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: Deitan Dubuc, Badge 1615
CC: Office of Police Conduct Review
DATE: October 20, 2022
RE: Administrative Investigation Case #21-04251

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 Police that the listed policy violations by Sgt. Dubuc are sustained. The memo accompanies the enclosed Notice of Discipline and Suspension Form.

13.43 [redacted]

13.43 [redacted]

- [redacted]
  - [redacted]
- [redacted]
- [redacted]

13.43

Allegation [redacted]: It is alleged that Sgt. Dubuc failed to ensure that MPD rules, regulations and orders were followed. **MPD P/P 1-405 Responsibility of Supervisors**.

- When Sgt. Dubuc was notified of the missing 2-year-old, he did not ensure that officers had carried out the steps required by MPD policy 8-201 including – notification to 911 for the NCIC entry, responding to the child's home to verify the status of the juvenile, ideally with a search of the premises (with consent) and then a follow-up contact with MECC Channel 7 to confirm if the missing report is founded or unfounded.
- Sgt. Dubuc did not make other notifications or consult investigative resources to determine the best course of action in handling this report of a missing two-year-old. This failed to set an example for subordinates as required by the policy.
- The Police Conduct Review Panel (PCRP) provided a unanimous recommendation of Merit for this allegation.
- I agree with the PCRP, that there is a preponderance of the evidence to show that Sgt. Dubuc failed to ensure that the officers under his command followed the requirements of MPD P/P 8-201 Missing Juveniles. This allegation is **sustained.**

<u>Summary of the Basis for Decision</u>:

The facts noted in the case investigation support the conclusion that Sgt. Dubuc violated Minneapolis Police Department Policies 13.43 [redacted] 1-405 Responsibility of Supervisors. I concur with the recommendation from the Police Conduct Review Panel that there is merit 13.43 [redacted].

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

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 ethics and our department's core values of trust, accountability, and professional service. Furthermore, I expect them to demonstrate procedural justice in their work.

Sgt. Dubuc failed to ensure that officers had carried out the steps required in the missing juvenile policy; 13.43 he did not make notifications to a higher-ranking supervisor; and he did not consult any investigative resources to determine the best course of action. In his investigative interview and Loudermill hearing, Sgt. Dubuc described a situation in which the reporting party/father was not concerned for the safety of the 2-year-old who was in the care of her adult sister. This is not supported by the BWC video of the father reporting the missing child to Officers Hain and Rasmussen or the initial PIMS report that was written by Officer Rasmussen and approved by Sgt. Dubuc. In the narrative report, Officer Rasmussen described the father as concerned and wrote, "PPI [father] believes that PPI [adult daughter] is suffering from mental illness, and according to the PIMS database, PPI was reported missing on 04/29/2021 and reportedly had returned as of 05/03/2021 at 1412 hours when a follow up was conducted by Sgt. Julie Ann Hagen. PPI was also placed on a transport on 04/04/2021 for a mental health evaluation."

Sgt. Dubuc failed to recognize and act on the seriousness of the situation as a reasonable supervisor should. As a supervisor, he had a greater responsibility to take action himself and to direct the actions of his subordinates to diligently and thoroughly investigate the circumstances of the incident and protect the welfare of the missing child. The missing child policy protocols exist to confirm the status of a child reported missing as quickly as possible, protect the welfare of a child who may be endangered and increase the opportunities to locate the child by entering the information in NCIC and making appropriate notifications for a search as soon as possible. While the necessary steps were later taken by other employees and the child was located, unharmed, in another state, the initial failures could have resulted in harm to the missing child or significant delays in locating and returning her to her parents.

As interim Chief of Police with authority to discipline for violations of policy under Minn. Stat 626.89 Subd. 17, I am issuing a Letter of Reprimand 13.43 - Personnel Data

13.43 - Personnel Data

13.43 - Personnel Data

13.43 - Personnel Data

13.43 13.43 - Personnel Data

Allegation 13.4: MPD P/P 1-405 Responsibility of Supervisors, Sustained. **Letter of Reprimand.**

DocuSigned by:
Amelia Huffman
13.37
Amelia Huffman
Interim Chief of Police

Enclosure: Discipline Form

CC: OPCR Case File
Inspector Gomez