



# **Arlington Police Department**

## **Use of Force**

### **2015 Annual Report**

---

## **Table of Contents**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	3
INTRODUCTION/POLICY.....	4
INJURIES OF ALL PARTICIPANTS OF FORCE INCIDENTS .....	5
GRAPH OF INJURIES .....	5
Total UOF Occurrences by Districts – 2015 .....	6
NO. OF UOF OCCURRENCES AND NO. OF INCIDENTS – 5 YR TREND.....	7
NO. OF OFFICERS USING FORCE – 5 YR TREND.....	7
SUBJECTS UPON WHOM FORCE WAS USED AND SUBJECTS ARRESTED – 5YR TREND.....	8
FIREARM POINTED AT SUBJECT – 5 YR TREND .....	8
OC INCIDENTS – 5YR TREND .....	9
ECW INCIDENTS – 5YR TREND .....	9
2015 TYPE OF FORCE USED.....	10
COMPARISON OF TOTAL FORCE USED TO EFFECTIVE APPLICATIONS FOR 2015 .....	10
USE OF FORCE BY REASON FOR CONTACT.....	11
UOF BY REASON FOR CONTACT CHART .....	11
TYPE OF FORCE BY REASON FOR CONTACT .....	12
USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS BY TIME OF DAY.....	12
PERCENTAGE OF INCIDENTS BY TIME OF DAY .....	12
TYPE OF FORCE PER OCCURRENCE BY TIME OF DAY.....	13
AGE PROFILE OF EMPLOYEES WHO USED FORCE .....	14
BREAKDOWN OF EMPLOYEES USING FORCE BY AGE .....	14
RACE PROFILE OF EMPLOYEES USING FORCE.....	15
RACE PROFILE OF EMPLOYEES INVOLVED IN FORCE OCCURRENCES.....	16
GENDER PROFILE OF EMPLOYEES USING FORCE.....	17
GENDER PROFILE OF TOTAL EMPLOYEES RELATED TO USE OF FORCE OCCURRENCES .....	18

RACE PROFILE OF SUBJECTS..... 19  
GENDER PROFILE OF SUBJECTS ..... 20  
AGE PROFILE OF SUBJECTS ..... 21  
INJURY PROFILE OF SUBJECTS..... 22  
SUBJECT INJURIES ..... 22  
TREATMENT PROFILE OF SUBJECTS..... 23  
ANALYSIS OF SUBJECTS ADMITTED TO HOSPITAL ..... 24  
USE OF FORCE LITIGATION SUMMARY ..... 25  
USE OF FORCE LITIGATION SUMMARY CHART ..... 26

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During 2015, Arlington Police Officers applied force in 2850 Use of Force occurrences.

These occurrences were documented on 877 separate incidents. In 2015, the Arlington Police Department responded to 297,379 calls for service which is a decrease of 15,823 calls for service from calendar year 2014 which had a total of 313,202. This number represents all police-public interactions including dispatched calls as well as self-initiated stops and investigations. The 877 reported incidents represent .3% of all calls-for-service.

There were 1,790 subjects involved in the 877 incidents. Subjects include males, females, unknown subjects and animals.

Of the 1,790 subjects involved in reported use of force, 696 were arrested. The 696 arrested subjects that force was used upon represent 4.8% of the 14,636 total numbers of subjects arrested by the Arlington Police Department.

Of the 1,790 subjects, 93.8% did not report injuries.

Force was reported to be effective in approximately 95% of the 2850 occurrences.

A total of 426 employees used force one or more times in 2015. This number includes sworn personnel and detention staff.

The most frequently used type of force was *Firearm Pointed at Subject* which was used on 1198 of the 2850 occurrences (42%).

Beginning with Recruit Class #46 in 2013, recruit training dealing with force application integrated neuro-scientific research to construct a tactics model which enhances a recruit's ability to use force more effectively. The model is specifically designed to enhance an officer's ability to utilize that portion of the brain known as the pre-frontal cortex, which enables cognitive processing, decision making, proportionality, ethics, and professionalism and inhibits inappropriate responses in force encounters. This furthers the application of procedural justice concepts during force occurrences in order to promote, sustain and enhance the legitimacy of the department with the people we serve.

De-escalation training was incorporated in all tactics training beginning in 2013. In 2013-2014 suspect care following force applications was introduced. In 2015, the concept of task-switching (force application to care delivery) was introduced in basic training and defensive tactics for detention officers. Delivery of post-force care will be incorporated in all force training in 2016.

**Note:** *The Data represented in this report involves all 2015 Use of Force Reports received by the Training Section as of February 17, 2016.*

## **INTRODUCTION/POLICY**

The Arlington Police Department requires employees who use force, to document the force usage on a Use of Force Report. This is in accordance with standards established by the Commission on Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) and as a matter of good community based government agency practice.

According to CALEA Standard 1.3.6, a written report is to be submitted whenever an employee:

1. Discharges a firearm, for other than training or recreational purposes;
2. Takes an action that results in, or is alleged to have resulted in, death or injury of another person;
3. Applies force through the use of lethal or less lethal weapons; or
4. Applies weaponless physical force at a level as defined by this agency.

The departmental policy on reporting force is outlined in General Order 401.05.A. and 401.05.D; specifically, the policy states:

**A. When Written Report Required.** Unless injury prevents it, before the end of the employee's shift, a Use Of Force report will be submitted when an employee:

1. Takes an action that results in or is alleged to have resulted in injury or death of another person;
2. Applies force through the use of:
  - Empty hand control;
  - Drawing a firearm in response to the presence of any subject unless the officer is acting in accordance with general maintenance, storage, or authorized training;
  - Pointing a firearm at any subject;
  - Handcuffing a person who is released without arrest;
  - Chemical irritant (oleoresin-capsicum spray, CS or CN gas);
  - TASER and/or the accidental discharge of a TASER;
  - Impact weapon;
  - Vascular Neck Restraint;
  - Discharge of firearm on or off-duty (training and recreation are exempted);
  - Diversionary device;
  - Apprehension by dog.


**D. Reporting Exception.** Personnel assigned to a tactical operation who participated in both a pre-operation briefing and a post-operation debriefing or evaluation and whose actions were reviewed according to the procedures of the Special Operations Standard Operating Procedure are exempt from completing the Use of Force Report form.

# INJURIES OF ALL PARTICIPANTS OF FORCE INCIDENTS

Officer Injuries, as noted on a Use of Force Report, remained steady for 2015. While there was a slight increase in 2012, the long term downward trend continued in 2015.

The number of subjects upon whom force was used increased from 1,244 (CY 2014) to 1,790 (43.9% increase). Reported injuries for force recipients remained the same from 2014 to 2015 (111) with a 0% increase and reported injuries for employees using force increased slightly from CY 2014 (38) to CY 2015 (42).

## GRAPH OF INJURIES



Yearly totals may differ from previous versions of this report due to system latency

## KEY ANALYSIS POINTS

The Percentage Difference reflects percentage of change from CY 2014 to CY 2015.


Report Type	2011	2012	2013 *	2014*	2015	% Difference 2014-2015
Officers / Detention Officers	630	621	620	683	682	-0.2%
<b>UOF Occurrences</b>	3090	2847	2564	2590	2850	<b>10.0%</b>
# of Incidents	1048	1063	971	907	877	-3.3%
Firearm Pointed at Subject	1385	1109	1097	1187	1198	-0.9%
# of Officers Using Force	440	413	418	415	426	<b>2.7%</b>
# of Subjects Force was Used	1407	1391	1502	1244	1790	<b>43.9%</b>
# of Subjects Arrested**	825	801	884	725	696	-4.0%
Subject Injury	209	232	214	111	111	0.00%
Employee Injury	28	53	43	38	42	<b>10.5%</b>
OC Incidents	174	192	155	131	108	-17.6%
ECW Incidents***	141	238	203	111	140	<b>26.1%</b>

Yearly totals may differ from previous versions of this report due to system latency. The number of officers/detention officers includes authorized related positions in the department and may include some vacancies. Previous reports only included filled commissioned officer positions.


### Total UOF Occurrences by Districts – 2015

District	Count Per District
NORTH DISTRICT	868
SOUTH DISTRICT	432
EAST DISTRICT	567
WEST DISTRICT	371
JAIL	147
OTHER	465
<b>TOTAL (All Districts)</b>	<b>2850</b>

## NO. OF UOF OCCURRENCES AND NO. OF INCIDENTS – 5 YR TREND




## NO. OF OFFICERS USING FORCE – 5 YR TREND




# SUBJECTS UPON WHOM FORCE WAS USED AND SUBJECTS ARRESTED


## - 5YR TREND




## FIREARM POINTED AT SUBJECT - 5 YR TREND



## OC INCIDENTS – 5YR TREND



## ECW INCIDENTS – 5YR TREND




## 2015 TYPE OF FORCE USED

Type of Force Used	Total Used	Percent of All Force	Effective	Ineffective	N/A	Effectiveness %
Firearm Pointed at Subject	1198	42%	1156	42	0	96.5%
Empty Hand Control	516	18.1%	474	42	0	91.9%
DFIRTAS	487	17.1%	473	12	2	97.1%
Handcuffed Subj. w/o Arrest	350	12.3%	349	0	1	99.7%
ECW	140	4.9%	111	21	8	79.3%
OC Spray	108	3.8%	94	11	3	87%
Other	24	0.8%	24	0	0	100%
Apprehension by K9 w/o Bite	16	0.6%	16	0	0	100%
Impact Weapon	4	0.1%	4	0	0	100%
Apprehension by K9 w/Bite	2	0.1%	2	0	0	100%
Firearm Discharged	5	0.2%	5	0	0	100%
<b>Total Occurrences</b>	<b>2850</b>					

\*DFIRTAS – Drawing Firearm In Response To A Subject

\*\*Other – Jail Restraint Chair/Leg Restraints/ etc.


## COMPARISON OF TOTAL FORCE USED TO EFFECTIVE APPLICATIONS FOR 2015



## USE OF FORCE BY REASON FOR CONTACT

Total UOF by RFC	Number	% of Total
Dispatched Call	1941	68.1%
On-View Offense	505	17.7%
Jail Custody	147	5.2%
Traffic Stop	129	4.5%
Other	127	4.5%
Tactical Operation	1	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2850</b>	<b>100%</b>

## UOF BY REASON FOR CONTACT CHART



## TYPE OF FORCE BY REASON FOR CONTACT

Type of Force Used	Dispatched Call	Jail Custody	On- View Offense	Other	Traffic Stop	Tactical Operation	Total
Firearm Pointed at Subject	820	0	217	88	73	0	1198
DFIRTAS*	393	0	62	16	16	0	487
Empty Hand Control	318	99	83	4	12	0	516
Handcuffed Subject w/o Arrest	235	0	75	19	21	0	350
OC Spray	48	26	32	0	2	0	108
ECW	98	0	36	0	5	1	140
Other**	3	21	0	0	0	0	24
Firearm Discharged	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Apprehension by K9 w/o Bite	15	0	1	0	0	0	16
Apprehension by K9 w/Bite	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
VNR***	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Impact Weapon	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
<b>Total Occurrences</b>							<b>2850</b>

\*DFIRTAS – Drawing Firearm In Response To A Subject.


\*\*Other – Jail Restraint Chair/Leg Restraints

\*\*\*VNR – Vascular Neck Restraint

## USE OF FORCE INCIDENTS BY TIME OF DAY


Time Of Day	Total	% of Incidents
0600-1400 hours	164	18.7%
1400-2200 hours	356	40.6%
2200-0600 hours	357	40.7%
<b>Total Incidents</b>	<b>877</b>	<b>100%</b>

## PERCENTAGE OF INCIDENTS BY TIME OF DAY



## TYPE OF FORCE PER OCCURRENCE BY TIME OF DAY


Type of Force Used	Day Shift	Evening Shift	Midnight Shift	Total Used	% by Type of Force Used
Firearm Pointed at Subject	181	414	603	<b>1198</b>	<b>42%</b>
Empty Hand Control	84	239	193	<b>516</b>	<b>18.1%</b>
DFIRTAS	110	168	209	<b>487</b>	<b>17.1%</b>
Handcuffed Subject w/o Arrest	46	114	190	<b>350</b>	<b>12.3%</b>
ECW	31	47	62	<b>140</b>	<b>4.9%</b>
OC Spray	24	42	42	<b>108</b>	<b>3.8%</b>
Other	17	6	1	<b>24</b>	<b>0.8%</b>
Firearm Discharged	3	1	1	<b>5</b>	<b>0.2%</b>
Apprehension by K9 w/o Bite	1	3	12	<b>16</b>	<b>0.6%</b>
Apprehension by K9 w/Bite	0	2	0	<b>2</b>	<b>0.1%</b>
VNR	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Impact Weapon	0	0	4	<b>4</b>	<b>0.1%</b>
<b>Total Occurrences</b>	<b>497</b>	<b>1036</b>	<b>1317</b>	<b>2850</b>	
<b>% by Scheduled Shift</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>36.4%</b>	<b>46.2%</b>		



## AGE PROFILE OF EMPLOYEES WHO USED FORCE


Type of Force Used	18-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-46	47-50	51+	Totals
Firearm Pointed at Subject	95	331	370	191	141	46	24	1198
Empty Hand Control	53	134	132	62	91	21	23	516
DFIRTAS	43	123	90	85	81	30	35	487
Handcuffed Subject w/o Arrest	30	68	109	66	44	22	11	350
ECW	11	42	38	18	19	8	4	140
OC Spray	18	23	23	11	13	13	7	108
Other	2	1	12	4	3	0	2	24
Firearm Discharged	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	5
Apprehension by K9 w/o Bite	0	0	4	0	12	0	0	16
Apprehension by K9 w/Bite	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
VNR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Impact Weapon	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	4
<b>Total Occurrences</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>724</b>	<b>780</b>	<b>438</b>	<b>406</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>2850</b>
<b>Percentage</b>	<b>8.8%</b>	<b>25.4%</b>	<b>27.4%</b>	<b>15.4%</b>	<b>14.3%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3.8%</b>	

## BREAKDOWN OF EMPLOYEES USING FORCE BY AGE




## RACE PROFILE OF EMPLOYEES USING FORCE

Type of Force Used	<u>A</u>	<u>AI</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>W</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>% by Force Used</u>
Firearm Pointed at Subject	51	3	106	166	872	1198	42%
DFIRTAS	16	3	71	83	314	487	17.1%
Empty Hand Control	26	3	80	92	315	516	18.1%
Handcuffed Subject w/o Arrest	19	3	50	45	233	350	12.3%
OC Spray	3	0	10	12	83	108	3.8%
ECW	7	2	16	20	95	140	4.9%
Other	0	0	7	9	8	24	0.8%
Firearm Discharged	0	0	1	0	4	5	0.2%
Apprehension by K9 with Bite	0	0	0	2	0	2	0.1%
Apprehension by K9 w/o Bite	0	0	0	7	9	16	0.6%
VNR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Impact Weapon	0	0	1	0	3	4	0.1%
<b>Total Occurrences</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>436</b>	<b>1936</b>	<b>2850</b>	
<b>% of Total Occurrences</b>	<b>4.3%</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>15.3%</b>	<b>68%</b>		



**RACE PROFILE OF EMPLOYEES INVOLVED IN FORCE OCCURRENCES**

	Race					Total
	A	AI	B	H	W	
<b>Occurrences</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>436</b>	<b>1936</b>	<b>2850</b>
<b>Percentage</b>	4.3%	0.5%	12%	15.3%	68%	100.00%



This comparison takes into account all commissioned officers and detention staff; however, it does not separate those assigned to Field Operations versus those in Support Operations and Community Support.

## **GENDER PROFILE OF EMPLOYEES USING FORCE**

Type of Force Used	Female	Males	Totals
Firearm Pointed at Subject	147	1051	1198
Empty Hand Control	80	436	516
DFIRTAS	66	421	487
Handcuffed Subject w/o Arrest	45	305	350
ECW	32	108	140
OC Spray	14	94	108
Other	9	15	24
Firearm Discharged	0	5	5
Apprehension by K9 w/o Bite	0	16	16
Apprehension by K9 w/Bite	0	2	2
VNR	0	0	0
Impact Weapon	1	3	4
<b>Total Occurrences</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>2456</b>	<b>2850</b>
<b>% by Gender for total UOF</b>	<b>13.8%</b>	<b>86.2%</b>	

Male employees represented 86.2% of all force occurrences. This represents a ratio of female to male use of force at a rate of roughly 1 to 6.2


Comparing the following uses of force by females and males as compared to the total number of occurrences, the following results are found:

	<u>Females</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Ratio</u>
o Firearm Pointed at Subject	12.3%	87.7%	01:7.1
o Empty Hand Control	15.5%	84.5%	01:5.4
o DFIRTAS	13.6%	86.5%	01:6.4
o ECW	22.9%	77.1%	01:3.4
o OC Spray	13%	87%	01:6.7

The disparity between males and females using force is greatest with the “Firearm Pointed” and “OC Spray” categories of force.


## GENDER PROFILE OF TOTAL EMPLOYEES RELATED TO USE OF FORCE OCCURRENCES

Gender	Female	Male	Total
Number of Total Employees (Sworn/Detention)	135	527	662
Total Occurrences	394	2456	2850




## RACE PROFILE OF SUBJECTS

Type of Force Used	A	B	H	UNK	W	Animal	Totals
Firearm Pointed at Subject	24	557	236	3	378	0	1198
Empty Hand Control	16	224	76	0	200	0	516
DFIRTAS	9	265	75	0	138	0	487
Handcuffed Subject w/o Arrest	6	166	70	0	108	0	350
ECW	2	70	22	0	46	0	140
OC Spray	1	55	16	0	36	0	108
Other	1	11	0	0	12	0	24
Firearm Discharged	0	4	0	0	0	1	5
Apprehension by K9 w/o Bite	0	7	3	0	6	0	16
Apprehension by K9 w/Bite	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
VNR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Impact Weapon	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
<b>Total Occurrences</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>1363</b>	<b>498</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>924</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2850</b>
<b>% by Race of Total Occurrences</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>47.8%</b>	<b>17.5%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>32.4%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	



## GENDER PROFILE OF SUBJECTS


Type of Force Used	Female	Male	Unknown	Animal	Total Used
Firearm Pointed at Subject	289	906	3	0	1198
Empty Hand Control	105	411	0	0	516
DFIRTAS	118	369	0	0	487
Handcuffed Subject w/o Arrest	92	258	0	0	350
ECW	11	129	0	0	140
OC Spray	32	76	0	0	108
Other	12	12	0	0	24
Firearm Discharged	0	4	0	1	5
Apprehension by K9 w/o Bite	2	14	0	0	16
Apprehension by K9 w/Bite	0	0	2	0	2
VNR	0	0	0	0	0
Impact Weapon	2	2	0	0	4
<b>Total Occurrences</b>	<b>663</b>	<b>2181</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2850</b>
<b>% by Gender For Type of Force Used</b>	<b>23.3%</b>	<b>76.5%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>0%</b>	



## AGE PROFILE OF SUBJECTS

Type of Force Used	00-14	15-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-up	Unk	Total
Firearm Pointed at Subject	12	190	441	258	99	68	29	101	1198
Empty Hand Control	8	92	186	145	37	33	6	9	516
DFIRTAS	6	46	185	115	49	16	11	59	487
Handcuffed Subject w/o Arrest	6	100	114	52	21	10	5	42	350
ECW	0	16	50	51	16	2	1	4	140
OC Spray	1	27	30	30	11	4	0	5	108
Other	0	0	16	4	0	0	0	4	24
Firearm Discharged	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	1*	5
Apprehension by K9 w/o Bite	0	3	5	4	3	0	0	1	16
Apprehension by K9 w/Bite	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
VNR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Impact Weapon	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
<b>Total Occurrences</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>1031</b>	<b>662</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>2850</b>
% by Age for UOF of Subjects	1.2%	16.7%	36.2%	23.2%	8.3%	4.7%	1.8%	8%	


Note: \*Reflects firearm discharge against animal  
 Force used on Subjects between the ages of 20-39 constituted 59.4% of all force.



## INJURY PROFILE OF SUBJECTS

SUBJECT INJURY TYPE	SUBJECT COUNT	% of Injuries by Type
Death or Serious Bodily Injury	2	0.1%
Injury	75	4.2%
Injury Complained of but not Observed	34	1.9%
No Injury	1679	93.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1790</b>	


## SUBJECT INJURIES



## TREATMENT PROFILE OF SUBJECTS

SUBJECT TREATMENT TYPE	SUBJECT COUNT	% BY TREATMENT TYPE
ADMITTED TO HOSPITAL	19	1.6%
NO TREATMENT REQUESTED	1085	91.2%
TREATED AND RELEASED	86	7.2%
Unknown	0	0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1190</b>	

NOTE: Unknown is a subject whom the officers were unable to take into custody.



## **ANALYSIS OF SUBJECTS ADMITTED TO HOSPITAL**

Nineteen (19) subjects were listed as "Admitted to the Hospital":

Five (5) of the nineteen (19) were documented properly for this category.

Four (4) of the nineteen (19) subjects admitted to the hospital with injuries were as a result of the application of force. One (1) subject had eye irritation due to O/C spray. One (1) pregnant female claimed stomach pain after a brief struggle and was taken to the hospital. One (1) subject was arrested by TCSO with the assistance of APD. Force was used by both APD and TCSO. TCSO transported the subject to the hospital. No details were provided as to the injuries sustained. One (1) subject was admitted to the hospital after a deadly force application (See report number 15-57467).

One (1) in this category was related to deadly force used on a dog. The dog received medical treatment at a veterinary clinic.

The hospitalizations listed below were reported improperly:

Three (3) of the subjects were hospitalized due to narcotics related issues and were not related to the application of force. These were incorrectly documented on the Use of Force form. These should not have been listed as "Admitted to Hospital" since it was not as a result of any force used.

Seven (7) of the subjects were hospitalized on emergency applications for detention.

One (1) elderly subject complained of chest pains after being arrested. No force was used during the arrest. A Use of Force report was generated as a result of handcuffing the subject and then releasing him for medical reasons. The admittance into the hospital was not related to an application of force.

Three (3) involved injuries that were sustained prior to officer's arrival on scene and were not related to the application of force.

The improper reporting of injuries/hospitalizations is being addressed through training and education.

## USE OF FORCE LITIGATION SUMMARY

City of Arlington—Arlington Police Department					2011 - 2015	
Case Style	Court	Brief Facts	Disposition	Amount Paid	Totals per Year	% of Total Payout
<b>2011</b>						
Cause No. No Suit Filed; <b>Kennedy Nyakondo</b> v. City of Arlington, Texas	No Suit Filed	Excessive force alleged during traffic stop	Denied	\$0	<b>\$56,145.70</b>	<b>26.34%</b>
Civil Action No. 4-11-cv-00193-Y; <b>Jonathan Pierce</b> v. The City of Arlington,	US District Court—Ft. Worth Division	Wrongfully tazed when police chasing another suspect	Settled	<b>\$29,448.76</b>		
Case No. 4:13-cv-00465-Y; <b>Manuel Juarez</b>	US District Court—Ft. Worth Division	Alleged injury during arrest	Dismissed	<b>7,437.99</b>		
Case No. 153-266799-13; 4:13-cv-00631-A, Hailey Hutchinson	153rd Dist. Ct., Tarrant Cty; US Dist Court, Ft. Worth	Alleged injury during arrest	Settled	<b>19,258.95</b>		
Case No. No Suit Filed, Vincent Wali	No Suit Filed	Alled excessive force during arrest	Denied	\$0		
<b>2012</b>						
Civil Action No. 4:14-cv-00029-A, Brandon Wade	US District Court—Ft. Worth Division	Alleged excessive force	Dismissed	<b>22,894.95</b>	<b>157,036.72</b>	<b>73.66%</b>
Case No. No Suit Filed; James Kite	No Suit Filed	Eye injury from being maced by police	Denied	\$0		
Civil Action No. 236-261015-12; 4:12-cv-00818; Julie & Ki Perry	236th Dist. Ct., Tarrant Cty; US Dist Court, Ft. Worth	Attendee at party alleging excessive force by police	Dismissed	<b>\$40,703.76</b>		
Case No. 3:13-cv-02199-O; Victor Vega	US Dist Court, Dallas	Excessive force alleged during traffic stop	Dismissed	<b>\$11,167.27</b>		
Case No. 4:13-cv-00911-O; Yadier Carreno	US Dist Court	Excessive force alleged against multiple officers	Dismissed	<b>\$53,945.19</b>		
Case No. 3:13-cv-02205-D; Vanessa Aguilar	US Dist Court, Dallas	Alleged excessive force	Settled	<b>\$28,325.55</b>		
<b>2013</b>						
Case No. No Suit Filed; Kwontrail Hawthorne	No Suit Filed	Alleged excessive force when tazed by police	Denied	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Case No. No Suit Filed; Andrew Hill	No Suit Filed	Alleged excessive force during arrest	Denied	\$0		
<b>2014</b>						
Case No. No Suit Filed; Paul Phillips	No Suit Filed	Alleged excessive force during arrest	Denied	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>2015</b>						

Case No. 4:15-cv-00384-A; Bobbie Waters; Estate of Jonathan Paul	US District Court	Death while in police custody	Open	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
Case No. 4:15-cv-00929-A; Terrance Davis	US District Court	Alleged assault during booking	Open	\$0		
Case No. No Suit Filed; Christian Taylor	No Suit Filed	Fatally shot by police responding to burglary	Open	\$0		
Case No. No Suit Filed; Dale Kerlee	No Suit Filed	Wrongfully tazed by police searching home	Open	\$0		
Case No. No Suit Filed; Patricia Griffin	No Suit Filed	Officer pushed citizen against door, causing injury	Denied	\$0		
Case No. No Suit Filed; David Dixon	No Suit Filed	Alleged excessive force when restrained	Open	\$0		
<b>Grand Total</b>					<b>\$213,182.42</b>	<b>100%</b>

## USE OF FORCE LITIGATION SUMMARY CHART

