

# TUCSON POLICE DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL REPORT

TO: CHIEF OF POLICE  
 VIA: Bureau Commander  
 VIA: Captian M. Ronstadt

NAME OF PERSON ABOUT  
 WHOM REPORT IS WRITTEN

Sergeant James Scott

PR#: 52267

Div/Sq: ODM/7

Hours: 1700-0300

D.O.: F,S,U

## EXECUTIVE REVIEW

<div style="position: relative;"> <div style="position: absolute; top: -20px; left: -20px; font-size: small;">Acknowledge # 25834 1/11/18</div> <div style="text-align: center;">DIVISION COMMANDER</div> </div>	CHIEF OF POLICE	BUREAU COMMANDER
--	-----------------	------------------

Reference: Untruthfulness Addendum to 18-0476

**Details:**

From April through August of 2018 Sgt. Scott engaged in, and successfully concealed, an extra marital affair with [REDACTED]. While it is not our place to judge the personal decisions of Sgt. Scott outside of his work schedule, the nature of this relationship is what predisposed him to intentionally engaging in activity in an effort to conceal it. This behavior was discovered while concealing her identity in a police report. Sgt. Scott then engaged in evasive and untruthful behavior over the course of three interviews by OPS. The following breakdown of his interviews show a pattern of ongoing untruthfulness in violation of General Orders.

This is a summary of the untruthful behavior:

**Motive and Mindset**

Sgt. Scott was intentionally untruthful in the report in an effort to conceal [REDACTED] identity. It does not matter now if identifying her in the report would or would not have exposed their affair. It is important to look at his decision at the time it was made. Some facts to consider are the location and time. This incident was reported at Reid Park at 2242 hours. Sgt. Scott indicated Reid Park was where he and [REDACTED] met "90 percent" of the time. The investigation also revealed they met after she got off work around 2200 hours. Sgt. Scott reported he could not remember if they met the night this incident occurred; however, I find it highly unlikely they were both at Reid Park by chance given what we know about their on duty meetings. Sgt. Scott drafted an inaccurate report to prevent being discovered having an affair. Statements made throughout the interviews highlight his mindset regarding people knowing about their relationship.

**Interview #1**

**Page 8 Line 18**

Regarding other people knowing about the affair Sgt. Scott stated, "...which I wasn't thrilled about but yeah so she had family that knew and friends that knew about it, yeah."

**[REDACTED] Interview**

**Page 4**

[REDACTED] explained how she learned Sgt. Scott's wife found out about the affair. His reaction showed his mindset regarding concealing the nature of their relationship.

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

Maker shall sign and date report immediately after last sentence and then draw a line across page below maker's signature. Subsequent endorsements will be made in inverse rank order with each endorser drawing a line across page immediately below the endorser's signature. Back side of page will be used if more space is needed.

---

NARRATIVE (Continued)

*Q: ...and his, you said his wife found out?*

*A: She did.*

*Q: And how, how do you know she found out?*

*A: Because he called me.*

*Q: Oh and told you that?*

*A: Mm-hm.*

*Q: Okay. What did he say exactly?*

*A: That he thinks that I told her which I did not...*

*Q: Okay.*

*A: ...and he's accused me of a bunch of stuff and called me a bunch of names and yeah.*

Sgt. Scott called [REDACTED] and yelled at her and called her names when his wife learned of the affair. He was clearly lashing out and angry about being discovered.

**Interview #3**

**Page 36 Lines 7-26**

[REDACTED] was applying for the position of police recruit. This discussion was around Sgt. Scott not being in contact with her background investigator even given his relationship with her and concerns about her suitability for the job.

*Q: Were you concerned that your affair would come to light through the background process?*

*A: Mm, no, I don't think it would no.*

*Q: Did you at any point tell her not to disclose your relationship in the background investigation?*

*A: Nope, I did not, I actually told her once, I actually said I mean if my name come tell her that you know me, I mean I don't care, I told her if he calls me I'll tell him about you I mean [REDACTED]*

*[REDACTED] you've been on ride alongs, so no I told her, I didn't say no don't disclose me, I think I opened up if he asked about me or if I come up tell him yeah you know a sergeant in Team 3 that knows you well, I was open to him calling me, Kishbaugh but I never reached out to him and told him to come, or I never told her hey bring my name up, I said but I didn't, quit opposite of that I kinda said if it comes up don't hide it, I don't care. I mean I wasn't gonna say talk about our relationship but saying you know me and I, it's to, to that extent if that makes sense.*

The last sentence is of note. "I mean I wasn't gonna say talk about our relationship but saying you know me and I, it's to, to that extent if that makes sense." That statement indicates that he was open to sharing public knowledge of their friendship and knowing each other. He had no intention of sharing the depth of their relationship. He was in a mindset of concealing the affair from the Department.

**Interview #3**

**Page 36 Lines 28-42**

*Q: And did you ever do anything to conceal your relationship with [REDACTED] from the Department.*

*A: From the Department, no, nothing.*

*Q: Nothing at all?*

*A: No 'cause I would, we're talking about the last time I was in here but when we 45, that 45 spot where I said cops regularly go, I was there I think two nights ago with another officer, so if I was trying to hide my identity with her I wouldn't be in a public space where cops go or at the park, um, park there's public around, cops drive through the park regular at night, so if I was trying to conceal my identity I think from*

---

NARRATIVE (Continued)

*the Department, I didn't hide that I had a friendship with her, they didn't know the extent of it I guess but I wasn't gonna hide like I know her, we have a friendship and we talk, so I wasn't worried about that coming to light cause people knew we talked occasionally, she'd been on a ride along*

This series illustrated Sgt. Scott was manipulating the questions. He stated he would not hide his "friendship" but he was not going to disclose the extent of it. "I didn't hide that I had a friendship with her, they didn't know the extent of it I guess but I wasn't gonna hide like I know her.."

**Interview #3**

**Page 37 Lines 37-44**

This portion of the interview continued to be about Sgt. Scott not initiating contact with Det. Kishbaugh about [REDACTED] background investigation.

**Interview #3**

**Page 37 Line 37 through page 38 Line 3**

*Q: Not to hire her, not to say go and give, to say that hey I'm in a, a relationship with her, do you need me as a reference, do you need to speak to me because..*

*A: Oh no I didn't wanna...*

*Q: We do that?*

*A: no I did not wanna disclose our affair to Kishbaugh, I didn't wanna disclose that to anyone, so no the, the affair was a personal life decision that wasn't good and that's morals and all, but no I wasn't gonna disclose an affair to a background investigator like hey me and this individual are having an affair, that would no I wouldn't do that.*

This statement gave insight into Sgt. Scott's thought process. He stated clearly he did not want to disclose his affair to anyone. He stated he would not disclose his affair to a background investigator. This shed light on his mindset in the report writing and showed his predisposition to being untruthful if he were to have been interviewed by Det. Kishbaugh.

Sgt. Scott said he told [REDACTED] to disclose they knew each other and previously he talked about limiting that disclosure to the friendship. It is common practice for a background investigator to ask how an applicant is known or the nature of the relationship. Sgt. Scott said he planned to not disclose the true nature of their relationship. He was making overt decisions to maintain the secrecy of his affair.

Previously Sgt. Scott stated he had not done anything to conceal the relationship from the Department. This last statement indicated the opposite.

**Interview #3**

**Page 38 Lines 5-8**

*Q: So how would that affect you if Kishbaugh found out you were having an affair with her?*

*A: Uh, uh, I don't know, I don't think it would've affected me you said, how would it affect me? Well he would probably judge me but I, I had no, I think it would affect the application process tremendously....*

Sgt. Scott stated Det. Kishbaugh would judge him. Previously he stated the affair was a personal life decision that wasn't good and he referenced morals. Self-image is a very common motive to be untruthful. Sgt. Scott had been involved in something he wanted to conceal. He engaged in a pattern of ongoing deceptive behavior which culminated in lying in a police report about the nature of a contact.

**Interview #3**

**Page 38 Lines 25-26**

*Q: Well it, just so you're hi, you're hiding an affair...*

*A: Yes*

**Interview #3**

**Pages 39 – 40**

The interviewers circled back to asking if Sgt. Scott was untruthful in the report to conceal the affair. He adamantly denied that was the case. He denied to the point that his actions became consistent with being deceptive. He indicated that it was 100 percent not the reason and offered explanations as to why it would not have been a big deal to identify her in the report.

**Inappropriate physical contact/Sexual Activity on duty**

**Interview #1**

**Page 5 lines 29 – 43**

*Q: Did any sexual activity take place in a patrol car?*

*A: No*

*Q: With her?*

*A: Sex no. Sexual, well maybe we should clarify what's, I...no.*

*Q: Okay*

*A: Like what do you mean sexual activity?*

*Q: Anything that can be construed of being sexual in nature?*

*A: Where does a kiss fall?*

*Q: Okay but just a like a kiss hello, kiss goodbye?*

*A: We would kiss occasionally but it wasn't really in the car, it was outside the car but, yeah.*

This was the first time he addressed their physical contact. He denied any more contact beyond a kiss.

**Interview #1**

**Page 6, lines 20-27**

*Q: Okay um, and just kissing and what about is there any other activity that happened between you and her at the park that would I guess look inappropriate to the public if they were walking by and seeing...*

*A: Yeah*

*Q: seeing it?*

*A: um, like if I was hugging her I'd grab her in the butt sometimes, so yeah that could be inappropriate for the public to see, yeah.*

This was the second opportunity to be forthcoming about the contact and her contacting his groin.

**Interview 1**

**Page 7 lines 15-17**

This was in regards to activity occurring at locations where they met other than Reid Park.

*Q: Okay. Any, any sexual activity at all, groping, making out, things like that that would've happened at these other locations?*

---

NARRATIVE (Continued)

*A: Nothing more than the park kissing. So maybe kissing yeah.*

This was the third Opportunity to be forthcoming about the contact with his groin.

**Interview 1**

**Page 8 Lines 26 – 39**

*Q: ...I'm just gonna kinda back up here a little bit....when Sgt. Petersen brought up the um actions that were sexual in nature you kinda hesitated..*

*A: Yeah*

*Q:...What would these typical rendezvous consist of?*

*A: Mostly talking um, the reason I hesitated cuz I just wanted to clarify what you mean by sexual I just wanna make sure I'm not saying like kissing someone is that sexual or not, I don't wanna fall into that so I was just trying to clarify that, mostly just talking um, she had plans to be a cop so we talked about that...*

This was the fourth time he denied any activity beyond kissing. He did not bring forward the contact with the groin.

**Interview 1**

**Page 8 lines 41-42**

*Q: Okay*

*A: We'd hug when we'd get to see each other, give each other a kiss but.*

He stated for the fifth time that the contact was limited to kissing.

**Interview 1**

**Page 10 Lines 26-44**

This is after a break from 1919 to 1924. The interview started at 1906. This was not a long or confrontational interview that would lend itself to confusion. The interviewers talked to [REDACTED] prior to interviewing Sgt. Scott and she described "groping" his groin during their contacts while he was on duty.

*Q: did she ever grab your groin?*

*A: Mm, Uh, I know that she has I'm trying to place a time at work that she did. Yeah she...*

*Q: While you were on duty?*

*A: ...yeah she...*

*Q: Off duty*

*A: ...yeah when we were hugging I remember a time when she oh my, like did it jokingly, I'm sorry, oops my bad trying to be cute so yeah.*

*Q: Okay*

*A: She did grab it in that sense.*

*Q: Purposefully in a sexual manner grabbed you groin?*

*A: Well I consider that purposely*

*Q: Okay*

*A: In a sexual manner...*

**Interview 1**

**Page 11 Lines 2-7**

*Q: Did it happen more than one time or..*

*A: I can't recall.*

---

NARRATIVE (Continued)

*Q: Just..*

*A: if it happened more than once, I know it's happened off duty where she'd do that, oh my bad, I'm sorry...*

*Q: Okay*

*A: ...but it may have happened over four months or whatever how, five months....*

Sgt. Scott acknowledged [REDACTED] purposefully grabbed his groin in a sexual manner only after being asked about that directly. On five different occasions during the first interview he adamantly stated the contact was only kissing and hugging and he touched her buttocks. He minimized their contact and was not forthcoming.

**Other members' knowledge about the relationship or affair**

[REDACTED] provided OPS with a screen shot of a text message from Ryan Azuelo confronting her about the relationship with Sgt. Scott. In the text message Azuelo indicates Sgt. Scott is his "best friend". Azuelo knew about their relationship; however, a request to interview him to establish the depth of his knowledge was denied.

**Interview #1**

**Page 8 Lines 7-23**

*Q: During your relationship with [REDACTED] was there anybody else that had knowledge at the time? During the relationship, not after, but during?*

*A: Uh, yes, one person that I know of per her, I can't confirm it but she said so and....*

*Q: Well and to your knowledge..*

*A: Well no okay the people, yes okay, I was thinking else, I was thinking something different, so did people know about our relationship to, yeah, she, a lot of people on her side knew about it...*

*Q: Okay*

*A: Which I wasn't thrilled about but yeah so she had family that knew and friends that knew about it, yeah.*

*Q: Okay, any of those people associated with the Tucson Police Department?*

*A: Uh, there's one person associated with the Police Department yeah that knew about it.*

**Interview 1**

**Page 12 Lines 31-38**

*Q: Okay. If she's, if she's had prior relationships with people on the department is there anyone that you're aware of that has said anything to you, approached you, any comments that might lead you to believe they would be the one to try and sabotage you?*

*A: Like I ss, there's only one person on this department that knows about it and no, they're a friend of mine and not, I wouldn't think they would ever, and I have even confronted this person that I know they know so, if that makes sense.*

Sgt. Scott clearly established he is aware of other people associated with the Department who knew about their relationship during the first interview. He indicated one of them was a "friend".

**Interview #3**

**Page 39 Lines 1-6**

Sgt. Scott was being questioned about coming forward to [REDACTED] background investigator about knowing her.

*Q: Who else knew about your affair?*

*A: Uh, no, uh, her family and friends, no one on the department knew.*

---

NARRATIVE (Continued)

*Q: Okay, you...*

*A: No one on the department, none of my family knew, none of, no one on the department knew, her like mom, her best friend, people on her side.*

The pattern of untruthfulness and failure to be forthcoming continued. In the first interview he was clear that at least one person, that he referred to as a friend, knew about the relationship. [REDACTED] identified that his best friend was aware of the relationship. Here he stated two times no one on the department knew. This was a false statement.

**Locations where they met**

**Interview #1**

**Page 5 Lines 11-18**

*Q: And where would you meet when you met with, with her on duty?*

*A: Um, typically at Reid Park cuz a lot of times she'd go running and I'd be there hanging out doing 64, so we'd meet there, I think that was primarily, I think we met at another location once or twice, but it was mostly always at the park, Reid Park.*

“I think we met at another location once or twice” is significant verbiage that minimized a second location [REDACTED] specifically identified as a place where inappropriate conduct occurred.

*Q: Okay was it the same spot all the time or was it...*

*A: It was just whatever was convenient*

**Interview #1**

**Page 6 Lines 42-43**

*Q: Okay. And did you meet anywhere else with her besides the park?*

*A: On duty?*

**Interview #1**

**Page 7 Lines 1-6**

*Q: On duty.*

*A: Uh, one other place, I'm trying to think, I know we met somewhere else, like I said ninety percent of the time it was at the park, I know we met at some place off of Broadway once or twice and over the months I may have seen her somewhere else I just have to think about it I mean, but like I said ninety percent of the time it was at the park.*

The verbiage “I’m trying to think, I know we met somewhere else” is significant because it showed he was hesitant to disclose the Broadway location. He indicated it was “some place off Broadway.” It is revealed in the second interview he knew exactly where this location was and he used it frequently. This was evasive and not forthcoming.

**Interview #2**

**Page 2 Bottom 2 Q & A paragraphs**

*Q: Okay. Alright and then I, I wanna go back to, uh, in your, in your note or in your interview before, uh, you had discussed, um, that maybe once or twice you had gone to another location besides Reid Park.*

*A: Mm-Hm*

*Q: Do you recall where that location was?*

---

NARRATIVE (Continued)

*A: Uh, there was a few, um, the one I said in here somewhere off Broadway, I'm assuming I know where this is, um, Broadway and I think it's between Tucson and Country Club on the south side of the road next to some Mexican Chicken place, Pollo...*

In the first interview, when asked about meeting at other places, he stated there was one other place and he struggled to remember where it was. When he was asked again, "there was a few" and he was well aware of the location on Broadway to include where it was and what business was nearby. He knew this information during the first interview and attempted to minimize it and prevent it from coming to light.

**Interview #2**

**Page 3**

The majority of this page goes over a print out of a Google map. The meeting location was identified and confirmed as Charles H Tweed which was next door to Pollo Feliz. This was consistent with what [REDACTED] described in her interview.

*Q: How many times do you think you met there?*

*A: Uh maybe 2, 3 times, I don't, can't...*

*Q: And was there a specific time you guys would meet there?*

*A: Just on those couple occasions she was coming from work and not at the park, so if that was closer to where I was or if I was already there so, say hey I'm here if you wanna...*

*Q: And why would you go to that parking lot?*

*A: That's a very common spot for cops, I mean was introduced to that spot by other cops and I pulled in that lot before the cops been forty, that's a good parking lot at night it's dark and there's a pretty a wall all the way around here and there's one entrance so it's just officer safety, I mean that's a common place for Team 3 cops.*

During the first interview he was unsure about this location. In the second interview he went there often and it was a common and good spot for cops.

**Interview #2**

**Page 4**

*Q: And...*

*A: I mean I still park there to this day regularly.*

Sgt. Scott spent the remainder of the fourth page of the interview giving details about who initiated meeting at this location, how the meetings were arranged, how sometimes he was doing paperwork and she would come there, or other times he would be driving and they would both go to that location. This was a significant and notable contradiction to his statement in the initial interview where there was "one other spot", "somewhere off Broadway", and he struggled to remember it.

On page 5 he recalled enough to provide approximate times they met. On page 7 he provided details of how he and [REDACTED] would park.

This was the second topic where he was clearly not forthcoming and making a conscious effort to minimize/conceal the nature of the contact and meetings from investigators. Much like the questioning around the physical contact he did not bring this information forward until he was specifically asked about the location.



**Concealing her identity in a police report**

Sgt. Scott had contact with [REDACTED] at Reid Park under case #1807160622. This portion addresses the factually inaccurate statements in the report, and his intentional decision to be untruthful in an effort to conceal her identity.

**Interview #1**

**Page 11 Lines 16-32**

This portion of the interview discussed any times where [REDACTED] had been in Sgt. Scott's patrol car while he was on duty.

*Q: Alright and was she ever in your patrol car while you were with her on duty?*

*A: She did a ride along with me once...*

*Q: Okay besides a ride along?*

*A: Okay, has she ever been in the car with me, yes uh, one day she was running at the park and she called me saying some guy just came up to me and wanted to kiss me and she got freaked out and we actually had a call like in thirty minutes before that about some guy and the J John it so I went over there and found the guy, I took police action, we got officers over there, we dealt with him, it was a young kid with mental health issues, afterwards she called me she was sitting across the street kinda crying and scared so I said, I let her get in my car and I drove her so down Broadway, down Randolph to her car, so she's in the car there, nothing sexual or anything like that, so she was in the car there and on a ride along, I can't think of any times, parked next to her cuz she had her car and I had my car typically, there was no reason.*

**Interview #3**

**Page 4 Line 31 through page 5 22**

Sergeant Scott confirmed that he received a phone call from [REDACTED] to report an incident about a subject harassing her while she was running at the Reid Park Track.

**Interview #3**

**Page 7 Line 7-11**

Sgt. Scott was provided his case report and reviewed it to cover how he addressed [REDACTED] contacting him.  
*Line 7-11: ...wrote a quick case, pretty much documenting (pause) what I told you for the most part um, I documented the first case was J John'd, uh, I felt that needs to be covered uh, (pause) then we get reached out to us identifying him, just a short case.*

This is significant because it was the first time he appeared to recognize the discrepancy between his report and what he described as happening. The locations of the pauses were notable. "Pretty much documenting what I told you." "For the most part". "Then we get reached out to". He began to attempt to minimize the discrepancies and attempted to not point out that what he documented was significantly different from what actually occurred and what he stated.

**Report 1807160622**

**Narrative portion, second paragraph, first line**

*"At approximately 2240 hours, I was flagged down reference a similar incident. The victim did not identify herself but advised the suspect's location."*

This is not an accurate statement based on what he described in the first interview and confirmed in the third interview. This is clearly untruthful.

**Interview #3**

**Page 17 Lines 32-43**

*Q: and you wrote that you were flagged down*

*A: Mm-Hm*

*Q: when we just discussed and you explained what happened you said you received a phone call.*

*A: Yeah*

*Q: So*

*A: It, it was a phone call I received*

*Q: So*

*A: That, this..*

**Interview #3**

**Page 18 Lines 1-44**

*Q: explain why you documented*

*A: Okay*

*Q: it as a flag down and stated it was a phone call?*

*A: Okay, just like we were previously talking was there benefits by notifying these other units I mean I'm kinda, I'm looking at this now and my wording is obviously poor um, the victim did not want to identify herself, I kinda go into...*

This was the first time he was confronted about the report. He did not answer the question.

*Q: Okay*

*A: A better, I'm sorry*

*Q: Why did you put I was flagged down and the victim did not identify herself?*

*A: Okay um, I can't give a re, so this whole statement right here, I was flagged down reference a similar incident, victim did not identify herself um, poor choice of words, she, [REDACTED] we know is the subject here, she refused, refused complainant would've been better, I wish I could've put in here refused complainant, I had no intention of putting her in here because she didn't wanna be involved in the case, a better wording would've been a refused complainant contacted me reference you know this incident....*

This was the second time he was challenged to provide a reasonable explanation for his actions. He thought out loud and worked around to his statement. He stated he wished he would have used different wording, the word choice was poor, and never provided an answer. Circumventing the question and vocalizing his rationalization of his actions was consistent with being untruthful.

**Interview #3**

**Page 19 Lines 6-18**

*Q: And when you say the victim did not identify herself.*

*A: Yeah*

*Q: Are you referring..*

*A: I wanted..*

*Q: to [REDACTED]*

*A: Yeah and I'm kinda implying she didn't want to be identified in the case um, like I said refused complainant would've been better uh, refused individual, refused would've been better work cuz she didn't*

---

NARRATIVE (Continued)

*wanna be identified in this case incident. It was kind of, that's what I put in here that's I guess the intention or what I was trying to imply here*

At this point Sgt. Scott was still searching for an explanation. He started using "implications" and stated, "I guess that the intention."

**Interview #3**

**Page 19 Line 27 – Page 20 Line 4**

*Q: So I, I guess we need an explanation as...*

*A: Okay*

*Q: to why it was documented this way?*

*A: Uh, (pause) well I see that was at 249 I was probably typing this up quickly, I was getting off of work, possibly I was just trying to run through this and get this documented real quick and write a quick case (pause) I mean I'm trying to answer your question specifically, why was it documented like this is what you are saying, um, 249, I'm getting off work, I assume I was writing this trying to get this documented really quickly, get this entered and submitted, the choice of word probably weren't ideal or they're not ideal, we're talking about it so I was flagged down reference this incident, I was flagged down saying another thing was I was called over the phone, I was, this was, this incident was brought to my attention by someone and that someone did not want to be identified in this case report so that's the kinda hitting both of those statements there, um, flagged down we typically, I know what that seems like hey right here come then you pull up like hey what do you need, the phone call was kind of a flag down but it was over the phone but what I'm documenting here which wasn't lost as I was contacted reference this incident and this subject did not want to be identified and involved in this case so.*

Sgt. Scott failed to explain why he documented the contact the way he did for a third time. The rationalization and thinking out loud provided insight into his attempts to explain away the untruthfulness. He repeated the question in his answer, he stated he was trying to answer the question, he tried different excuses to include the time, the end of his shift, etc. He concluded his statement by circling back and pointing out something positive to distract from his inability to answer "What wasn't lost as I was contacted reference this incident and this subject did not want to be identified". If he had written that exact statement it would have been truthful.

**Interview #3**

**Page 20 Line 18-26**

*Q: Okay so why did you accurately portray in the narrative that the victim did not wanna prosecute or the victim wanted to remain anonymous?*

*A: Well by me putting in here that she did not wanna be involved in the case is her implying she does not wanna be a victim. If that's, clarifies it any. Her not wanting so similar to this original incident by them saying like you asked me, like comp does not want officer contact that's them implying they don't wanna be a victim so that's how I was implying in here, her not wanting to be identified is her not wanting to be a victim in the case*

He stated, "by me putting in here that she did not wanna be involved in the case..." Those words are not in the case.

---

NARRATIVE (Continued)

This was the fourth attempt to explain why he failed to accurately document the incident. He attempted to deflect the conversation away from the documentation again by bringing up the refused complainant in the previous related J/John.

**Interview #3**

**Page 20 Lines 37-43**

*Q: where is here you're saying she did not identify herself when in fact she was fully identified cuz she called you..*

*A: Yeah*

*Q: and you knew who she was so that's not what happened she didn't identify herself, correct?*

*A: Correct*

Over the next few pages Sgt. Scott repeatedly attempted to explain his documentation as an attempt to imply the victim did not want to be identified in the case, and a poor choice of words.

**Interview #3**

**Page 22 Lines 19-38**

The interviewers asked Sgt. Scott if he was investigating this incident as a Police Sergeant or [REDACTED] boyfriend. Sgt. Scott clearly stated he was operating as a police sergeant and his relationship did not affect how he addressed this incident. The interviewers asked if the relationship changed how he documented it.

*Q: Would it have changed your wording?*

*A: Uh..*

*Q: On how you identified the contact and how you identified the victim in the narrative?*

*A: I would have to be there at 242 am writing this up, I like I don't know why those were the words I chose, that was me typing quickly at 242, I get off at 3, trying to write up a quick case, I can't say definitively I would've had a different statement here yes or no, I (pause) I mean going forward I think okay put an unidn, you know victim did not want to be iden, want to be identified, if I put in here I guess that she called me but she didn't wanna be, she wanted to be refused then that probably could've raised questions about like how would she call but wanna be a refused complainant I don't, that might make things confusing I don't know.*

*Q: Confusing how?*

*A: Well cuz they would say well identify the victim if she called you you know her so but she did not wanna be identified or this case so, I guess I'm just getting caught up on that.*

This set the foundation for the next few pages of the transcript. In pages 23 through 25 Sgt. Scott acknowledged he intentionally chose the wording he used to conceal [REDACTED] identity. He adamantly stated the reason for this was to keep her out of the report at her request, and he would have done the same for anyone.

**Interview #3**

**Page 28 Line 14-15**

*Q: Does the statement in the narrative that you res, that you used to conceal the fact that you received a phone call..*

*A: Mm-Hm*

**Interview #3**

**Page 29 Lines 9-18**

*Q: Do those statements match the reality of what happened on that day?*

*A: No but what we're high, what we're hitting is she did come forward she did con, I'm just saying the statements are crappy statements, I get that but we still would be as a prosecution standpoint or a defense standpoint is okay our victim here came forward contacted him, didn't wanna be involved is what I'm getting from those two statements, they could've been better statements but it's still hitting the overall fact that she contacted me, she did not wanna be involved and that's, so I don't think it would've changed much, I don't think it would change much honestly in my perspective. Maybe someone else's but I just...*

In this statement he acknowledged the documentation was not accurate and Sgt. Scott minimized this fact again.

Sgt. Scott has extensive experience dealing with individuals who wish to keep their identity concealed.

**Interview #3**

**Page 30 Line 35 – Page 31 Line 16**

*Q: Okay have you ever have to deal with people who provided information that wanted to remain anonymous?*

*A: Yes I did.*

*Q: Okay and how would you document that in reports?*

*A: Um, those reports well when, when dealing with informants we fully documented the informant, his identity and what he gave us but that case is typically walled off which is separated from further case reports.*

*Q: Okay.*

*A: So they are like...*


*Q: What about somebody just gave you some information?*

*A: Just off the street or..*

*Q: Sad they wanted to remain anonymous?*

*A: Uh, I would write it at that, just this information was given to me, individual wanted to be unanimous, anonymous sorry.*

This point of the interview showed his documentation was not a mistake caused by the time or his lack of knowledge around how to conceal the identity of someone wanting to remain anonymous. He stated exactly how to document this contact. He was intentionally untruthful in the police report to conceal the identity of who made the report.

  
Lt. James Brady #45650 10/04/2018