



City of Phoenix

To: Jack F. Harris
Public Safety Manager

Date: July 27, 2007

From: James A. Piña, Assistant Chief
Professional Standards Division

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. Piña', written over the 'From:' field.

Subject: INTERNAL INVESTIGATION - PSB06-0057

Internal Investigators:

Commander George Richards
Lieutenant Joseph Knott (Investigative Review)
Sergeant Joe Smelter (Primary Investigator)
Sergeant Brian Riggan (Interviews)

Allegation #1:

Officer Chase made false and/or misleading statements during an internal investigation into a pursuit he initiated on May 13, 2006, in the area of 1600 W. Indian School Road

Findings:

Sustained

Employee/s Involved:

Officer Michael Chase #6855
Division: Patrol Support Division
Precinct: Traffic Bureau North
Squad: T36
Schedule: 5:00 p.m.-3:00 a.m./S-M-T
Date of Hire: February 28, 1998

Complainant:

Department Initiated

Witness Employees:

See Witness Employee section

Civilian Witnesses:

See Suspect section

Photographs:

See Photograph section

Departmental Reports:

2006 60908377 – Aggravated Assault

Attachments:

See Attachment section

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

On May 13, 2006, after being involved in a police pursuit in the area of 1600 W. Indian School Road, Officer Michael Chase was issued a Notice of Investigation by his supervisor and directed to complete a memo documenting his involvement in the pursuit. A subsequent review of that memo by his chain of command identified conflicts between Officer Chase's account of what led to the pursuit and the information revealed through reviewing his radio-transmissions related to that pursuit. Specifically, based on a review of the first 84 seconds of audio-recorded radio transmissions made during the incident, the sequence of events as described by Officer Chase in his memo were in conflict with his radio transmissions. Evaluating the sequence of events using standard time/distance formulas further demonstrates that Officer Chase's account of what occurred is improbable. Also, when the suspect from the pursuit, Mr. Anthony Carrington, was interviewed about this incident his account of what occurred, in terms of sequence of events, was found to be consistent with both the radio transmissions and the time/distance analysis. Mr. Carrington's statement completely contradicts what Officer Chase claims happened. Based on a thorough review of all information, Investigators established that Officer Chase's account of what occurred is not supported by the evidence. When given an opportunity to reconcile his version of what occurred with all of the other information, Officer Chase was unable to do so. In fact, as he changed his version of what occurred in an effort to reconcile the matter, he actually created further conflict between his account of the incident and what all the other information demonstrates. The allegation that Officer Chase made false and/or misleading statements in a memo during a departmental investigation is sustained.

