

Complaint Form, Page 1

OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS - USE BLACK INK ONLY!		
(1) Day, Date & Time Complaint Received []-[]-[]-[]-[]-[]-[]		
Complaint Against: Personnel <input type="checkbox"/> Policy <input type="checkbox"/> Procedure <input type="checkbox"/> How Received: Person <input type="checkbox"/> Phone <input type="checkbox"/> Letter <input type="checkbox"/> SFPD <input type="checkbox"/> Mail-In <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> : (specify) _____		
(2) Primary Complainant: () Co-Complainant <u>Jami Tillotson</u> <hr/> Last Name First Name Middle Initial HOME ADDRESS: <u>555 7th Street</u> Street Apartment _____ <u>San Francisco, CA 94103</u> City State Zip _____ WORK ADDRESS: <u>(same)</u> Street Apartment _____ City State Zip _____	(3) Personal Information Age: <u>50</u> Date of Birth: <u>12/31/1964</u> Sex: <u>Female</u> Ethnicity: <u>Caucasian</u>	
(5) Location of Occurrence: <u>850 Bryant St</u> <u>San Francisco, CA</u>		(6) Type of Place <u>Hall of Justice</u>
(8) Day, Date, & Time of Occurrence: A.M./P.M. (Circle one) <u>January 27, 2015</u>		(7) District <u>San Francisco</u> (9) Incident Report or Citation No. <u>150-082-376</u>
(10) SECONDARY COMPLAINANT? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Witnesses? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> (If "Yes", attach separate sheet of paper.) Taped Interview? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Criminal Case Pending in Relation to This Matter? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <u>unknown</u>		

Other: N/A

Type of Injury: _____

Medical Release Signed? Yes No

(12) Activity	(13) Type	(14) DISP	(15) Uniform		(16) Rank	(17) Member's Name & Star Number	(18) Unit	(19) Svc	(20) Sex	(21) Eth
			Yes	No						
				X	Sgt.	Stansbury 2387				
			X		Sgt	Buckner				
			X		Sgt	Farmer				
			X			Woods				
			X			Eng				
			X			Kneucker				

Instructions|Page 2

(22) NARRATIVE OF INCIDENT: (Jami Tillotson, OCC Complaint)

On January 27, 2015 I was in Department 17 of the San Francisco Court in my role as Deputy Public Defender. I was in the holding tank interviewing a client when another attorney came in to inform me that one of my clients was being interrogated in the hallway outside the courtroom.

When I entered the hallway I saw my client and his co-defendant standing with their backs to the wall being questioned by Sgt. Stansbury while 5 uniformed officers stood by. I approached Sgt. Stansbury, identified myself as counsel and asked for information regarding the detention. I was not given any information regarding the basis for the detention, and was told only that it was "a police investigation."

At that point I stood beside my client to explain his rights under the detention. Sgt. Stansbury then began to take photos, and when I objected I was told that if I continued I would be arrested "for resisting arrest."

I was handcuffed in front of my client, and although I again insisted that I was present in my role as counsel, was lead through the hallway in handcuffs by Officer Kneuker and placed in the holding tank in Southern Station where I remained cuffed to the holding tank wall for approximately an hour. I twice asked that the handcuffs be removed but both requests were denied.

Officer Kneuker's treatment of me while in handcuffs was unreasonably rough. As he was leading me out of the hallway he began to shout at me and he gripped my arm in an overly aggressive manner. I explained that such treatment was neither necessary nor merited, but he ignored my protest.

Officers also ordered my colleague to stop filming, and when he refused to do so, attempted to intimidate him. Again, the officers' treatment of professional staff at work in the courthouse was not only unduly aggressive but their attempts to use their authority to overcome our actions went beyond the rule of law.

At no time did any one of the six officers present intervene to address whether the arrest of an attorney in the courthouse while she is acting in her role as counsel may be outside the boundaries of their authority.


As a result of my arrest, my client was left without the benefit of advice of counsel. The removal of counsel, and as such of any protection against the actions of the officers, created an environment in which my client believed he did not have the right to object to the questioning. His confusion and distress at the turn of events was clearly evident.

Not only was my arrest a violation of the law, but the officers showed complete disregard for my role as counsel and the processes of the courts. The handcuffing and removal of a client's attorney in front of that client sends a clear message that clients cannot object to police officer actions or demands, and as such creates a chilling effect.

YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO MAKE A COMPLAINT AGAINST A POLICE OFFICER FOR ANY IMPROPER POLICE CONDUCT. CALIFORNIA LAW REQUIRES THIS AGENCY TO HAVE A PROCEDURE TO INVESTIGATE CITIZENS' COMPLAINTS. YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO A WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF THIS PROCEDURE. THIS AGENCY MAY FIND AFTER INVESTIGATION THAT THERE IS NOT ENOUGH EVIDENCE TO WARRANT ACTION ON YOUR COMPLAINT; EVEN IF THAT IS THE CASE, YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO MAKE THE COMPLAINT AND HAVE IT INVESTIGATED IF YOU BELIEVE AN OFFICER BEHAVED IMPROPERLY. CITIZEN COMPLAINTS AND ANY REPORTS OR FINDINGS RELATING TO COMPLAINTS MUST BE RETAINED FOR AT LEAST FIVE YEARS. IT IS AGAINST THE LAW TO MAKE A COMPLAINT THAT YOU KNOW TO BE FALSE. IF YOU MAKE A COMPLAINT AGAINST AN OFFICER KNOWING THAT IT IS FALSE, YOU CAN BE PROSECUTED ON A MISDEMEANOR CHARGE.

I HAVE READ AND UNDERSTOOD
THE ABOVE STATEMENT.

THE ACKNOWLEDGMENT HAS BEEN
READ TO THE COMPLAINANT.

Complainant Signature/Date:  2/4/2015	Taken By (Name#/Unit)/Date:
Assigned Investigator/Date:	Closure Approval/Date: