

Amelia Huffman
Interim Chief of Police
Minneapolis Police Department
350 South 5th Street, Room 130
Minneapolis, MN 55415
(612) 673-3550
Amelia.Huffman@minneapolismn.gov



TO: Michael Griffin, Badge 2475
CC: Office of Police Conduct Review
DATE: 7/24/2022
RE: Administrative/Employment Investigation Case #22-00458

CHIEF'S DECISION:

- ☒ **Discharge**
- ☐ **Suspension** **Duration:** _____
- ☐ **Permanent Demotion**
- ☐ **Temporary Demotion, Duration:** _____
- ☐ **Written Reprimand**
- ☐ **No Merit**

This memo summarizes my approach and reasoning for my decision as interim Chief of the Minneapolis Police Department to terminate Officer Michael Griffin; the preponderance of the evidence supports the facts alleged in this investigation. Six allegations against Officer Anthony Griffin are sustained. This memo accompanies the enclosed discharge form.

Allegations:

Policy Number	Sub-Section	Policy Description	Category	Disposition
5-408	(1)	Ammunition	B	Sustained
5-408	(1)	Ammunition	B	Sustained
5-410	(III)(B)(1)(a)	Rifles-Assignment	C	Sustained
1-403		Compliance with lawful orders	D	Sustained
5-101	(.01)	Truthfulness	D	Sustained
2-106		Complaint Investigations (Garrity)	D	Sustained

Summary of the Basis for Decision:

The facts noted in the case investigation support the conclusion that Officer Griffin violated Minneapolis Police Department policies listed and I concur with the recommendation from the Police Conduct Review Panel that these allegations have merit.

- On January 12, 2022, Officer Griffin approached his supervisor (Sgt. Ryan Johnson) asking for rifle ammunition according to Sgt. Johnson's statement and the memo written contemporaneously. Sgt. Johnson didn't have new ammo prepared by Range staff for Officer Griffin as was the procedure and he wasn't aware that Officer Griffin was a certified rifle operator. He asked Officer Griffin and received a response from Officer Griffin that he was trained. Sgt. Johnson issued patrol rifle ammunition to Officer Griffin.
- After Officer Griffin left the office, Sgt. Johnson contacted Rangemaster Sgt. Caspers and learned that Officer Griffin was not certified to carry a department rifle. Sgt. Caspers directed Sgt. Johnson to retrieve the ammunition and any rifle being carried by Officer Griffin.
- Sgt. Johnson called Officer Griffin back to the precinct and asked if he had been patrol rifle certified, and Officer Griffin indicated he had been, describing the "familiarization" course he had attended. Sgt. Johnson informed Officer Griffin that this was not a qualification course, which is a 3-day course, and that he was not certified to carry a patrol rifle.
- Sgt. Johnson asked Officer Griffin to turn in the rifle ammunition. According to Sgt. Johnson, statement, Officer Griffin refused to go and get it and Sgt. Johnson had to go to Officer Griffin's squad to retrieve the rifle. Officer Griffin later told Sgt. Caspers that Sgt. Johnson went into his squad and took the rifle and ammunition. This is documented in the transcript of the conversation between Sgt. Caspers and Officer Griffin.
- Because of the call from Sgt. Johnson, Sgt. Caspers contacted the Training Division, to confirm whether Officer Griffin had ever participated in the Patrol Rifle Operator course and learned that he had not.
- Officer Griffin went to the Range to speak with Sgt. Caspers about the rifle policy and training. Sgt. Caspers informed Officer Griffin he wasn't certified, but Officer Griffin stated that he shot the rifle during in-service. Sgt. Caspers made it clear that Officer Griffin was not allowed to carry a rifle, and Officer Griffin stated he was going to continue to carry his personally owned rifle. Sgt. Caspers instructed Officer Griffin not to do that, but Officer Griffin stated that he had a right by law to carry a weapon, and further went on to say that he owned a National Firearms Act registered weapon and that he has been carrying it on duty for years.
- Officer Griffin told Sgt. Caspers that previous supervisors had authorized him to carry a personal rifle and he provided a list of Lieutenants (all retired) he claimed knew and allowed it.
- On January 12, 2022, Lt. Brian Sand and Inspector Katie Blackwell met with Officer Griffin. Lt. Sand documented the conversation in a memo. According to that memo, Officer Griffin stated that he had been denied training on the rifle and had no way to protect himself. Inspector Blackwell and Lt. Sand told Officer Griffin that he was not permitted to carry a patrol rifle whether City or personally owned. Officer Griffin agreed.
- On March 15th, 2022, Officer Griffin provided a Garrity statement to OPCR.

- Officer Griffin stated that when asked by Sgt. Johnson if he was certified on the rifle, he responded that he was not. He said that Sgt. Johnson then issued him rifle ammunition.
- Sgt. Johnson provided a statement in which he says that Officer Griffin was being deceptive about his qualification to carry a rifle. Sgt. Johnson issued the new, rifle ammunition because, "it was almost inconceivable to (him) that an officer would carry a rifle and go about getting their own ammunition knowing that they couldn't carry a department issued rifle without receiving a significant amount of training."
- In his statement, Officer Griffin said that after getting the ammunition, he went out on patrol with the rifle and was later called back and asked by Sgt. Johnson to turn in the rifle and ammunition. Officer Griffin stated that he returned the rifle to the armory and gave the ammunition to Sgt. Johnson as directed.
- According to Sgt. Johnson's statement, he told Officer Griffin to return the ammunition, but that "Officer Griffin wouldn't go and get it. And I ended up having to go out to Officer Griffin's squad and retrieve the rifle that was in his squad."
- According to the transcript of the recorded conversation between Sgt. Caspers and Officer Griffin, Officer Griffin told Sgt. Caspers that Sgt. Johnson went into his squad and took the rifle and ammunition.
- In his Garrity statement, Officer Griffin was asked why he needed to obtain rifle ammunition for the department issued rifle if he was not certified to carry a rifle and he said, "Because I was using the department rifle." When asked for clarification he said that on January 12, 2022, he was issued new rifle ammunition (by Sgt. Johnson), went to the armory, selected a rifle, made it squad ready and set about his tour of duty with the rifle in his squad. Officer Griffin stated that prior to January 12, 2022, he carried a department issued rifle, making it squad ready with personally owned ammunition as he had not been issued department ammunition." Officer Griffin further stated that he was using, "5.56 ammo...that's appropriate for the rifle."
- Officer Griffin said that he never claimed to be certified rifle operator but that his familiarization training permitted him to carry a rifle. He referred to a statement made during familiarization that "If an officer who was an operator goes down, then... You know, I can grab the rifle and use it..." He also stated that he understood that familiarization training was not the same as the three day operator course.
- Officer Griffin was asked if he was aware of the policy where only certified rifle operators may carry department issued rifles and he replied, "To be honest, I haven't looked at that policy in years."
- Officer Griffin stated that he has applied or made it known to his supervisors of his desire to attend rifle school, "probably every time they have made it available" over the course of his career. He went on to say that he's being discriminated against when it comes to attending the rifle school and cites the number of times that he not been allowed to participate in the rifle training. He provided an e-mail as evidence of his request, which shows he was denied as patrol rifles were not being provided to those assigned as Beat Officers at that time.
- Officer Griffin was asked whether he informed Sgt. Caspers or his supervisors that he intended to carry a personally owned rifle, he said, "It's possible." He stated that he told Lt. Sand and Sgt.

Caspers that if he was not going to be allowed to carry a department issued rifle, he intended to carry a personally owned rifle as he saw no other options to adequately protect himself. When asked if it was his prerogative to violate the policy he disagreed with, he said, "I believe as a man and as a responsible police officer, it is still my responsibility to make sure that I am safe and that I have the ability to protect other people as well, and especially myself."

- During his Garrity interview, investigators noticed that Officer Griffin was carrying a rifle magazine on his duty belt. When asked about it, Officer Griffin stated that because he was trained to deploy the rifle, he wanted to be prepared. He went on to say that the magazine was personally owned and that it was loaded with personally owned ammunition.
- During the Garrity interview, Officer Griffin asked if anyone had seen him carrying a personally owned rifle and he was advised that while no one had seen him carrying the rifle, that he himself had reported to people that he was carrying a personally owned rifle, had been doing it for years and that he had permission to do so. He was provided with the memo from Sgt. Caspers which documented these statements. Officer Griffin stated that he had never said those things, and "That is a flat out lie, I never told him that. He knows it, and I know it. That is not what was said." His denial is in direct contrast to the recorded statements he made while talking to Sgt. Caspers. According to the transcript of that conversation, Officer Griffin stated, "I decided this. I said... 'Cause I'm a grown man, I'm an adult, I am responsible for my actions. I said I will take my own rifle, put it in my trunk of squad, I went my lieutenant and sergeants and told them, "This is what I'm doing. This is why."

The Police Conduct Review panel recommended a finding of merit for the listed policy violations in this case, and I concur with their recommendations.

Allegation 1:

MPD Policy and Procedure 5-401(1) – Ammunition

Officers shall only carry MPD approved ammunition.

- Officer Griffin stated that prior to having been issued department owned ammunition for the patrol rifle on January 12, 2022, he had used personally owned ammunition to make the department rifle squad ready.
- There is preponderance of the evidence to Sustain this allegation, based on the admission of Officer Griffin in his statement to OPCR (Page 18, line 6). The MPD approved ammunition is .223 ammo, and Officer Griffin stated he was carrying a larger caliber round of 5.56 ammunition (Page 18, line 12).

Allegation 2:

MPD Policy and Procedure 5-401(1) – Ammunition

Officer shall only carry MPD approved ammunition.

- On March 3, 2022, Officer Griffin was notified by e-mail and interoffice mail of this investigation. In the notification he was advised that one of the allegations was that he carried unauthorized equipment or weapons while on-duty and in the performance of his official duties as a police officer.
- On March 15, 2022, Officer Griffin appeared for his Garrity interview in full uniform which included a personally owned rifle magazine loaded with personally owned ammunition affixed to his duty-belt.
- There is a preponderance of the evidence to sustain this allegation based on the statement of Officer Griffin during his interview with OPCR (Page 60, lines 1-16). Allegation 2 is the same as Allegation 1 but demonstrates a continued pattern of failing to comply with this policy over time and after both receiving direction from the Rangemaster and his chain of command to cease carrying a rifle.
- During the Loudermill, attorney Joe Kelly affirmed that Officer Griffin was carrying his personally owned magazine containing personally owned ammo stating: "When he gave a statement to OPCR, he did in fact have a magazine of 556 ammunition of his own. He acknowledged that. He has never lied or misrepresented any of these statements. His position on that, was that after January 12, 2022, he was told by the sergeants that the training was actually not so he could carry a rifle, but it was in case an officer who had gone through the three day certification was apparently incapacitated, that Officer Griffin would be authorized under department policy to pick up said rifle and deploy it as needed under policy. Officer Griffin had the ammunition on his person, understanding that in the case that he needs to use the rifle, he may need ammunition to load into the department weapon, if absolutely necessary."
- MPD policy does not permit the carrying of ammunition not approved by the Department for the purpose described by Joe Kelly on Officer Griffin's behalf. Furthermore, it is unclear how the unapproved ammo being carried by Officer Griffin would perform in the department rifle. When questioned during the Garrity statement about the grain of the ammo he carried, Officer Griffin did not know. Sgt. Caspers described how using the wrong ammo in the Department rifle would lead to massive failure: "Because the old rifles were 16-inch rifles, there were 62-grain bullets. We have now gone down to a 10-inch rifle with a suppressor, which... That rifle does not stabilize, so it could be up to 10 inches difference in, uh, point of aim, point of impact, which would be a massive, uh, failure. So we changed out the ammo, and specifically told everyone, "Don't carry that ammo." We took it back, and then issued the new 75 grain."

Allegation 3:

MPD Policy and Procedure 5-410(III)(B)(1)(a)

Certified Rifle Operators will check out a rifle from the precinct or unit armory at the beginning of their shift. Only currently certified officers may check out a rifle.

- In his statement, Officer Griffin said that he has carried a rifle:

Inv. Barkley:

Okay. Have you carried a department issued rifle without being a certified rifle user?

Ofc. Griffin:

Yes. I carried a rifle, yes.

- Officer Griffin said that he was confused as to whether he was able to carry the patrol rifle on-duty or not, because he was “trained” during in-service to use the rifle (familiarization).
- Officer Griffin described the familiarization training as allowing that if an officer who was an operator goes down, then he could grab the rifle and use it. He stated this level of familiarization allowed him to carry the rifle: “how can you in one breath say I'm able to grab said weapon if an operator goes down and I can deploy it then, but I'm not able to use it any other time? How does that make sense? Either I'm trained to use it or I'm not.”
- Sgt. Johnson, Sgt. Caspers and Lt. Sand all stated that it would not be reasonable to confuse a brief familiarization in the use of the rifle with the 3-day rifle school required to certify as a rifle operator.
- Officer Griffin also added that he was denied participation in the Patrol Rifle Operator course on multiple occasions. He also stated that he informed Sgt. Johnson that he was not a certified rifle operator, “He knew about- that I was not a operator before he ever gave me the ammo.”
- Officer Griffin said that on January 12, 2022, he checked out a rifle from the precinct armory, made it squad ready and mounted it in his squad for patrol.
- A screen shot of BWC footage recorded on a previous date, January 4, 2022, shows a rifle in the squad operated by Officer Griffin. On that date he was working without a partner.
- During the Loudermill, attorney Joe Kelly spoke on Officer Griffin’s behalf and cited confusion generated by the history of the rifle program over the years. He stated that the familiarization training created a second group of officers allowed to carry a rifle, beyond those certified in the three-day operator’s course because the training content included loading, unloading and making the rifle squad ready.
- Neither Mr. Kelly nor Officer Griffin asserted that Officer Griffin ever completed a qualification course of fire with the rifle. Additionally, Mr. Kelly introduced the history of the rifle program but made no reference to the content of the yearly training announcements which Officer Griffin reported responding to many times in an effort to become a rifle operator. Since at least 2012, a course titled Annual Training and Qualification has been offered to all rifle operators with the notation that attendance is mandatory to remain in the rifle program. A training announcement for 2021 MPD Patrol Rifle Operator Annual Training and Qualification was issued on May 21, 2021, and included the attendance note: MANDATORY TO REMAIN IN THE PATROL RIFLE PROGRAM. It is unclear how Officer Griffin could both conclude that he had completed training and was legally permitted to carry a rifle for years and that he was not subject to annual rifle training and qualification.

- There is a preponderance of the evidence to sustain this allegation. Officer Griffin admitted that he was carrying a department rifle and that he has not participated in the department authorized certification course. The familiarization training as described by Officer Griffin included no qualification course of fire and no annual update. Regular training announcements for the patrol rifle program explicitly require annual participation and qualification to remain in the rifle program. This is consistent with both handgun and shotgun qualification which have been required on an annual basis for many years.

Allegation 4:

MPD Policy and Procedure 1-403 Compliance with Lawful Orders

An employee must always obey lawful orders given by supervisors or their designees, but all employees will be held accountable for their use of delegated authority.

Employees shall truthfully answer questions or render material(s) and relevant statements in a departmental investigation when so directed, consistent with the constitutional rights of the employees.

- Sgt. Johnson stated that he called Officer Griffin to the office and informed him that he needed to get the 30 rounds of ammunition back from him. Sgt. Johnson stated that Officer Griffin refused to return the rifle and the ammunition and that he was forced to retrieve the items from Officer Griffin's squad himself.
- Officer Griffin was asked in his OPCR statement "Did you go out to the car, to the squad, and retrieve the ammo and the firearm and bring it back in?" Officer Griffin stated, "Yes." Officer Griffin was asked to clarify, "did you do that on your own or did he ask you to do that?" Officer Griffin indicated that we couldn't remember the sequence of events, whether he brought it in initially, or had to go out to the squad himself to get it for Sgt. Johnson.
- In a recorded conversation between Officer Griffin and Sgt. Caspers, Officer Griffin told Sgt. Caspers that Sgt. Johnson went "in my (Officer Griffin's) squad and took the rifle. And he took the ammo." This is consistent with Sgt. Johnson's statement of the account to OPCR.
- There is a preponderance of the evidence to sustain the allegation that Officer Griffin refused to comply with the order of Sgt. Johnson to turn in the patrol rifle and ammo that had been issued, based the Garrity statement by Sgt. Johnson (to OPCR) and Officer Griffin's recorded conversation with Sgt. Caspers.
- In the Loudermill hearing, attorney Joe Kelly references an e-mail from Sgt. Johnson to Sgt. Caspers, where Sgt. Johnson wrote, "When Officer Griffin came into the officer (SIC) he gave me the ammunition back" (Memo titled, "FW department rifle policy issue"). While this does create a discrepancy, Sgt. Johnson's Garrity statement is more credible as it is bolstered by Officer Griffin's own words describing the event to Sgt. Caspers.

Allegation 5:

MPD Policy and Procedure 5-101.01 Truthfulness

MPD employees shall not willfully or knowingly make an untruthful statement or knowingly omit pertinent information in the presence of any supervisor, intended for the information of any supervisor, or before any court or hearing.

MPD employees are obligated under this policy to respond fully and truthfully to questions about any action taken that relates to the employee's employment or position regardless of whether such information is requested during a formal investigation or during the daily course of business.

- Sgt. Johnson stated that on January 12, 2022, Officer Griffin led him to believe that he was authorized to carry the patrol rifle. Sgt. Johnson agreed later that Officer Griffin was deceptive and affirmed that he would not have issued rifle ammunition to a person he did not believe to be a rifle operator as it was inconceivable to him at the time that a person who was not certified would carry a rifle. Sgt. Johnson followed up with Rangemaster Sgt. Caspers as he was uncertain of Officer Griffin's status as a patrol rifle operator.
- Sgt. Johnson wrote in the first memo on January 12, 2022, describing the conversation he had with Officer Griffin when retrieving the rifle and ammo, "I asked him if he had ever been certified to carry the department rifle and he said uh-uh. He then claimed that he thought the range staff had told him when he did shoot the department rifle at the range once before he thought that counted as his certification. He also said he had been carrying his own rifle and own ammunition for several years. I asked his who at the range specifically told him that was the case, and he couldn't answer."
- According to Officer Griffin in his statement, he never said he was certified, only that he was trained to use the rifle.
- In the recorded conversation with Sgt. Caspers, Officer Griffin provided a different basis under which he was permitted to carry a rifle, asserting he had a legal right:

Sgt. Caspers: Okay. Well, so here's the deal. Okay? Per policy... And it's out there, and you can't say you didn't know it because it's been in policy. The rifle operator program, the establishment, the requirements are in the policy and that is for you to know, says that you must go through the operator course to be a rifle operator. You cannot deploy a rifle and then s- that's why you didn't get ammo, because you're not a rifle operator. So you were carrying personal rifle ammo in a city rifle not as an operator.

Ofc. Griffin: Okay.

Sgt. Caspers: Do you see where the problem is there?

Ofc. Griffin: No.

Sgt. Caspers: That's a... You don't see a problem?

Ofc. Griffin: Because there's no legal standing that says I couldn't.

- Also during the January 12, 2022 conversation with Sgt. Caspers, Officer Griffin supplied additional rationale for his decision to carry a rifle: he was denied the opportunity to attend the rifle operator training over the course of several years and separately, he had a legal right to carry a rifle under Minnesota law: "Legally. [inaudible] I already took this up with the state [inaudible]. I'm... I have a... I have the stamp license to carry [inaudible] so I know all [inaudible] I know I am legally within my bounds to carry any weapon I want to."
- On March 15, 2022, investigators asked Officer Griffin if the policy on January 12th said that only certified rifle operators could carry a rifle and Officer Griffin said, "I wouldn't dispute that, no."
- On the same date, Officer Griffin said he knew there was a three-day course, that it was required to become a rifle operator and that he did not attend the three-day course. He maintained that there was confusion about whether he was authorized to carry the rifle because he had received familiarization training.
- There is a preponderance of the evidence to sustain this allegation. Officer Griffin requested ammunition for a rifle he knew he was not certified to carry, and when asked by his supervisor whether he was authorized to carry the rifle (whether the term approved, certified or authorized was used, it is all consistent with being understood as allowed by policy to carry the patrol rifle), he responded in the affirmative. This misled his supervisor into believing that Officer Griffin was authorized to carry the patrol rifle, which he was not. Both Officer Griffin and Sgt. Johnson have acknowledged in their statements to OPCR, that they had a conversation about whether Officer Griffin was certified to carry a patrol rifle. It is not reasonable to believe that Sgt. Johnson, a part-time range instructor, would have issued ammunition to Officer Griffin if Officer Griffin had responded clearly and truthfully that he was not a certified patrol rifle operator. Additionally, Officer Griffin's statements to Sgt. Casper indicating that he has carried an unauthorized rifle for years and he believes he is not bound by MPD policy as he had a legal basis to carry weapons not authorized bolster Sgt. Johnson's belief that Officer Griffin was deceptive in his request for ammunition for a weapon he was not certified to carry.

Allegation 6

MPD Policy and Procedure 2-106 Complaint Investigations

All employees shall answer all questions truthfully and fully render material and relevant statements to a competent authority in an MPD investigation when compelled by a representative of the Employer, consistent with the constitutional rights of the individuals.

All statements of involved police employees shall be signed and sworn. Any employee found to have intentionally given a false statement shall be subject to MPD disciplinary procedures, up to and including dismissal.

- During the Garrity statement, Officer Griffin said multiple times that he did not tell anyone that he had been given permission to carry a personally owned rifle while on-duty.
- In his statement to OPCR, Officer Griffin was informed, "You told somebody that you bring your own rifle and that you've been doing it for year, and that you had permission to bring your own rifle." Officer Griffin replied, "I never said that." When asked for confirmation, "You did not say that you had permission to bring your own rifle to work?" Officer Griffin replied, "Never said that to anyone." The investigator went on to state, referencing the memo from Sgt. Caspers, "He said that you said you told him that you had permission from fifth precinct supervisors and supervisor's past to carry your own personal rifle." Officer Griffin replied, "No, Okay, I never told him I had permission from anyone. That is a flat out lie, I never told him that. He knows it and I know it, that is not what was said."
- In a recorded conversation, Officer Griffin told Sgt. Caspers that he has carried for years, a personally owned rifle while on-duty, and stated to Sgt. Caspers, "I decided this. I said...'Cause I'm a grown man, I'm an adult, I am responsible for my actions. I said I will take my own rifle, put it in my truck of squad, I went my lieutenant and sergeants and told them, 'This is what I'm doing. This is why.'" When Sgt. Caspers asked, "Which Lieutenant," Officer Griffin replied, "We had, um 13.43 which he knew...I did to my s- uh, Lieutenant 13.43 Uh, told them they did...I told um, the one...clown that used to be here. 13.43 he knew about it."
- There is a preponderance of the evidence to sustain the allegation that Officer Griffin lied during his Garrity statement, as he denied telling Sgt. Caspers that he previously received permission by his supervisors to carry a personal rifle. The conversation was recorded, and Officer Griffin did in fact tell Sgt. Caspers that he had permission from previous supervisors to carry a personal rifle.

As interim Chief of Police, I am responsible for providing clear expectations for what is acceptable behavior in our workplaces as well as what will not be tolerated. Based on my review of the facts in this investigation, Officer Griffin engaged in conduct that cannot be tolerated or accepted. The Minneapolis Police Department has set a clear standard; an officer's word must be true. The credibility of an officer and the Department rests on truthfulness in all aspects of the job. In former Chief Arradondo's 2017 vision statement he clearly explained these expectations for Minneapolis police officers:

Be truthful in all you say or put in writing. The first time you are not truthful it will always be remembered. If you are not truthful in the course of your duties, regardless of the situation, then you have committed one of the most egregious acts you can commit as someone who wears the MPD badge. Likewise, if you know a colleague is not being truthful and you remain silent, once again, you are complicit in one of the most egregious acts you can commit as someone who wears the MPD badge. We MUST be accountable to each other and the communities we serve. There is no place in the MPD for employees who are not truthful. If you are not truthful in the course of your duties, you render yourself useless as an MPD employee.

Those we serve will not tolerate employees who are not truthful. As your Chief, I will not tolerate untruthfulness.

As interim Chief, I hold officers of the Minneapolis Police Department to a high standard. I expect them to live up to our oath of office, our professional code of conduct and our department's core values of trust, accountability, and professional service. With his conduct, Officer Griffin failed to meet these standards. The policy violations in this matter undermine the public trust. Officer Griffin has made clear with his own words that he does not believe himself bound by the policies of the Minneapolis Police Department even in these most serious matters. The choice to carry a rifle while on duty without completing the required course of training and qualification to achieve certification may be a matter of life and death. The Minneapolis Police Department and the community are fortunate to have avoided a tragedy were Officer Griffin to have used a firearm that he had not demonstrated proficiency through the training and qualification that comes with the rifle operator certification course.

During the Loudermill hearing, Attorney Joe Kelly disclosed that Officer Griffin was given an opportunity to become certified with the Patrol Rifle in June 2022. Officer Griffin failed the qualification course. Officer Griffin had been carrying a firearm for which he was unable to demonstrate proficiency through a qualification course. The protection of the lives and safety of community members and other officers alike requires that officers complete necessary firearms training and qualification courses demonstrating proficiency with the tools used in a deadly force situation and then carry those tools in accordance with policy and training.

As interim Chief of Police with authority to discipline for violations of policy under Minn. Stat 626.89 Subd. 17, I am terminating Officer Griffin's employment with the Minneapolis Police Department for untruthfulness.

DocuSigned by:
Amelia Huffman
FBFE4338427B46A...

Amelia Huffman
Interim Chief of Police

7/25/2022

Enclosure: Discipline Form

CC: OPCR Case File
Inspector Blackwell