2016.000 (6 9 200 pr gr

DATE: <u>10/06/16</u>

ALLEGATION / INQUIRY / COMMENDATION – REPORT FORM

I. Infor	mation Source:						
Name: <u>Mic</u>	<u>hael</u> Rac	e: <u>W</u> Sex	M Age:	Dat	e of Birth		
Gun Address:	iter	rings City:	<u>Adairsville</u>	Z	Cip:	30103	
Home Phone:		Busin	ess Phone:				
II. Deputy/C	Civilian Employe	e Information:					
Name: Division:	Michael Wells Traffic		: <u>Sgt.</u> Number:		I.D.#:	-	
Name: Division:		Rank: Unit l	 Number:		I.D.#:	-	
III. Location of Incident:							
Е.	75 Northbound	exit 288 to 296					
Date:	10/04/16	Time:	20:30	Case	Number:		
IV. Descripti	ion of Incident:	Allegation	⊠Inquiry	Comme	ndation		
Mr. Gunter contacted a supervisor to file a complaint against Sgt. Wells. He explained his grandson Gavin Long was driving in Bartow County on 75 northbound from exit 288 to exit 296. He said his grandson is a new driver and has aspergers. When Sgt. Wells was following him he was getting nervous so he kept changing lanes to move over. Each time he pulled over Sgt. Wells followed him. He said this continued for 8 miles. He was then stopped and pulled over at the Pilot gas station at exit 296 where GSP was called. Mr. Long was charged with DUI and three failure to maintain lane charges. Mr. Gunter complains that Sgt. Wells extended a situation longer than it should have and entraped his grandson.							
V. Witness 1	Information:						
Name:	Gavin Long	Address	s:		City:		

Home Phone	·	Business	Phone:		
Name: Home Phone:		Address: Business	Phone:	City:	
VI. Person	Γaking Report:				
Name: Division:	Lt. B. Anderson ADC Shift:	<u>3</u>	Rank Badge Number:	<u>Lt.</u> <u>344</u>	
VII. Superv	isor's Comments / R	Recommendat	ions:		
VIII. Allega	tion / Inquiry / Com	mendation In	formation:		
How	A/I/C Received:	⊠Teleph	one Written Form	Personal Contact	
A/I	/ C Referred to: <u>Lt. M</u>	<u>lcCleod</u>			
□ A	/I/C Resolved on I	nitial Contact	Allega	tion / Inquiry Withdrawn	
IX. Docume	ntation Attached:	Incident Rep	ort Written Statem	ent Other	
X. Division	Commanders Revie	W: <u>APīA</u> (Signature)	w D	ate)	
□R€ □R€	ecommend Formal Cotional Comments:	for for formmendation.	urther investigation.	INTOXICATED	
			THE ROADS, THER		
	TELLING 1	YEAM CIOF	LIVES WERE SAVE	ا,۵	
Sustained:	The evidence is sufficient to	prove the allegations			
Not Sustained		•			
Exonerated:	The evidence shows that the				
Unfounded: The evidence shows that the allegation is false or not factual. Policy Failure: The evidence is sufficient to show that the incident occurred, but was a result of flawed policy or procedures.					
Policy Failure	: The evidence is sufficient to	show that the incider	it occurred but was a result of fl	awed noticy or procedures	

XI. Service of Employee							
I hereby certify that the alleg Employee Rights Form and a			ve received a copy of the				
Employee Signature			ate				
Witness Signature	.	D	ate				
XII. Notification of Fin I understand that the invest (sustained, not sustained, e she has done so. I further u determine if adverse discip	stigating officer has the do xonerated, unfounded, or understand that the invest	policy failure) and I here tigating officer is merely a	eby certify and affirm that he				
Employee Signature		Date					
Witness Signature		Date					
Distribution: Division Cor	nmander						

Internal Affairs

CHEROKEE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: Captain. J. New

FROM: Lieutenant C. McLeod

DATE: 5 November 2016

SUBJECT: AIC/Sgt. M. Wells

I spoke with Mr. Gunter about the incident involving his grandson Gavin Long. I explained I had watched the in car video of the stop and the minutes before the stop was conducted.

Mr. Gunter had a concern about Sgt. Wells following Gavin for several miles, changing lanes behind Gavin. I explained the video shows Sgt. Wells following at an acceptable following distance of 2.5-3 seconds which is normal for standard driving conditions. I also explained I saw Gavin fail to maintain lane several times, turning on his turn signal after he had already driven into another lane. Sgt. Wells was seen traveling in one lane while Gavin was in another. Mr. Gunter understood the story of events he received from Gavin was inconsistent with the video evidence.

Mr. Gunter's original complaint cited Sgt. Wells following Gavin for several miles to "entrap" him. I explained Sgt. Wells was in another jurisdiction and was waiting for a response from said jurisdiction prior to making a stop. Once Sgt. Wells received confirmation a Trooper was nearby, Sgt. Wells selected a location and made the stop. Mr. Gunter understood the reasoning.

Mr. Gunter then questioned the validity of the DUI arrest. I told Mr. Gunter GSP took the charges on Gavin. While I could provide some verification as to the validity of the stop and the charges of failure to maintain lane, I could not make comment as to the DUI investigation.

Mr. Gunter accepted my explanation regarding Sgt. Wells' actions as being within State Law and Policy. Mr. Gunter acknowledged his concern is really with GSP and the DUI investigation and not Sgt. Wells.