

LEXINGTON POLICE DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL ORDER

Lexington, Kentucky

DATE OF ISSUE

September 13, 2021

EFFECTIVE DATE

October 9, 2021

NUMBER

PO:21-349

TO: RETIREMENT	AMENDS:
INDEX AS: OFFICER JUSTIN BURNETT	RESCINDS:

This is to advise on the retirement of Officer Justin Burnett on Years of Service, to be effective, October 9, 2021.

Favrence B. Weathers

Lawrence B. Weathers Chief of Police

LBW/rmh



Lexington-Fayette Urban County Division of Police

MEMORANDUM

Lexington, Kentucky

Commander Chad Bacon Public Integrity Unit

DATE OF ISSUE

August 23, 2021

EFFECTIVE DATE

NUMBER COP: 21-0138

SUBJECT:

Formal Complaint PIU2021F-016

Officer Justin Burnett

Lawrence B. Weathers FROM:

Chief of Police

I am recommending that Officer Justin Burnett be scheduled to go before the Disciplinary Review Board in regards to his Formal Complaint (PIU2021F-016).

Saurena B. Weathers

Lawrence B. Weathers Chief of Police

LBW/rmh

Attachment

Public Integrity Unit



LEXINGTON POLICE DEPARTMENT MEMORANDUM Lexington, Kentucky

ANDUM 08/11/2021

EFFECTIVE DATE

08/11/2021

NUMBER

PIU 21-080

0:	SUBJECT:
Lawrence Weathers	Summary of Formal Complaint on Ofc. Justin
Chief of Police	Burnett, PIU2021F-016
FROM:	
Lieutenant Matt Brotherton	
Bureau of Investigation - Public Integrity Unit	

DATE OF ISSUE

Sir,

This memorandum will provide a summary of the investigation into the Formal Complaint filed by Lt. Chris Van Brackel against Officer Justin Burnett. According to the Complaint:

On 06-25-21, officers were dispatched to 175 N. Mt. Tabor regarding a report of domestic violence. Upon arrival they located the suspect in an apartment at this location after speaking briefly with the female victim. The officers asked the subject to come out of the apartment, however he did not comply and attempted to close the door on the officers. While the suspect continued to force the door closed on the officers the Taser was utilized on the suspect in order for the officers to gain access into the residence. Upon gaining control of the suspect and handcuffing him, Officer Burnett continued to engage with the subject and the situation escalated to the point where Officer Burnett placed his hands in the area of the subject's neck. Officer Burnett was eventually pulled off the suspect by another officer on-scene to de-escalate the situation.

If the above allegations are true, Officer Justin Burnett has violated General Order 1973-02K Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.23 Use of Force, which states No officer shall use more force in any situation than is reasonably necessary under the circumstances. The use of physical force shall be restricted to that amount of force which is reasonable and necessary to effect a lawful arrest, overcome resistance, or in defense of self or others. Officers shall use force in accordance with law and established procedures.

Investigation

Pursuant to being assigned the formal complaint, I reviewed all relevant BWC footage and submitted memos. The following is a synopsis of the event:

On Friday, 06/25/2021, Officers Justin Burnett and Rebecca McAllister were dispatched to 175 N. Mt. Tabor Apt. for a report of domestic violence. At the scene, they met with the victim and then attempted to make contact with the suspect who was still in the apartment. Based on the statements given by the victim, the Officers had sufficient information to charge the suspect with Assault 4th, Domestic Violence.

Officers Burnett and McAllister made contact with the suspect, Juan Turcios, when he opened the apartment door slightly. Mr. Turcios refused to allow Officers inside. Mr. Turcios attempted to close the door on the Officers, but Officer Burnett was able to get his body into the doorway

enough to prevent the door from being completely shut; however, Mr. Turcios pressed his body against the door, trapping Officer Burnett in the doorway.

After giving repeated directions to Mr. Turcios, Officer Burnett deployed both of his Taser Cartridges; the deployments were ineffective. Officer Burnett then borrowed Officer McAllister's Taser and Mr. Turcios stepped away from the door. Officers Burnett and McAllister then entered the apartment, deployed a third cartridge, and were able to handcuff Mr. Turcios.

Following the handcuffing of Mr. Turcios, Officers moved him to a seated position in the apartment hallway. There, Officer Burnett and Mr. Turcios continued speaking to each other about the incident. Ultimately, Officer Burnett yells at Mr. Turcios and tells him to "Shut the fuck up!" and then reaches down and begins to engage physically with Mr. Turcios. The two of them move down the hall, Mr. Turcios handcuffed on his back and side, and Officer Burnett standing over him.

The two end up in the bathroom where they are yelling at each other and Officer Burnett places his right hand under Mr. Turcios' chin in the neck area. Officer McAllister and Officer Logan Stricker then pull Officer Burnett off of Mr. Turcios. Officer Burnett then leaves the apartment and Officer Sticker stays with Turcios.

Officers Stricker, in his submitted memo, stated that he "observed Officer Burnett's hands around the suspect's neck" and that he assisted Officer McAllister in "pulling Officer Burnett off of the suspect." Officer McAllister, in her submitted memo, stated:

The suspect was also yelling so much that he was spitting in Officer Burnetts' face, causing him to lose his patience with the suspect to the point that Officer Burnett had placed his hands around the suspect's throat. Officer Stricker and I pulled Officer Burnett off the suspect to keep Officer Burnett from hurting the suspect. Recognizing that Officer Burnett was clearly upset, I told him to go outside to get away from the suspect.

Lt. Van Brackel reviewed the incident and determined that Officer Burnett placed his hand first over Mr. Turcios' mouth and then on his neck, utilizing inappropriate control techniques and force. Additionally, he determined that Officer Burnett's language escalated the situation.

Training Review

The incident was submitted to the training section for review. According to Sgt. Kidd:

Based on the suspect's actions and the totality of circumstances presented at the time of the incident, it was not an appropriate use of force by Officer Burnett to choke the handcuffed suspect. Under our policy "Choke holds (i.e. a physical maneuver that restricts an individual's ability to breathe for the purposes of incapacitation) are prohibited unless deadly force is authorized."

Officer Burnett was not presented with a deadly force situation that justified physically choking a handcuffed suspect. In this case the actions by Officer Burnett are not consistent with our department's policy and runs counter to our Defensive Tactics instruction. Officer Burnett's actions were not an objectively reasonable amount of force in this particular case.

Additionally, on July 19th, Officer Burnett completed de-escalation and defensive tactics retraining with the Training Section.

Interview with Officer Burnett

On July 23rd, 2021, Lt. Biroschik and I spoke with Officer Burnett in the PIU Office. We spoke to Officer Burnette after he completed his retraining. Below is a summary of the recorded interview.

During the conversation, Officer Burnette acknowledged that he did not act appropriately and that he allowed Mr. Turcios to frustrate him to the point that he used inappropriate language and control techniques that are not approved.

When asked whether he violated policy, Officer Burnette said that he did violate policy in regards to profanity and that he "maybe" violated policy with the force he used. Officer Burnette said that he was attempting to move Mr. Turcios' head so that Mr. Turcios could not continue to spit on Officer Burnette. He stated that he does not know what else he could have done.

Officer Burnette acknowledged that he did not clearly recall his actions from the incident. He stated that he did not know that he had his hand on Mr. Turcios' neck until he watched Officer Stricker's BWC footage.

Conclusion

Officer Burnette, during his interactions with Mr. Turcios, failed to use de-escalation techniques as taught by the Lexington Police Department. Officer Burnette's use of profanity and unauthorized control techniques ultimately led to other officers having to remove him from the scene. According to the Training Section, the force used by Officer Burnette was not consistent with the Lexington Police Department's training or expectations.

Lieutenant Matt Brotherton Bureau of Investigation Public Integrity Unit

cc: file - PIU 2021F-015



Lexington Police Department MEMORANDUM Lexington, Kentucky

DATE OF ISSUE
July 14, 2021

EFFECTIVE DATE

NUMBER

PIU: 21-073

TO:
 Assistant Chief Brian Maynard
 Bureau of Patrol

FROM:
 Lieutenant Matthew Brotherton
 Bureau of Investigation
 Public Integrity Unit

COMPLAINANT: Lieutenant Chris Van Brackel

ACCUSED OFC.: Officer Justin Burnett

ALLEGATION: Violation of General Order 1973-02K Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers,

Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.23 Use of Force.

ALLEGED CIRCUMSTANCES: On 06-25-21, officers were dispatched to 175 N. Mt. Tabor regarding a report of domestic violence. Upon arrival they located the suspect in an apartment at this location after speaking briefly with the female victim. The officers asked the subject to come out of the apartment, however he did not comply and attempted to close the door on the officers. While the suspect continued to force the door closed on the officers the Taser was utilized on the suspect in order for the officers to gain access into the residence. Upon gaining control of the suspect and handcuffing him, Officer Burnett continued to engage with the subject and the situation escalated to the point where Officer Burnett placed his hands in the area of the subject's neck. Officer Burnett was eventually pulled off the suspect by another officer on-scene to de-escalate the situation.

ACTION REQUESTED:

- The Bureau Commander and Officer Burnett should sign the Acknowledgment Sheet and process this complaint.
- The Commanding Officer should provide the attached copy of the Form 111 and the Officer's Rights Packet to Officer Burnett.
- Officer Burnett should contact the Public Integrity Unit to arrange for a time to provide a formal statement.

	<u>DATE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
Bureau Commander	07/19/21	0830
Supervisor	०२/११/२०२१	0723
Officer	07/19/21	0723
Accused officer would like the Public Integrity Unit to notify that a formal complaint is filed against them. (Circle One)	the FOP Presider	nt or their designee
Returned to the Public Integrity Unit MI Returned	CON 07/1	9/21/1:45

Lieutenant Matthew Brotherton

Bureau of Investigation Public Integrity Unit

mrv

enclosures

cc: Chief Lawrence Weathers file – PIU2021F-016

Lexington Police Department Formal Complaint Form 111

File #: PIU2021F-016

		101				
Member(s) Involved		Employee No.	D.O.B.	D.O.E	Present Ass	signment
Burnett, Justin		43978		3/21/2005	BOP - Ea	
Complainant		Address-Apt. No	o Zip Code		Telephone	No.
Lt. Chris Van Brack	el		•			
Employed By		Business Address - Zip Code			Telephone No.	
Lexington Police De		150 E. Main,		<u> </u>		
Date of Incident	Time of Incident	Location of Incident Date and T		Date and Tir	ne Reported	How Reported:
6/25/2021		175 N. Mt. Tabor 7/14/20		7/14/2021 @	09:57 Letter Phor	
arrival they located to victim. The officers attempted to close the officers the Taser was Upon gaining control subject and the situal subject's neck. Officers attempted to close the officer shades at the situation. If the above allegation is the above allegation is the officer shades are states No officer shades are shades and necessary to efficient accorded to the officer in accorded to the officers attend to the offic	asked the subject as door on the office as utilized on the old of the suspect as tion escalated to dicer Burnett was on. The constant of the suspect as a second of the suspect as a s	to come out of ficers. While to suspect in ord and handcuffing the point whereventually pull cer Justin Burr Officers, Appear in any situation of the point was a fine and the point was a fine a	of the apartment of the suspect of the suspect of the of g him, Officer Bred off the subsection of the	ent, however leads to for ficers to gain a ser Burnett consumett placed haspect by another ated General Corational Rueasonably necestata amount of	he did not conce the door concess into the door concess into the tinued to end is hands in the officer of the transfer of the	omply and r closed on the he residence. ngage with the the area of the on-scene to de- 8-02K of Force, which r the h is reasonable
I swear/affirm that the fa		Date: 07/		ge and belief.	- 10 ·	(
Subscribed and sworn	before me this date:	7/4/21 (D)	ate)	1 May	(Notar	OtawKINFS
			Му Со	ommission Expire	s: 232	2005

Address

Witnesses:

Name

Phone Number

Chief of Police (or "Designee"	'):				
Policy Violation	Finding				
GO 1973-OZK OR 1.73 USE & FORCE	Proper Conduct				
	Improper Conduct				
	Insufficient Evidence				
	Policy Failure				
	Unfounded				
Chief of Police Recommendati					
Recommend Case Be Closed Corrective Training Recommended Below Disciplinary Action Recommended					
Comments:					
Relieved of Duty Referent To Review 1	BOARD LEVEL Z HUMIN ASSIN				
Reviewed of Duty Referent To Review 1 VIEW BUC'S PILL SYNOPSIS.					
1 1	1- 1				
Signature: James West	Date: 08/23/2021				
Disciplinary Review Board					
Policy Violation	Finding				
	Proper Conduct				
	Improper Conduct				
	Insufficient Evidence				
	Policy Failure				
	Unfounded				
Disciplinary Review Board Recomm	endation				
Recommend Case Be Closed Corrective Training Recommended	Below Disciplinary Action Recommended				
Comments:					
Signature: Date:					
Chief of Police 2nd Recommends					
Recommend Case Be Closed Corrective Training Recommended	Below Disciplinary Action Recommended				
Comments:					
G: 4	Date:				
Signature:					
Proper Conduct: Allegation is true; the action of the agency or the officer was consistent with agency policy.					
<u>Improper Conduct</u> : The allegation is true; the action of the agency or the officer was inconsistent with agency policy.					
Insufficient Evidence: There is insufficient proof to confirm or to refute the allegation.					
Policy Failure: The action of the agency or the officer was consistent with agency policy, but the policy did not take into account the					
circumstances present in this instance. Unfounded Complaint: Either the allegation is demonstrably false or there is no credible evidence to support it.					
Uniounided Complaint. Ditter the anegation is demonstrately raise of there is no creating					