

**From:** Mail Service  
**To:** [SFPD, Commission \(POL\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: "Openess" reports  
**Date:** Saturday, July 21, 2018 11:00:39 PM

---

*Sent from my MetroPCS 4G LTE Android device*

I am resending this email for publication in your 30 day correspondence to the Police Commission.----- Original message-----

**From:** Mail Service  
**Date:** Mon, May 21, 2018 10:29 AM  
**To:** SFPD, Commission (POL);  
**Cc:** [Paul.Henderson@sfgov.org](mailto:Paul.Henderson@sfgov.org);  
**Subject:**Re: "Openess" reports

Why are the openess reports published if there is no procedure to criticize the quality of the investigations?  
Why did it take 19 months of taxpayer funded investigation to come to conclusions that appear to have been written by the child of the investigator for a creative writting class?  
Are all of the investigations that take more than a year handled this poorly?  
Why do any investigation? All of those cases should be given as creative writing assignments as soon as possible.  
The investigators could just go on vacation and quit pretending they are actually professional investigators.  
There is a serious systemic problem if an answer cannot be provided to explain an UF conclusion to an allegation of CRD when it can be seen and heard on a video that is not mentioned in the openess repprt.

*Sent from my MetroPCS 4G LTE Android device*

----- Original message-----

**From:** SFPD, Commission (POL)  
**Date:** Fri, May 18, 2018 12:26 PM  
**To:** Mail Service;  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:**Re: "Openess" reports

Mr. Sabel,

Thank you for your email. The Commission Office has sent your complaint to Mr. Erick Baltazar of the Department of Police Accountability. Mr. Baltazar has advised the Commission Office that your case has been investigated. While the Commission has oversight of the DPA, the Commission has no control over the outcome of an individual investigation.

Regards,

San Francisco Police Commission  
1245 Third Street, 6th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94158  
[\(415\) 837-7070](tel:(415)837-7070)

---

**From:** Mail Service [≥](#)

**Sent:** Thursday, May 17, 2018 2:10 PM

**To:** BreedStaff, (BOS); Breed, London (BOS); Henderson, Paul (DPA); SFPD, Commission (POL); Roxas, Samantha (BOS)

**Subject:** Fw: "Openess" reports

I do not understand how the investigation was closed if the evidence I provided was not used in the investigation. Specifically the video of excellent quality of the full encounter with the named officers.

Why was every descriptipn of the event different in all of the 7 allegations the were allegedly investigated?

Why did the account provided differ substantially from the account I provided in my written and oral testimony?

Why did my testimony match the video and the officers testimony not match the video?

*Sent from my MetroPCS 4G LTE Android device*

----- Original message-----

**From:** Mail Service

**Date:** Thu, May 17, 2018 10:37 AM

**To:** [sfpd.commission@sfgov.org](mailto:sfpd.commission@sfgov.org); [samantha.roxas@sfgov.org](mailto:samantha.roxas@sfgov.org); [London.Breed@sfgov.org](mailto:London.Breed@sfgov.org); [Paul.Henderson@sfgov.org](mailto:Paul.Henderson@sfgov.org);

**Cc:**

**Subject:**Fw: "Openess" reports

I do not understand how the investigation if the evidence I provided was not used on that investigation.

*Sent from my MetroPCS 4G LTE Android device*

----- Original message-----

**From:** Mail Service

**Date:** Tue, May 15, 2018 11:32 PM

**To:** [samantha.roxas@sfgov.org](mailto:samantha.roxas@sfgov.org); [London.Breed@sfgov.org](mailto:London.Breed@sfgov.org); [sfpd.commission@sfgov.org](mailto:sfpd.commission@sfgov.org); [Paul.Henderson@sfgov.org](mailto:Paul.Henderson@sfgov.org);

**Cc:**

**Subject:**Fw: "Openess" reports

How would the "openess" report be veiwed as a real investigation if the report was written correctly with all of the evidence included.

The simplest alegation CRD for the officer's statement "I will work on you..." should read: The complaning party claims that the officer said "I will work on you". The officer denied using those exact words. After reviewing the video provided by the complaining party where those words "I will work on you" were clearly stated by the officer we find the allegation of CRD unfounded.

Does this seem like a proper conclusion? or did the investigation determine that it was correct behavior for the officer to state "I will work on you". Then unfounded is the wrong conclusion.

Where is the accountability?

I do not see it and your investigators have not informed me how this was the correct conclusion. I have only seen poor excuses.

Norman Sabel

*Sent from my MetroPCS 4G LTE Android device*

----- Original message-----

**From:** Mail Service

**Date:** Mon, May 14, 2018 5:48 PM

**To:** [samantha.roxas@sfgov.org](mailto:samantha.roxas@sfgov.org); [sfpd.commission@sfgov.org](mailto:sfpd.commission@sfgov.org); [Paul.Henderson@sfgov.org](mailto:Paul.Henderson@sfgov.org); [London.Breed@sfgov.org](mailto:London.Breed@sfgov.org);

**Cc:**

**Subject:** Fw: "Openess" reports

I was surprised to receive a prompt response to this email when an "investigator" called me this afternoon. I was not surprised by the unresonsive statements that the "investigator" provided to me. Where is the accountability in the DPA when they refuse to acknowledge the video that was provided by me on 9/08/2015? This was not a case of my word v the officers. It was a case of my word which matches the video v the officers words which do not match the video.

Why was the my account of the event given in the openess report fail to match the account I gave to the investigator on 9/08/2015?

Why did the investigation take 19 months to complete if their was no evidence other than my word v the officers words?

What was investigated in those 19 months?

Norman Sabel

*Sent from my MetroPCS 4G LTE Android device*

----- Original message-----

**From:** Mail Service

**Date:** Sat, May 12, 2018 10:37 AM

**To:** [sfpd.commission@sfgov.org](mailto:sfpd.commission@sfgov.org); [Paul.Henderson@sfgov.org](mailto:Paul.Henderson@sfgov.org);

**Cc:** [London.Breed@sfgov.org](mailto:London.Breed@sfgov.org);

**Subject:** "Openess" reports

To all members of the SF Police Commission.

Where is the accounting in the DPA?

I mentioned in my letter to Paul Henderson that I attended a meeting with the investigator to review the investigation. I asked a very specific question about the allegation of CRD. Specifically I asked if she had viewed the video that was recorded by the person who called the police. She said that she had. I then asked if she heard the threatening statement from the officer. She stated that she had. I then asked for an explanation for the conclusion of an unfounded allegation. She maintained silence to that question and refused to respond to any further questions.

The summary in the "openess" report is not even close to what I viewed in the meeting with the investigator. Who writes these "openess" reports and why does the DPA refuse to hold officers responsible for their misconduct?

Again I ask: Where is the accountability in the Department of Police Accountability?

Norman Sabel

*Sent from my MetroPCS 4G LTE Android device*

----- Original message-----

**From:** Norman Sabel

**Date:** Thu, May 3, 2018 11:12 AM

**To:** [Paul.Henderson@sfgov.org](mailto:Paul.Henderson@sfgov.org);

**Cc:**

**Subject:** "Openess" reports

I appeared at a Police Commission meeting on 7/05/2017 to raise my concerns about the results from a 19 month

investigation into the complaint I filed on 9/08/2015. I wrote a letter to you about this situation and I never received a response.

Recently I discovered the "openess" reports. I downloaded the report from April 2017. I found the report for my complaint on page 65-69. My problems with this report are. The report of my account is incorrect and inaccurate.

The report on the officers accounts are illogical and impossible. They have no resemblance to the incident report or the use of force report. The most troubling part is that there is no mention of the video of the incident or any other evidence that was reviewed other than CAD reports.

Who writes these reports and why was the video completely ignored?

I reviewed several other reports and I could see obvious problems in these reports when there were serious alleogations directed towards the improper actions of the out of control officers of the SFPD.

When the allegations were not serious the reports appeared well written and factually accurate. The opposite was obvious when the allegations were serious.

I hope to receive a real response soon.

Norman Sabel

*Sent from my MetroPCS 4G LTE Android device*