

G[redacted] consistently alleged that the Electronic Police Report (EPR) associated with NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 failed to document that R[redacted] C[redacted] was in possession of a firearm during the incident.

G[redacted] first raised this allegation in his initial CTN 2025-0190-P interview, stating "One of the guys had a gun which he didn't even mention in the report."[21] G[redacted] further stated, "And then the fact that he brought a gun, he probably was going to do something else to me. They didn't mention that into the report."[22] G[redacted] emphasized this allegation again, stating "The police knew he had a pistol. They didn't even put the… mention the fact that he had a gun when he was making these threats in the police report. They didn't even mention a gun at all."[23] G[redacted] raises this allegation again three times in his written statement provided during CTN 2025-0190-P. G[redacted] first stated, "Officer Thompson conveniently left out of his NOPD Incident Report D-05248-24 the fact that C[redacted] had showed G[redacted] his concealed handgun (Glock 17)."[24] G[redacted] then stated, "Once again Officer Thompson did not mention the real gun in his report."[25] G[redacted] noted this allegation again in his conclusion, summarizing that an investigation should include "Omissions in Report: Key details, such as C[redacted] displaying a concealed weapon during the incident, were omitted from the report..."[26] This allegation was again raised in the OIPM complaint referral letter, CC2025-0019, which raised a suggested violation of ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4(a): Neglect of Duty (General), to wit NOPD Chapter 82.1 (Report Preparation) Paragraph 8*** against Officer Thompson for his report writing pertaining to the D-05248-24 incident.

OIPM reviewed NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 report and confirmed that C[redacted]'s possession of a firearm is not recorded anywhere in the narrative. Officer Calvin Thompson body-worn camera shows C[redacted] telling Officer Thompson that he was armed and can be heard stating that he was "strapped."[27] The video also shows a firearm protruding from C[redacted]'s right pants pocket. Despite this, the report written by Officer Thompson contains no reference to C[redacted]'s firearm possession.[28]

Although this omission was specifically alleged by the complainant, and although the PIB investigator did review the report for completeness and accuracy in CTN 2025-0190-P, the allegation against Officer Thompson was determined to be unfounded.

---

[21] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 1, at 7:26 – 7:30.
[22] *Id*. at 8:15 – 8:24.
[23] *Id*. at 14:42 – 14:55.
[24] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 3, ¶ 6.
[25] *Id*. at ¶ 22.
[26] *Id*. at ¶ 31.
[27] Thompson BWC, *supra* note 9.
[28] NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 Electronic Police Report, 4/6/2024.

NOPD Chapter 82.1, Paragraph 4 requires that members make sure reports are sufficiently detailed and reasonably free of errors before submitting.[29] Paragraph 7 further requires that all EPRs accurately reflect the identity of persons involved and all significant information gathered, including what was seen, heard, or otherwise perceived by the officer.[30] Paragraph 8 states that members shall not suppress, conceal or distort the facts of any incident and shall not make an intentionally false, inaccurate or incomplete report.[31]

The failure to document C[redacted]'s firearm possession represents the omission of a critical fact that was directly observed and heard by the reporting officer. C[redacted]'s possession of the firearm, while not central to the investigation in NOPD Item No. D-05248-24, would become relevant as the same firearm was alleged to have been used during the incident related to NOPD Item No. D-05315-24, which stems directly from the confrontations that happened during NOPD Item No. D-05248-24.

This omission raises serious concerns about the report's completeness and accuracy, and it suggests a potential violation of ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 04(c)(6)***, for failure to comply with written reporting requirements. CTN 2025-0213-P found the allegation against Officer Thompson unfounded, but that investigation focused on whether the party's involved statements were omitted or misrepresented, not on whether the firearm's presence was left out of the police report. CTN 2025-0213-P also investigated a neglect of duty allegation for Report Preparation, but that inquiry was limited to a missing material witness in NOPD Item No. D-05315-24 report. It did not address whether Officer Thompson failed to note the firearm's presence in NOPD Item No. D-05248-24. As such, the OIPM asserts that the CTN 2025-0190-P and CTN 2025-0213-P investigations failed to investigate the complainant's allegation that the presence of a firearm was omitted from NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 and both investigations should have investigated Officer Thompson for potential violations of ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c)(6) to wit NOPD Ch. 82.1 Report Preparation, Paragraph 8*** for this specific omission.

b. Failure to Accurately Document R[redacted] C[redacted]'s Arrest Status

G[redacted] reported that the EPR associated with NOPD Item No. D-05315-24 contains an inaccurate entry stating that R[redacted] C[redacted] "was arrested on April 6, 2024, at 12:15pm."[32]

This allegation was mostly discussed by G[redacted] in CTN 2025-0213-P, however, G[redacted] initially briefly mentioned this allegation in his second CTN 2025-0190-P interview, stating "They say he was arrested when he wasn't arrested."[33] and "You put in a report that he was arrested, then you let him go on the

[29] NOPD Chapter 82.1: Report Preparation, 1/14/2018, ¶ 4.
[30] *Id*. ¶ 7.
[31] *Id*. ¶ 8.
[32] CTN 2025-0213-P, *supra* note 14, Page 5.
[33] CTN 2025-0190-P, Gentry Second Audio Statement, at 15:16 – 15:19.

IPM Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

body-cam footage..."[34] This allegation was raised formally by the OIPM in CC2025-0019, stating that NOPD Item No. D-05315-24 report "incorrectly lists one party as arrested when they only had a warrant issued for their arrest."[35] G[redacted] formally raises this allegation in his 5/5/2025 written statement, stating "NOPD Incident Report D-05315-24 reflects that C[redacted] was arrested on April 6, 2024, at 12:15pm... Upon information and belief this documentation is false, written with malice and in reckless disregard of the truth."[36] G[redacted] additionally raised this allegation throughout his CTN 2025-0213-P interview.

The OIPM reviewed the available body-worn camera footage and found that, although C[redacted] was briefly handcuffed, placed in a police unit, and questioned, he was eventually released on the scene.[37] He was not booked, transported, or taken into custody. No formal custodial arrest occurred during the incident. The record reflects that Sgt. Gaines, the on-scene supervisory officer, determined that officers would seek warrants for arrest rather than make an on-scene arrest.[38] However, Officer Thompson's report does not reflect this decision. Instead, it records a specific arrest date and time, creating an impression that C[redacted] was arrested on April 6, 2024.

NOPD Chapter 82.1 requires that police reports accurately reflect the actions taken by officers and the enforcement decisions made.[39] Recording a specific arrest time when no custodial arrest occurred constitutes a material mischaracterization of enforcement action.

The failure to accurately document whether C[redacted] was arrested or released pending a warrant suggests a potential violation of ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 04(c)(6)*** for failing to comply with written reporting requirements governing accuracy and completeness of police reports. This discrepancy is not about whether the decision to make an arrest was legal or not, it is about accurately reflecting what happened in the report.

The complainant raised this issue, and the OIPM suggested this allegation in the CC2015-0019 referral letter.[40] However, the investigator did not compare the report to the body-worn camera footage and did not determine whether this specific error violated Chapter 82.1. Instead, CTN 2025-0190-P investigated whether statements made by parties at the scene during NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 were omitted. CTN 2025-0213-P only looked at whether Officer Thompson failed to include details about a material witness in NOPD Item No. D-05315-24 report, not whether that report incorrectly listed an arrest date for C[redacted], despite this being alleged by G[redacted] multiple times in interviews during both investigations. As a result, it was not investigated whether the report complied with NOPD Chapter 82.1's requirements for

[34] *Id*. at 17:49 – 17:54.
[35] CC2025-0019, *supra* note 5, Page 3.
[36] CTN 2025-0213-P, *supra* note 14, Page 5.
[37] Calvin Thompson BWC, at 2:07 – 57:30. Title: 7820 Means Ave, ID: D-05315-24. Serial: X60AC722A, Model: Axon Body 3.
[38] *Id*. at 56:15.
[39] NOPD Chapter 82.1, *supra* note 29, ¶ 7.
[40] CC2025-0019, *supra* note 5, Page 3.

Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

documenting the enforcement action. The OIPM asserts that the CTN 2025-0190-P and CTN 2025-0213-P failed to investigate the complainant's allegation that NOPD Item No. D-05315-24 report did not accurately document C[redacted]'s arrest status, and as such, the OIPM asserts that Officer Thompson should have been investigated for potential violations of ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c)(6) to wit NOPD Ch. 82.1 Report Preparation, Paragraph 8*** for this specific allegation.

c. Failure to Document Alleged Threatening and Hostile Conduct

G[redacted] consistently alleged that he was verbally threatened while officers were present at the scene and that these threats were not accurately documented in NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 report.

G[redacted] first raised this allegation in his first CTN 2025-0190-P interview, stating "I was threatened with a gun. One of the guys had a gun, which he didn't even mention in the report."[41] The OIPM raised these concerns in its formal submission to PIB (CC2025-0019), noting that the report failed to document the threatening statements that were made on scene or the circumstances behind them.[42]

The first police report records some of the exchange between C[redacted] and G[redacted] such as C[redacted] giving G[redacted] his address and stating he is welcome to come by if he wants "trouble" and that C[redacted] is not the one to "play with."[43] The report also reflects G[redacted]'s comments such as, "He [C[redacted]] better check his jacket he is about whatever" and G[redacted] calling S[redacted] a "broke bitch who needs to pay her rent." The report does state the officers separated the parties and decided not to arrest anyone even though "threatening comments were made on scene" but if anything escalated past an argument, police action would be taken.[44] However, the report does not state all of the threats, what was said, or the circumstances under which the statements occurred. It also did not document the sequence of hostile interactions leading up to the decision to separate the parties.

In G[redacted]'s first CTN 2025-0190-P recorded interview, he reported that after the parties were separated, C[redacted] made repeated statements indicating he wanted to fight and a willingness to go to jail, and that Sgt. Gaines allowed this conduct to continue without documenting it in the report.[45] None of these statements are reflected in NOPD Item No. D-05248-24.

NOPD Chapter 82.1 requires officers to document what they saw, heard, and otherwise perceived, as well as all material facts relevant to an incident.[46] The failure to document the substance and source of threatening and hostile conduct resulted in a report that does not fully record all of the known circumstances that happened during the encounter.

---

[41] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 1, at 7:24 – 7:31.
[42] CC2025-0019, *supra* note 5, Page 3.
[43] D-05248-24, *supra* note 28, Page 3.
[44] *Id*. at Page 3, 4.
[45] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 1, at 11:40.
[46] NOPD Chapter 82.1, supra note 29, ¶ 7.

Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

In CTN 2025-0190-P, PIB classified the complaint as Cleared by Camera and did not fully investigate whether the report's omissions of the threats made complied with Chapter 82.1 reporting requirements.

Failing to document threatening or hostile conduct by anyone involved violates written reporting requirements and suggests a potential violation of **Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 04(c)(6)** for failing to comply with instructions governing accuracy and completeness of police reports. Clear documentation of who made threats, what was said, and when it occurred is necessary to accurately evaluate later enforcement decisions.

This issue was also not investigated in CTN 2025-0213-P. That investigation focused on other reporting concerns related to NOPD Item No. D-05135-24, not on whether the NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 fully documented the content and source of the threats made on scene. As a result, this reporting issue remains unreviewed under Chapter 82.1.

The OIPM asserts that CTN 2025-0190-P and CTN 2025-0213-P investigations failed to investigate whether the NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 EPR failed to include threatening comments and escalating conduct on scene as alleged by the complainant, and Officer Thompson should have been investigated for potential violations of ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c)(6) to wit NOPD Ch. 82.1 Report Preparation, Paragraph 8*** for this specific allegation.

d. Failure to Accurately Document Property Damage Amount

G[redacted] alleged that NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 inaccurately stated the dollar amount of alleged property damage related to the claim that he slashed the tires of S[redacted]'s vehicle.[47] This specific report writing allegation was not investigated in CTN 2025-0190-P or CTN 2025-0213-P.

G[redacted] raised this allegation in his second CTN 2025-0190-P interview, stating that Officer Thompson lied in NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 report about the value of S[redacted]'s damaged tires, writing that they cost $300 when in fact the value was never provided to Officer Thompson by S[redacted].[48] The OIPM raised this concern in its formal submission to PIB (CC2025-0019), noting that the reported value of the alleged damage was not based on any documented estimate, invoice, or verification.[49]

Body-worn camera footage shows Officer Thompson speculating about the value of the tires, stating that they cost "about $300 a tire."[50] The EPR then reflects a damage amount that mirrors this estimate, even though no receipts, repair invoices, photographs, or third-party estimates were obtained to verify the cost.[51] When S[redacted] was questioned by Officer Thompson as to the value of the tires, she never provided an answer as to their estimated value.

[47] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 33, at 1:14.
[48] *Id*. at 1:14 – 1:24.
[49] CC2025-0019, *supra* note 5, Page 6.
[50] Thompson BWC, *supra* note 9, at 27:35 - 28:14.
[51] D-05248-24, *supra* note 28, Page 2.

Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

NOPD Chapter 82.1 requires that police reports accurately document known facts as well as pertinent information and evidence gathered through what was seen, heard, or assimilated by any other sense.[52] By including an unverified and speculative damage amount, the EPR presented an estimate as a confirmed fact.

Property value can affect how a crime is classified and how serious the charge is. Therefore, accurately documenting damage amounts is important. Despite this, PIB classified the complaint as Cleared by Camera in CTN 2025-0190-P and did not investigate whether Officer Thompson violated policy by guessing at the damage amount instead of confirming.

The failure to verify and accurately document the alleged property damage amount constitutes a failure to comply with written reporting requirements and suggests a potential violation of **Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 04(c)(6)** for failing to comply with instructions governing accuracy and completeness of police reports.

This reporting concern was also not investigated in CTN 2025-0213-P. That investigation focused on the omission of a witness statement, body-worn camera activation issues, and warrant approval decisions. It did not look at whether NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 accurately documented the dollar amount of alleged property damage, or whether that amount was backed by verified evidence. As a result, whether the report complied with NOPD Chapter 82.1 in documenting property damage valuation remains unreviewed.

The OIPM asserts that CTN 2025-0190-P and CTN 2025-0213-P investigations failed to investigate whether NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 failed to accurately document the value of damaged property and what value was told to the officer by the reporting party, and Officer Thompson should have been investigated for potential violations of ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4: Neglect of Duty (c)(6) to wit NOPD Ch. 82.1 Report Preparation, Paragraph 8*** for this specific allegation.

e. Characterization of Aggressor in Report

G[redacted] alleged that NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 inaccurately characterized the nature of the encounter and unfairly framed him as the aggressor.[53]

CTN 2025-0190-P did investigate Officer Thompson for potentially violating ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 04(c)(6) to wit NOPD Chapter 82.1 Report Preparation***. However, that investigation only looked at whether NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 was incomplete for failing to include "Mr. G[redacted]'s assertion that Ms. S[redacted] had been evicted."[54] The investigation failed to review whether the report inaccurately characterized the nature of the encounter on scene, or whether G[redacted] was incorrectly labeled the aggressor, even though G[redacted] raised both allegations multiple times.

[52] NOPD Chapter 82.1, supra note 29, ¶ 7.
[53] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 33, at 9:38, 13:58.
[54] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 10, Page 8.

Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

G[redacted] stated in his initial CTN 2025-0190-P intake interview that C[redacted] "started rumbling off at the mouth like, 'Don't look my way because you don't want no trouble.' this and that..." after which G[redacted] stated he responded by only stating, "what the F you talking about?"[55] G[redacted] then stated to Investigator Richards, "that was the only thing I told the guy [C[redacted]]. All of a sudden, we were in an argument, a confrontation. That doesn't constitute to me as an argument."[56] This statement is in reference to NOPD Item No. D-02548-24, which states "Mr. G[redacted] got into an verbal argument with an unknown male subject later identified as Mr. R[redacted] C[redacted]..."[57] G[redacted] alleged that the report improperly characterized the verbal exchange as an argument. This allegation is again alleged in G[redacted]'s written statement for CTN 2025-0190-P, where G[redacted] stated the above EPR excerpt was "patently false and shows malice on the part of Calvin Thompson and he acted in reckless disregard for the truth."[58] G[redacted]'s second verbal statement to Investigator Richards additionally includes allegations that the EPR favors the other involved party, S[redacted], and Officer Thompson's report makes G[redacted] out to be "the aggressor".[59] The OIPM again raised G[redacted]'s allegation in its formal submission to PIB (CC2025-0019) that the report's use of generalized language, including the phrase "verbal argument," failed to reflect the full scope of hostile and threatening conduct that occurred on scene.[60]

The police report documents that witnesses later stated G[redacted] made a finger-gun gesture as he drove away.[61] However, the report does not document all of the threatening or hostile statements made by R[redacted] C[redacted], despite G[redacted]'s consistent statements that C[redacted] repeatedly made remarks indicating a desire to fight and a willingness to go to jail.[62] These remarks can also be heard on Officer Thompson's BWC. The report also does not document the sequence or escalation of hostile interactions that preceded officers decision to separate the parties.

The report therefore documents conduct attributed to G[redacted] in detail while documenting C[redacted]'s alleged conduct in only general terms. Documenting conduct attributed to one party while leaving out hostile conduct attributed to the other can create an unbalanced narrative. It can frame one party as the aggressor without recording other context that could change that interpretation. NOPD Chapter 82.1 requires that police reports accurately and completely document what officers saw, heard, and otherwise perceived, as well as all material facts relevant to an incident.[63] These omissions in NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 EPR are especially relevant because of NOPD Item D-05315-24, which occurred shortly after this incident concluded. NOPD Item D-05315-24 involves parties who were also present during NOPD Item D-05248-24. This makes it even more important to accurately document both parties' conduct and the escalating circumstances witnessed by officers in NOPD Item No. D-05248-24, to possibly help establish the pattern of facts that led to NOPD Item No. D-05315-24.

[55] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 1, at 13:43 – 14:00.
[56] *Id*. at 14:10 – 14:25.
[57] D-05248-24, *supra* note 28, Page 3.
[58] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 3, ¶ 6.
[59] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 33, at 9:36.
[60] CC2025-0019, *supra* note 5, Page 3, 7.
[61] D-05248-24, *supra* note 28, Page 4.
[62] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 1, at 11:40.
[63] NOPD Chapter 82.1, *supra* note 29, ¶ 7.

In CTN 2025-0190-P, PIB classified the complaint as Cleared by Camera, finding that the report writing allegations were unfounded. However, this investigation did not look at the issues identified above: the use of "verbal argument," the alleged mischaracterization of G[redacted] as an aggressor, and the selective inclusion of G[redacted]'s conduct while omitting the conduct of other parties. Instead, CTN 2025-0190-P's investigation into report writing deficiencies focused only on the report being incomplete because it did not include "Mr. G[redacted]'s assertion that Ms. S[redacted] had been evicted."[64]

The failure to accurately and completely document aggressive conduct and escalating circumstances is a failure to comply with written reporting requirements. This suggests ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 04(c)(6)***, which governs the accuracy and completeness of police reports. This concern does not require proof of intentionally falsifying a report. It is about whether the report fully and fairly documented the known circumstances of the incident.

This issue was also not investigated in CTN 2025-0213-P. That investigation focused primarily on NOPD Item No. D-05315-24, including omitting a witness statement, body-worn camera activation, and warrant approval decisions. It did not investigate whether NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 selectively documented conduct in a way that potentially affected how the aggressive behavior was presented. As a result, whether NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 report complied with NOPD Chapter 82.1 in fully and fairly documenting the escalation of events remains unreviewed.

f. Failed to Document Material Witnesses and Witness Statement

G[redacted] consistently alleged that the primary police reports failed to document known witnesses and left out material witness statements, including statements from parties present during both NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 and NOPD Item No. D-05313-24.

Regarding NOPD Item No. D-05248-24, the subject of CTN 2025-0190-P, G[redacted] noted in his written statement provided to Investigator Richards that "Mr. R[redacted] [C[redacted]] is not listed in NOPD Incident Report D-05248-24 as a person being interviewed and other information suggests that Mr. C[redacted] was not interviewed at any point in this investigation."[65] G[redacted] further requested in his written statement that the involved officers be investigated for potential violations of NOPD Chapter 82.1 - Report Preparation. Officer Thompson was ultimately investigated for potential violations of ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 04 (c)(6)*** and the investigation determined the allegations were unfounded. The investigator determined that although C[redacted] was not listed as a formal witness in the police report, his presence, including his verbal communications with G[redacted], were documented in the report.

Given C[redacted]s presence at the scene throughout NOPD Item No. D-05248-24, and the EPR's documentation of repeated verbal exchanges between C[redacted] and G[redacted], it may have been important to list C[redacted] as a witness in the EPR rather than only mentioning his presence in the narrative. By failing to include C[redacted] in the EPR despite his continued presence during the investigation, his verbal exchanges with G[redacted], and his being mentioned in the EPR's narrative, Officer Thompson may have been in violation of **Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 04(c)(6)**. Although CTN 2025-0190-P did

[64] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 10, Page 8.
[65] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 3, ¶ 8.

analyze Officer Thompson for potentially violating **Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 04(c)(6)**, it failed to investigate Officer Thompson for omitting C[redacted] as a listed witness in NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 report, despite this allegation being raised by G[redacted].

D. **<u>Failure to Take Police Action in Response to On-Scene Threats – *Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 04 Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 1. Failing to take appropriate and necessary police action.*</u>**

The investigations did not look at whether officers failed to take appropriate and necessary police action in response to repeated threats while officers were present on scene.

CTN 2025-0190-P did investigate Sgt. Gaines for potentially violating ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 04 Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 1. Failing to take appropriate and necessary police action***, however, this investigation was limited to Sgt. Gaines' decision not to arrest S[redacted] and did not address the allegation that officers failed to take action in response to threats and escalating conduct while on scene.

The complainant's 4/24/2025 written statement provided to Investigator Richards in CTN 2025-0190-P does not formally raise the allegation that officers failed to take action regarding threats, but it does mention the alleged threats occurring at several points, raising the previously addressed allegation that officers failed to document said threats. However, G[redacted]'s written statement does formally request review of each officer's actions for potential violations of ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty***, additionally stating that the investigation should not be limited to only the allegations formally stated in said written statement.[66]

Further, G[redacted] raises the allegation that officers failed to take action relating to the threats during his initial CTN 2025-0190-P interview, stating to Investigator Richards, "they [officers] were biased in the fact that they let these people threaten me... in front [of] them multiple times, even asking the officer are you going to let us get our squabble on, stuff like that..."[67] Investigator Richards acknowledges this allegation, stating, "I understand what you're saying that, you felt the officers let them I guess threaten you..."[68] Investigator Richards later acknowledges, "Oh, so they were pulling out guns and stuff, threatening you while the police officers were there?" after which G[redacted] replies, "Yeah, with a concealed weapon."[69] G[redacted] goes on to state in the interview that C[redacted] was telling the officers on scene, "You going to let us get our squabble on and you can take us to jail' you know, just kept on threatening me..."[70] G[redacted] continues stating to Investigator Richards that he believed C[redacted] threatened him on scene in the presence of officers, ultimately stating, "They failed to protect me."[71]

---

[66] CTN 2025-0190-P, supra note 3, ¶ 31.
[67] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 1, at 4:30.
[68] *Id*. at 4:47.
[69] *Id*. at 7:48.
[70] *Id*. at 11:54.
[71] *Id*. at 16:06.

According to G[redacted], these exchanges and threats occurred after C[redacted] had already alerted law enforcement that he was carrying a firearm.[72] Despite the presence of a firearm and ongoing hostile conduct, G[redacted] complained that Sgt. Gaines did not take steps to secure the firearm, check for a concealed permit, separate the parties further to stop threats, or take enforcement action to address the threats and/or de-escalate the situation.

NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 acknowledges that "threatening comments were made on scene" prior to officers separating the parties.[73] However, no arrests were made, no documented warnings were issued, and no enforcement or protective action was taken in response to those threats.

By classifying the matter as Cleared by Camera in CTN 2025-0190-P, PIB did not investigate whether officers neglected their duty to take appropriate and necessary police action in response to on-scene threats and escalating conduct. The investigation focused on what was visible on video rather than whether officers' actions met the requirements of ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 04 Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 1. Failing to take appropriate and necessary police action***.

This issue was also not investigated in CTN 2025-0213-P. That investigation focused on reporting omissions, body-worn camera activation, and warrant approval decisions. It did not evaluate whether officers complied with ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 04 Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 1. Failing to take appropriate and necessary police action***, in responding to repeated threats and escalating conduct while present on scene.

Both investigations failed to investigate Officer Thompson and Sgt. Gaines for failing to take appropriate and necessary action related to on-scene threats and the question of whether either officer failed to take appropriate and necessary police action relating to threats remains unreviewed. Due to the complainant raising this allegation during CTN 2025-0190-P, the OIPM asserts that Officer Thompson and Sgt. Gaines should have been investigated in CTN 2025-0190-P for potential violations of ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 04 Neglect of Duty (c) Enumerated Acts/Omissions; 1. Failing to take appropriate and necessary police action***.

E. Officers Failed to Properly Label BWC – *RULE 4: PERFORMANCE OF DUTY: PARAGRAPH 04 - NEGLECT OF DUTY (c)(6) Failing to comply with instructions, oral or written, from any authoritative source: to wit NOPD Ch. 41.3.10 Body-Worn Camera ("BWC"), Par. 49)*

The complainant raised the allegation that officers failed to properly label their body-worn camera (BWC) recordings at multiple moments throughout CTN 2025-0190-P and CTN 2025-0213-P interviews, however, this allegation was never formally investigated in either FDI.

[72] *Id*. at 7:45, 11:30.
[73] D-05248-24, *supra* note 28, Page 4.

IPM Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

During his initial intake interview in CTN 2025-0190-P, after discussing that his public records request for officer BWC footage yielded no results, G[redacted] stated, "And from my understanding it's a certain way they supposed to file these things…"[74] During G[redacted]'s second intake interview in CTN 2025-0190-P, he again raised concerns about labeling and stated, "I eventually got it, but… one of the policies is, is that they supposed to document it a certain way."[75] When G[redacted] attempted to explain that the footage had not been labeled according to policy, Investigator Richards responded that mislabeling "happens pretty often," acknowledging that the footage "could have gotten mislabeled," and further stating that "sometimes they labeled under the wrong case number."[76] G[redacted] then stated that he believed the mislabeling was deliberate, explaining, "What I was trying to say was is that, I believe they did that purposefully… bodycam footage supposed to be labeled a certain way, they tell you verbatim how to label it so people can find it."[77] He further stated, "I gave her a date and time, I shouldn't have to do that. His job is to label all three of them… all three of them mislabeled."[78] Although the complainant's written statement provided to Investigator Richards in CTN 2025-0190-P does not specifically allege that officers deliberately mislabeled their BWC recordings, it does request investigators review the incident for potential violations of NOPD Chapter 41.3.10 - Body-Worn Camera ("BWC").[79] Investigator Richards further acknowledged the complainant's allegation in CTN 2025-0190-P intake documentation, stating "Mr. G[redacted] criticized the labeling of the BWC of the event by stating that the BWC was not labeled correctly."[80]

These same allegations were formally presented by OIPM in CC2025-0019. In that submission, OIPM advised that the complainant alleged the responding officers to both incidents "may have deliberately mislabeled or not labeled their body-worn camera (BWC) videos so as to prevent the complainant from requesting copies of the BWC via public records request," and that officers were deliberately attempting to "hide" their BWC or "didn't log it the way they were supposed to."[81] OIPM specifically identified this issue as a potential violation of ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 4(a) – Neglect of Duty (General), to wit NOPD Chapter 41.3.10 Body-Worn Camera, Paragraph 49***, and raised it as a suggested allegation against Officer Thompson and Sgt. Gaines in connection with NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 and NOPD Item No. D-05315-24.

Despite these repeated, formally raised allegations, neither CTN 2025-0190-P nor CTN 2025-0213-P investigated whether the involved officers failed to comply with BWC labeling requirements. No

[74] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 1, at 22:30.
[75] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 33, at 2:00.
[76] *Id.* at 2:23.
[77] *Id.* at 2:35.
[78] *Id.* at 3:20.
[79] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 3, ¶ 31.
[80] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 10, Page 4.
[81] CC2025-0019, *supra* note 5, Page 6.

Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

Supervisory Feedback Log, corrective counseling, or disciplinary finding was issued regarding improper BWC labeling.

NOPD Chapter 41.3.10, Paragraph 49 requires that BWC footage be properly labeled and categorized to ensure accurate retention, retrieval, and public records compliance.[82] Improper labeling interferes with the Department's ability to locate, review, and disclose video evidence. Failure to evaluate a formally raised BWC-labeling allegation leaves unanswered whether officers complied with **Chapter 41.3.10, Paragraph 49.**

F. Problems Caused by Limited Reviews

The deficiencies identified above show that potential disciplinary violations were not fully reviewed because of how CTN 2025-0190-P was classified. The use of a Cleared by Camera (CBC) classification limited the scope of review to whether events were visible on video, rather than whether officers' conduct complied with applicable law and NOPD policy. As a result, multiple potential violations of Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Chapter 82.1 (Report Preparation) and Chapter 41.3.10 (Body-Worn Camera) were not substantively examined, including whether officers failed to verify concealed-carry eligibility, failed to take appropriate police action in response to on-scene threats, failed to accurately and completely document material facts, or failed to properly label body-worn camera footage.

Although CTN 2025-0213-P later identified and sustained a reporting violation that required a supplemental report, that correction only happened after a separate investigation began. The need for a supplemental report shows that the original reporting problems were not caught or fixed during the initial review. Together, these facts show how a limited investigative classification can delay finding and fixing policy violations, weaken meaningful oversight, and create avoidable risks to public safety, civil liability, evidentiary integrity, and public records compliance.

II. Does the investigation suggest policy / procedure, other risk management or liability issues that were not adequately addressed by the department?

A. Legal Risk – Acting in Civil Matters

NOPD ***Rule 5: Restricted Activities, Paragraph 6 (Acting in Civil Matters)*** limits how officers may respond to civil disputes. Officers are not allowed to give legal advice or make legal decisions in civil matters, such as evictions. Their role is limited to preventing a disturbance or enforcing criminal law if a crime occurs.[83]

[82] NOPD Chapter 41.3.10: Body-Worn Camera ("BWC"), 9/1/2024, ¶ 49.
[83] NOPD Rule 5: Restricted Activities, Paragraph 6: Acting in Civil Matters, 11/13/2016.

In this case, the NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 EPR reflects that the constable declined to remove the tenant, S[redacted], after being advised that the judge would address the matter at a court hearing scheduled for April 8, 2024.[84] G[redacted] later contacted NOPD because he wanted officers to evict S[redacted] and arrest her for criminal damage to property after she cut a padlock off the Entergy power box.[85] While the investigator correctly noted that officers could not carry out an eviction because it was a civil matter, the investigation did not fully examine if officers responded appropriately when a civil dispute also involved alleged criminal conduct.

Landlord-tenant disputes and evictions are civil matters governed by court process, and NOPD officers do not have authority to remove a tenant. However, during his initial interview for CTN 2025-0190-P, G[redacted] also reported alleged criminal behavior, including criminal trespass[86], criminal damage to property[87], and threatening conduct involving a firearm.[88] Criminal trespass requires that a person enters or remains on property without a legal right to do so.[89] If a tenant still has a legal right to occupy a property and a pending court date, that element may not be met. Criminal damage to property requires intentional damage to property without consent.[90] The reports state that S[redacted] removed the padlock after being instructed by Entergy to restore electrical service, which was necessary for habitability.[91] The investigations did not clearly analyze whether the reported conduct met the legal elements of any criminal offense or whether officers appropriately distinguished between civil and criminal issues under Rule 5.

A more thorough administrative review in CTN 2025-0190-P, which focused on NOPD Item No. D-05248-24, would have clearly examined whether officers stayed within the limits of Rule 5 during their response, whether any legal advice about eviction was given, whether the reported criminal offenses met the required legal elements, and whether officers took appropriate action if any criminal conduct was observed. Both CTN 2025-0190-P and CTN 2025-0213-P did not reference the Acting in Civil Matters policy. These gaps leave unanswered questions about whether officers appropriately limited their involvement to keeping the peace and whether potential criminal issues were thoroughly investigated.

B. Operational Risks When Responding to More Than One Incident at the Same Time

Managing more than one active call at the same time can create operational risks, particularly when one incident requires officers to leave an active scene to address another emerging situation. These risks relate to scene management, evidence handling, documentation, and the ability to later reconstruct events accurately.

---

[84] D-05248-24, *supra* note 28, Page 3.
[85] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 1, at 4:07.
[86] *Id.* at 3:21.
[87] *Id*. at 4:07.
[88] *Id*. at 8:00.
[89] La. R.S. 14:63.
[90] La. R.S. 14:56.
[91] D-05248-24, *supra* note 28, Page 3.

In this matter, shortly after officers arrived to [redacted] to respond to NOPD Item No. D-05248-24, officers temporarily left the location to respond to a nearby report involving individuals allegedly armed with firearms and attempting to force entry into a residence.[92] While such decisions are often driven by safety concerns, shifting between active incidents can create a risk that important information from the original scene is not fully captured or clearly documented in real time.

One such risk is the loss or unavailability of witnesses. When officers leave a scene before it is fully stabilized, individuals who may have relevant information may depart or become difficult to locate later, limiting the ability to obtain timely and reliable statements. Another risk is confusion about the sequence of events, particularly when incidents occur close in time and location, which can lead to uncertainty about when specific statements, actions, or alleged threats occurred.

Responding to multiple incidents can also create challenges in evidence management. For example, body-worn camera footage recorded across different locations and time periods may later be misidentified, mislabeled, or associated with the wrong event if timelines are not clearly established. This concern is particularly relevant given the BWC labeling issues discussed earlier in this review.

From a risk management perspective, these types of operational challenges can make it harder for investigators to clearly understand what happened later, when it happened, and which evidence relates to which incident. Even when officers act appropriately in response to competing safety concerns, managing more than one call at a time can increase the risk of confusion or inconsistency in reports, evidence review, and investigative findings.

C. Failure to Document and Assess a Prior Reported Firearm-Pointing Incident

During the review of body-worn camera footage, members of the S[redacted] family stated that the night before the April 6 incident, G[redacted] was on their property and pointed a firearm at them from behind a screen door.[93] These statements reflect an allegation of prior firearm-related conduct involving the same parties and location just the day before.

Despite these statements being captured on body-worn camera, the incident reports do not document or assess this reported firearm-pointing incident. Instead, the written reports focus on verbal disputes, harassment, and property-related issues, and note only a finger-gun gesture allegedly done by G[redacted] as he departed the scene.[94] There is no indication that the reported firearm-pointing described on body-worn camera was treated as a separate incident or evaluated for potential follow-up.

---

[92] Calvin Thompson BWC, at 10:00. Title: 7820 HENLEY ST., ID: C-05248-24 / D-05248-24. Serial: X60AC722A, Model: Axon Body 3.
[93] Perrin Gaines BWC, at 16:59. Title: 7820 Henley St., ID: D-05248-24 D-05315-24. Serial: X6030123Z, Model: Axon Body 3.
[94] D-05248-24, *supra* note 28, Page 4.

From a risk management perspective, the failure to document and assess a reported firearm-pointing incident limits the department's ability to recognize and evaluate escalating behavior between the same parties. Allegations involving firearms, even when unverified, can be critical for understanding risk, guiding officer response, and determining whether additional protective measures or referrals may be appropriate.

This information may also be important for civilians seeking legal protection, such as a temporary restraining order or protective order, where courts often rely on documented prior conduct to assess danger and escalation. When reported firearm-related conduct captured on body-worn camera is not reflected in incident reports, individuals may lack documentation that could support requests for protection, and later reviewers may lack important context when evaluating subsequent incidents.

III. Should training or other programs have been required of the accused employee?

Every formal disciplinary investigation provides the investigator with the opportunity to recommend training, tactical, and / or policy recommendations to either the department as a whole or to specific involved officers based on the conduct observed during the investigation.

In CTN 2025-0190-P, Investigator Richards did not recommend any training for the accused employees. In CTN 2025-0213-P, Sgt. Jenkins made two recommendations; 1) that an SFL and counseling should be issued to Officer Thompson "to address his inadvertent omission of information regarding the witness statement from the documents related to this investigation." and; 2) that an SFL and counseling should be issued to Sgt. Gaines "for not obtaining permission to deactivate his BWC during a conversation with his supervisor."[95] In CTN 2025-0228-P, Sgt. Travis Johnson did not recommend any trainings for the accused employee.

Through the course of this case review the OIPM identified several areas discussed below, in which both the accused employees as well as the complaint investigators could benefit from additional training.

A. Training for Intake Officer / Investigating Officer

a. Over-Explanation During Intake

The intake interviews conducted in CTN 2025-0190-P show that the investigator spent a significant amount of time explaining how allegations are classified under NOPD policy and why certain officer actions may or may not violate policy. These explanations occurred during the intake phase, while the complainant was still explaining his concerns.

[95] CTN 2025-0213-P, *supra* note 20, Page 14.

Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

During the first CTN 2025-0190-P interview, the complainant clearly stated specific allegations, including false reporting, biased policing, and injury to public record.[96] In response, the investigator repeatedly explained that these concerns would fall under neglect of duty and explained why other classifications did not apply.[97]

During the intake process, the complainant raised specific legal concerns and described the conduct he believed was unlawful. While investigators are not required to accept a complainant's legal conclusions, best practices during intake support receiving allegations as they are presented and delaying reclassification or narrowing of those allegations until after a full review of the evidence.

In later CTN 2025-0190-P interviews, Investigator Richards repeatedly explained that body worn camera footage is often mislabeled and that this occurs frequently and is not necessarily intentional.[98] These explanations were offered while the complainant continued to raise concerns about missing or inconsistent documentation and before the investigative review was complete.

Similarly, when the complainant raised concerns about receiving different versions of the same police report through public records requests, the investigator explained that reports often include supplements and assured the complainant that nothing improper had occurred.[99] Providing reassurance before confirming the underlying facts can unintentionally minimize or redirect a complainant's concern.

The OIPM does not take issue with the investigator asking questions or providing information. However, from a training perspective, extensive explanation during intake can affect how a complainant understands the process and how allegations are framed before the investigation is complete. Additionally, the dismissal or re-framing of certain allegations presented by the complainant can have the effect of minimizing the complainant's lived experiences. While many of a complainant's presented allegations may not ultimately constitute policy or procedural violations under NOPD rules, by dismissing or re-framing them at the outset of the investigation a complainant may ultimately lose trust in the integrity of the NOPD investigation or assume that investigators are not taking their concerns seriously.

It is important to clarify that this concern relates to investigative practice and process, not to misconduct. Investigators are permitted to explain policy and ask clarifying questions. However, when explanations occur during intake before the full scope of the allegations is documented, it can create confusion about what is being alleged and what is being evaluated. Clear separation between intake and later analysis supports both transparency and fairness.

---

[96] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 1.
[97] *Id*. at 10:22, 11:05, 15:45, 21:33, 25:50.
[98] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 33, at 1:40.
[99] *Id*. at 11:10.

Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

b. Use of Language and Framing During Intake

The interviews also reflect how certain language used during interviews can shape how allegations are understood. In the third CTN 2025-0190-P interview conducted via telephone by Investigator Richards, Richards stated, "In fact, everybody was asked, did anybody produce a gun? Everybody said no, okay? So, I'm just saying what the video is saying and what it's showing me…"[100] This framing focused the issue on whether a firearm was physically displayed during the underlying incident.

The complainant, however, consistently described his concern as involving threats made by a person who was armed, even if the firearm was not drawn. The difference between whether a gun was produced and whether a person was armed during a threat is important for understanding how the allegation was being presented.

Language that summarizes events as "everybody said" or frames an issue as resolved can create confusion about what is actually being alleged. This type of phrasing may unintentionally narrow the scope of a complaint or signal that a concern has already been decided before the investigation is complete.

This issue became clearer during CTN 2025-0228-P, which G[redacted] initiated, alleging that the investigator of CTN 2025-0190-P, Dwight Richards, contacted the involved officers during the intake and classification phase of the investigation, which is not allowed under NOPD policy. G[redacted] stated that he understood Investigator Richards's comment that "everyone was asked" about the gun to mean that the investigator had contacted officers to ask whether a firearm was produced.[101] The record does not reflect that such contact occurred and G[redacted]'s allegations in CTN 2025-0228-P were determined to be unfounded. The phrasing by Investigator Richards appears to have referred to statements made on scene. However, the wording was broad and reasonably subject to misunderstanding. This exchange illustrates how generalized phrasing during intake or follow-up discussions can create confusion about what investigative steps were actually taken.

From a training perspective, intake officers and investigators would benefit from guidance on the careful use of language during complaint intake. Training should emphasize neutral phrasing, avoiding assumptions, and clearly separating what a complainant is alleging from how the department later evaluates those allegations.

c. Additional Training Recommendations

Additional training that focuses on taking allegations as presented, avoiding leading or corrective explanations, limiting over-explanation during intake, and using clear and neutral language would be beneficial. Clear boundaries between intake and evaluation help ensure that complaints are fully captured

[100] CTN 2025-0190-P, Gentry Third Audio Statement, at 3:28.
[101] CTN 2025-0228-P, Exhibit A, at 3:30 – 3:38.

and fairly reviewed, without creating confusion or the appearance that concerns are being minimized or decided too early.

This type of training is particularly important in cases that are later classified as Cleared by Camera. When an investigation relies primarily on video review, the initial framing of the complaint becomes even more significant. If intake language narrows or reframes the allegation before the evidence is fully reviewed, it may affect how the scope of the investigation is understood. Clear intake practices help ensure that classification decisions and investigative steps remain aligned with the allegations as presented.

B. Training Recommendations for Responding Officers

a. Scene Stabilization and Separation of Parties

NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 involved an ongoing landlord-tenant dispute with heightened emotions between multiple people. The EPR reflects that officers observed G[redacted] and C[redacted] engaged in a verbal argument and that officers separated the parties.[102]

However, BWC footage reflects continued verbal exchanges between the involved parties while officers remained on scene. The complainant alleged that after he photographed C[redacted]'s license plate, S[redacted] was permitted to photograph his license plate and made statements that further increased tension. S[redacted] said, "You didn't think I had anybody."[103] The incident involved repeated back-and-forth comments between parties while in the officers' presence.

Body worn camera footage further reflects that at one point G[redacted] was directed to sit inside his vehicle as part of the effort to separate the parties.[104] The footage reflects that he continued lowering his window and engaging verbally with individuals on scene.[105] When officers initiate separation measures, consistent enforcement of those boundaries is important. Clear instruction to remain inside the vehicle with windows up, when separation is being used as a conflict containment strategy, may reduce continued verbal exchanges and limit opportunities for further escalation.

Even when no physical force is used, emotionally charged civil disputes present a risk of escalation. Reinforcement training on scene stabilization and early separation of disputing parties would be beneficial. Such training may include:

- Creating and maintaining physical distance between disputing individuals
- Limiting direct verbal exchanges between parties once officers arrive

---

[102] D-05248-24, *supra* note 28, Page 3.
[103] Thompson BWC, *supra* note 9, at 23:07.
[104] *Id.* at 19:08.
[105] *Id.* at 22:30.

- Redirecting individuals away from confrontation
- Maintaining clear and consistent scene control throughout the encounter

These measures are preventative in nature and help reduce the likelihood of further escalation, intimidation, or retaliatory conduct.

b. Verbal Conflict Management

The incident reflects an environment in which allegations of harassment, threats, and prior disputes were present. Although no physical force occurred by either party, the interaction involved escalating language and heightened hostility between parties.

Training reinforcement on verbal conflict management would be beneficial. This includes:

- Interrupting escalating dialogue
- Avoiding actions that may unintentionally inflame tensions
- Using neutral positioning and tone
- Managing emotionally charged disputes in a way that minimizes further confrontation
- Delegation of separate interviews to specific officers

This recommendation is focused on strengthening patrol-level conflict containment skills during volatile civil disputes.

c. Report Writing and Property Valuation

Following NOPD Item No. D-05248-24, Officer Thompson documented that the value of S[redacted]'s damaged property, specifically her vehicle's four tires, was $1,200.[106] The report's narrative does not indicate whether this figure was estimated, verified, or based on a statement from the reporting party.

Because Louisiana law grades criminal damage to property offenses based on the amount of damage, accurate documentation of valuation is important. Recording a fixed dollar amount without identifying its source may create confusion regarding how the value was determined. There is no such requirement in NOPD policy regarding the articulation of the source of the property's value within a report, however NOPD Chapter 82.1 Report Preparation does state that "members shall ensure that their reports are sufficiently detailed for the purpose intended and reasonably free of errors..." and that all incident reports "shall accurately reflect the identity of the persons involved, witnesses, all pertinent information gathered including what was seen, heard or assimilated by any other sense and actions taken."[107]

---

[106] D-05248-24, *supra* note 28, Page 2.
[107] NOPD Chapter 82.1, *supra* note 29, ¶¶ 4, 7.

Body-worn camera footage reflects that Officer Thompson's valuation of the tires did not reflect what was stated on-scene by S[redacted]. S[redacted] initially stated she was unsure of the cost of the tires.[108] S[redacted] then inquires about the value of the tires to C[redacted], who then estimated that similar tires are typically approximately $50–$60 each.[109] The footage then reflects Officer Thompson asking S[redacted] whether approximately $300 per tire would be accurate.[110] S[redacted] never responds to Officer Thompson's question, in part due to a distraction regarding C[redacted] exiting the scene, and Officer Thompson never inquires with S[redacted] further or confirms the value of the tires with S[redacted]. Officer Thompson ultimately listed the value of the tires as $1,200, or $300 each, despite S[redacted] never providing a valuation to Officer Thompson.

Training reinforcement would be beneficial regarding:

- Clearly documenting the source of property valuations
- Distinguishing between estimated and verified amounts
- Avoiding leading questions when establishing monetary values
- Understanding how valuation may affect offense grading under Louisiana law

This recommendation is directed toward improving documentation clarity and ensuring that property values recorded in incident reports accurately reflect exactly what was seen and heard on scene.

C. Reinforcing Training for Field Operations Bureau Officers on Civil Matters

The two incidents in these matters arose out of an ongoing landlord-tenant dispute involving a contested eviction. NOPD Item No. D-0258-24 report narrative reflects that constables had previously responded to the property and that removal did not occur due to judicial intervention.[111]

Landlord-tenant disputes often involve overlapping civil and criminal issues. Officers responding to these incidents must navigate questions related to property access, utility control, lock changes, alleged harassment, and eviction status. These matters are primarily governed by civil court processes rather than criminal enforcement.

Additional training for FOB officers would be beneficial on the following topics:

- The limits of NOPD's role in eviction matters
- The role of the Civil District Court Constable in executing evictions
- When and how to verify eviction status

---

[108] Thompson BWC, *supra* note 9, at 27:40.
[109] *Id.* at 27:45 – 27:50.
[110] *Id.* at 28:07 – 28:11.
[111] D-05248-24, *supra* note 28, Page 3.

IPM Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

- Appropriate referral to court or constable authorities
- Distinguishing between civil disputes and criminal violations

Clear guidance regarding inter-agency coordination may reduce confusion during landlord-tenant conflicts and assist officers in maintaining neutrality while directing parties to the proper legal channels. This recommendation is preventative and aimed at strengthening clarity in responses to civil disputes that present with heightened conflict.

IV. Were there any other OIPM concerns with the investigation? If so, what allegation do they pertain to?

A. Classification Framework: Cleared by Camera versus Formal Disciplinary Investigation

The OIPM has a concern regarding the classification and structure of the investigation in CTN 2025-0190-P.

NOPD Policy Chapter 52.1 sets out the framework for complaint intake and investigation. Under Chapter 52.1, Paragraphs 67 through 71, a complaint may be classified as Cleared by Camera (CBC) when body worn camera footage clearly resolves the allegation and shows that no policy violation occurred. Under this classification, the review is limited because the video itself answers the complaint. The policy provides that when a matter is clearly resolved by camera, no additional investigation is required.[112]

Chapter 52.1 also provides for a Formal Disciplinary Investigation (FDI). An FDI is used when the allegation cannot be resolved by video alone. This type of investigation may include interviews, credibility assessments, and gathering information from outside sources to determine what occurred.[113]

In CTN 2025-0190-P, the complaint was classified as Cleared by Camera. However, the investigative record reflects that the investigator took steps beyond a limited review of body worn camera footage. The investigator assessed the credibility of G[redacted], including noting that certain statements he made had no basis in fact.[114] The investigator weighed the statements of S[redacted] and C[redacted] against G[redacted]'s version of events. Most notably, the investigator contacted an Entergy representative to confirm information regarding the electric service and lock issue.[115]

These steps involved evaluating competing accounts and gathering information from an outside source. Those actions are typically associated with a Formal Disciplinary Investigation rather than a limited Cleared by Camera review.

---

[112] NOPD Chapter 52.1: Complaint Intake and Investigation, 8/18/2024, ¶¶ 67 – 71.
[113] *Id*. Page 4.
[114] CTN 2025-0190-P, *supra* note 10, Page 4.
[115] *Id*. Page 7.

Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

The concern is not that the investigator acted in bad faith, or that additional work was improper. Thorough investigation is important. The concern is whether the classification selected under Chapter 52.1 aligns with the investigative steps that were actually taken.

When an investigation includes credibility determinations and outside fact gathering, the investigation begins to function like an FDI, even if it is labeled as CBC. Making sure the classification matches the actual work performed helps ensure the disciplinary process is consistent, transparent, and trustworthy to the community.

B. Intake Interview

The OIPM also reviewed whether the intake process in CTN 2025-0190-P was consistent with the requirements of Chapter 52.1. Chapter 52.1 requires that NOPD members courteously receive all misconduct complaints as presented and that the intake stage gather sufficient information to determine the appropriate classification.[116] [117] The purpose of intake is to document the complaint and collect relevant information before conclusions are reached.

As discussed in Section III, the intake interviews in this matter included extensive explanation by the investigator regarding how allegations would be classified and why certain violations may not apply. The interviews also included statements that could be viewed as narrowing or reframing the complainant's concerns before the full investigative review was complete.

The OIPM does not find that the intake process was refused or that the complaint was not accepted. However, the tone and structure of portions of the intake interview raise concern about whether the intake stage remained clearly separate from evaluation and classification.

Maintaining a clear boundary between intake and analysis is important to ensure that complainants feel heard and that classification decisions are based on a full and neutral review of the evidence.

C. Arrest Decisions

The OIPM reviewed how arrests were documented and how charges were classified in NOPD Item No. D-05315-24. G[redacted]'s main concern was not that officers failed to arrest someone on scene. His concern was that the report said an arrest happened when it did not, and that he was charged with a felony when he believed the charge should have been a misdemeanor. These issues were handled differently in CTN 2025-0190-P and CTN 2025-0213-P.

a. Mischaracterization of Arrest Status (R[redacted] C[redacted])

[116] NOPD Chapter 52.1, *supra* note 112, ¶ 19.
[117] *Id.* ¶ 55.

Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

The police report for NOPD Item No. D-05315-24 lists a specific arrest date and time for C[redacted]. However, body-worn camera footage shows that although C[redacted] was detained and handcuffed, he was later released at the scene.[118] He was not transported or booked that day. Officers later sought arrest warrants.

As discussed earlier in Section I.C.b (Failure to Accurately Document R[redacted] C[redacted]'s Arrest Status), recording a specific arrest time when no custodial arrest occurred is inaccurate. Chapter 82.1 requires that police reports clearly and accurately describe what happened.[119] A report must clearly distinguish between detention, release, and custodial arrest.

CTN 2025-0190-P did not analyze this issue because it was limited in scope and classified as Cleared by Camera, covering only NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 — not NOPD Item No. D-05315-24.

CTN 2025-0213-P was conducted as a Formal Disciplinary Investigation (FDI) and reviewed certain report-preparation issues. However, that investigation's review of report writing focused on omitted witness information. It did not fully evaluate whether the arrest entry in NOPD Item No. D-05315-24 accurately reflected what occurred on scene.

Accurate arrest documentation matters. Arrest records affect criminal history and public records. When the report does not match what occurred, it creates confusion and undermines trust.

D. Allegation of Wrongful Arrest (D[redacted] G[redacted])

Gentry also alleged that his arrest stemming from NOPD Item No. D-05315-24 was wrongful. The warrant affidavit lists aggravated assault under La. R.S. 14:37.[120]

Under Louisiana law:

- Simple assault (La. R.S. 14:38) is a misdemeanor.
- Aggravated assault (La. R.S. 14:37) involves use of a dangerous weapon and is classified as a felony.

A firearm qualifies as a dangerous weapon. If probable cause existed that a firearm was intentionally used to place another person in reasonable apprehension of receiving a battery, the statutory elements of aggravated assault would be satisfied.

CTN 2025-0190-P did not analyze whether the affidavit clearly explained probable cause. Because it was classified as Cleared by Camera, and because CTN 2025-0190-P was limited to review of NOPD Item

[118] Thompson BWC, *supra* note 37, at 57:30.
[119] NOPD Chapter 82.1, supra note 29, ¶¶ 4 – 9.
[120] NOPD Item No. D-05315-24 Electronic Police Report, 4/6/2024, Page 12.

No. D-05248-24, it did not include a detailed legal review of the charges stemming from NOPD Item No. D-05315-24. CTN 2025-0213-P focused on report omissions and credibility. It did not clearly explain how the facts were applied to the elements of La. R.S. 14:37.

The OIPM is not deciding whether the warrant was valid. That decision belongs to the judge who approved it. However, the investigations did not clearly explain the legal reasoning behind the charge or analyze these questions and concerns posed by the complainant.

E. Felony Versus Misdemeanor Classification

G[redacted] stated that officers charged him with a felony when it should have been a misdemeanor. Aggravated assault under La. R.S. 14:37 is legally classified as a felony. Therefore, listing that charge was consistent with the statute.

It is important to explain the difference between two roles:

- Officers decide whether there is probable cause and what charge fits the law.
- The District Attorney later decides whether to keep, change, reduce, or dismiss that charge.

This explanation was not included in the investigation. Without it, the complainant was left with the impression that officers improperly "over-charged" him. Clear explanation of charge classification and prosecutorial discretion would have directly addressed this concern.

The OIPM does not find that the felony classification itself was improper under Louisiana law. However, the investigations did not clearly explain:

- Why the arrest documentation reflected an arrest that did not occur on scene;
- How probable cause was articulated for aggravated assault; or
- The legal difference between officer charging authority and prosecutorial discretion.

Because these points were not clearly addressed, the complainant's concerns about arrest and charging decisions were not fully resolved.

F. Allegations of False Statements and Report Language

G[redacted] repeatedly alleged that the police reports contained false statements. He described certain language as "perjury."[121] His concerns focused on two specific issues: (1) The description of the incident

[121] CC2025-0019, *supra* note 5, Page 7.

OIPM Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799

as a "verbal argument" in NOPD Item No. D-05248-24; and (2) His belief that he was characterized as the aggressor.

a. Allegation of False Statements or Perjury

A finding of false reporting or perjury requires evidence that an officer knowingly made a materially false statement. The investigative record in CTN 2025-0190-P and CTN 2025-0213-P does not establish that an officer knowingly made a false statement. The dispute centers on how events were described and summarized, not on proof of intentional falsification. For that reason, a sustained violation for intentional false reporting would not be supported by the record reviewed.

b. Use of "Verbal Argument" in D-05248-24

In NOPD Item No. D-05248-24, the interaction between G[redacted] and C[redacted] is described as a "verbal argument."[122] G[redacted] objected to this phrasing. He stated that the incident involved threats and a firearm and that calling it a "verbal argument" minimized the seriousness of what occurred. He believed the language suggested a mutual argument rather than one party making threats, and him responding to said threats.

The term "verbal argument" generally refers to a dispute or heated exchange. It does not, by definition, exclude threats. However, when a report uses broad summary language without clearly documenting specific threatening statements, the description may appear incomplete.

As discussed earlier in Section I.C.c (Failure to Document Alleged Threatening and Hostile Conduct), alleged threats made by C[redacted] were not fully documented in the initial narrative of NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 report. If threats involving a firearm occurred, those statements should have been clearly recorded in that report pursuant to Chapter 82.1: Report Preparation. The omission of detailed threat language in NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 report contributed to G[redacted]'s perception that the incident was inaccurately minimized.

c. "Aggressor" Concern

G[redacted] also presented concerns that he was treated as the aggressor in the language of both police reports. While neither NOPD Item Nos. D-05248-24 or D-05315-24 reports explicitly label him as "the aggressor," narrative framing can influence perception. If one party's threatening conduct is not fully documented in the initial report, the summary may appear unbalanced. This concern ties directly to the documentation issues addressed earlier in this review, which noted that the complainant's concerns could

[122] D-05248-24, *supra* note 28, Page 3.

have been addressed through a formal disciplinary investigation into violations of **Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 04 (c)(6), to wit NOPD Ch. 82.1 Report Preparation**.

d. Distinguishing Word Choice from False Reporting

There is an important difference between:

- A knowingly false statement; and
- Language that is generalized, incomplete, or imprecise.

The evidence does not show that anyone intentionally falsified NOPD Item Nos. D-05248-24 or D-05315-24 reports. However, clearer documentation of threats and specific conduct would have improved the accuracy and completeness of the report under Chapter 82.1.

The OIPM does not find evidence of intentional false reporting in NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 or NOPD Item No. D-05315-24. However, the CTN 2025-0190-P and CTN 2025-0213-P investigations did not fully evaluate whether the language used in NOPD Item No. D-05248-24 report accurately and completely reflected the seriousness of the alleged threats. This concern is not about proving intentional false statements. It is about ensuring that reports clearly document the conduct that forms the basis for later enforcement decisions.

G. CTN 2025-0213-P Recommended "Unfounded" Disposition, Calvin Thompson Report Preparation

The CTN 2025-0213-P signed investigation submitted by Sgt. Willie Jenkins recommended that one allegation against Officer Thompson, ***Rule 4: Performance of Duty, Paragraph 04 (c)(6), to wit NOPD Ch. 82.1 Report Preparation, Par. 8***, be unfounded. Sgt. Jenkins acknowledged that the alleged conduct occurred, that a material witness had not been documented in the original NOPD Item No. D-05315-24 report, but ultimately recommended an unfounded disposition, reasoning that the omission was not intentional.[123] Sgt. Jenkins, while recommending an unfounded disposition, did recommend Officer Thompson receive an SFL entry "to address his inadvertent omission of information…"[124]

The unfounded recommendation was formally rejected by Deputy Superintendent Jonette Williams of PSAB. In her written directive, Deputy Superintendent Williams ordered that the finding be changed to sustained and directed Officer Thompson to complete a supplemental report documenting the omitted witness statement.[125] Her directive clarified that intent is not required for a report-preparation violation when material information is omitted.[126] Officer Thompson subsequently completed a supplemental

[123] CTN 2025-0213-P, *supra* note 20, Page 14.
[124] *Id*.
[125] CTN 2025-0213-P, Cover Letter Regarding Disciplinary Recommendations for FDI 2025-0213-P, 8/18/2025. Page 2.
[126] *Id*.

report documenting the previously omitted witness, confirming that the witness had been known but omitted from the original report.[127]

The OIPM agrees with Deputy Superintendent Williams's reasoning in her written directive but takes issue with the original finding of unfounded. Officer Thompson acknowledged in his statement to Sgt. Jenkins that he omitted the witness information.[128] Despite this acknowledgement, the violation was still recommended to be unfounded by Sgt. Jenkins who noted that the omission was not done intentionally or with malice, and that there is no belief that Officer Thompson would receive any benefit from omitting the information.[129] While Chapter 82.1 Paragraph 8 does state that members shall not make an intentionally false, inaccurate, or incomplete report, intentionality is not the only factor that should be considered when reviewing the policy.[130] NOPD Chapter 82.1 Paragraph 8 further states that members shall not "suppress, conceal or distort the facts of any reported incident…"[131] So, while the omission may not have been intentional, such an omission may still meet the criteria for paragraph 8 if the information omitted was suppressed, concealed, or distorted.

The unfounded disposition was ultimately disapproved and amended to sustained by Deputy Superintendent Williams, which the OIPM asserts was the appropriate determination, however it should be noted that multiple other supervisors approved the original recommended disposition before Deputy Superintendent Williams authored her cover letter recommending it be changed.

CONCLUSION / OIPM RECOMMENDATIONS ON FINDINGS – CTN

Accordingly, the OIPM recommends the following findings:

After reviewing the investigations in CTN 2025-0190-P, CTN 2025-0213-P, and CTN 2025-0228-P, the OIPM identified several concerns related to classification, documentation, intake practices, scope of review, and policy analysis.

Many of the complainant's concerns were not fully evaluated under the applicable policies. The initial classification of CTN 2025-0190-P as Cleared by Camera limited the review to what was visible on video and did not require a broader examination of report accuracy, policy compliance, arrest documentation, charge explanation, bias analysis, or body-worn camera labeling. Some issues were later addressed in CTN 2025-0213-P, but not all concerns raised by the complainant were clearly analyzed under the appropriate policy framework.

Because several allegations were not fully reviewed under the relevant policies, OIPM cannot make a final determination on whether the investigation's findings were sufficient. The record reflects areas

[127] NOPD Item No. D-05315-24 Electronic Police Report (Supplemental), 8/19/2025.
[128] CTN 2025-0213-P, *supra* note 20, Page 14.
[129] *Id*.
[130] NOPD Chapter 82.1, *supra* note 29, ¶ 8.
[131] *Id*.

where additional analysis, clearer explanation, or formal policy review would have strengthened the investigative process.

The concerns identified in this review do not establish intentional misconduct. However, they demonstrate how classification decisions, documentation practices, and investigative structure can affect whether allegations are fully examined.

Complaint intake, investigative scope, classification decisions, and policy analysis must all align clearly. When investigations do not clearly document how each allegation was evaluated under the correct policy framework, it limits the ability of oversight bodies to assess the adequacy of the findings.

For these reasons, the OIPM cannot say whether we agree or disagree with the findings as presented because all allegations were not fully evaluated. Continued attention to classification practices, report preparation requirements, bias analysis, arrest documentation, and intake training will strengthen future investigations and promote transparency, fairness, and community trust.

This review approved by:

Kirschelle Williams

Deputy Police Monitor

OIPM Office of the Independent Police Monitor
2714 Canal Street Suite 201 New Orleans LA 70119
www.nolaipm.gov (504) 309-9799