

TUCSON POLICE DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL REPORT

TO: CHIEF OF POLICE
VIA: Bureau Commander

NAME OF PERSON ABOUT
WHOM REPORT IS WRITTEN

VIA: Captain B Morales
Lieutenant J Bredehoft
Sergeant B Pelton

Officer James Voss

PR#: 43601 ✓

Div/Sq: ODE/2

Hours: 0530-1530

D.O.: F,S,Su

*RECEIVED. COC REVIEWS AND
INVESTIGATIONS ARE DUE TO
UNPROFESSIONALISM AND USE
OF FORCE CONCERNS.
05/27/25 CAPT. B. MORALES*

EXECUTIVE REVIEW

DIVISION COMMANDER

CHIEF OF POLICE

BUREAU COMMANDER

Reference: Concerns With Recent Investigations

Details:

I would like to voice some concerns I have about recent investigations that have had been initiated against me by my chain of command.

In the later part of 2024, I was compelled to write to my department chain of command as well as Tucson's city manager and the mayor and council after years of watching the quality of life for citizens in Tucson deteriorate largely due to the drug addicted homeless community and the crimes associated to the drug addicted homeless community. These crimes include, but are not limited to, criminal trespassing, criminal damage, open air drug use & drug sales, reckless burning, urinating & defecating in public, and general theft (including shoplifting and burglary). I wanted to address the lack of enforcement and/or the ineffective enforcement by all levels of law enforcement to include the Tucson Police Department, the Pima County Jail, and prosecutors from the Tucson City Court and the Pima County Attorney's Office. As a citizen of Tucson, I was tired of watching such a simple problem go unsolved for so long, especially since the problem with the drug addicted homeless community does so much damage to so many.

I decided to put pen to paper and express my opinion on this issue based on my first hand personnel experience as a patrol officer for over 20 years. I spent a great deal of time on this memorandum, most of the time used was my own personal time but I felt that the information that I had was important and needed to be heard. I submitted this memorandum on January 23, 2025. This City Memorandum was posted on The Tucson Police Protective League's Facebook page by a colleague.

On February 18, 2025, I was served with 2 PPRs (Personnel Performance Report). One PPR was regarding a use of force that occurred on January 4, 2025 and the other PPR was regarding another use of force incident that occurred on January 27, 2025. I was advised that my use of force in these incidents were justified but my conduct after the use of force caused concern. After reviewing the PPRs and comparing them to the body worn camera footage, I was confident in saying that these PPRs were **factually inaccurate**. I was also served with a notice of investigation (OPS #25-0112) on March 3, 2025.

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)

The City Memorandum I submitted on January 23, 2025 caught the attention of a local talk show host named Chris DeSimone. I was invited to appear on Mr. DeSimone's podcast on March 13, 2025. While on this podcast, I believed I was professional, positive, and respectful.

I attempted to address the factually inaccurate PPRs with SGT Pelton and LT Bredehoft through the following emails.

This email was sent to SGT Pelton & LT Bredehoft on April 1, 2025

Good evening gentlemen,

I would like to get a copy of the two complaints for the incidents that led to my two recent PPRs (Fight with Tariku at QT & the 17-year-old suicidal subject). I would like to have these complaints to prepare for the meeting with Captain Morales.

I thank you both for your attention to this matter.

***As you can see in the next email, this request was not honored and I had my meeting with CPT Morales without this information.

On April 4, 2025, LT Bredehoft responded

Jamie - I understand that your meeting with Capt Morales already occurred (4/2/25) but I wanted to provide you with follow up to your questions from earlier in the week:

Personnel Performance Reports (PPRs) - PPRs are a tool that are used to document conversations between a supervisor and an employee. In a positive sense, they can be given to document an exemplary event or task. In a negative sense, they can be given to address a behavior or action that the supervisor deems needing to be corrected. Essentially, they are a formal way to document a verbal counseling session. PPRs are not considered as a form of discipline and they are not grievable. They also do not have to be connected to any type of official complaint (often they are not), and they can be served at the discretion of the supervisor. PPRs can also be used as supporting documentation to address patterns of behavior.

P2501270106: Regarding this case, I spoke to OPS today and I confirmed that the mother of the juvenile involved has contacted OPS and intends to make a formal complaint. OPS has not yet had a chance to formally speak with the complainant. As such, an official OPS case number does not yet exist for me to provide to you. The PPR that you received for this incident was generated by your chain of command to specifically address your statement to the mother after the use of force.

P2501040058: Regarding this case, there is not an OPS complaint. The PPR that you received for this incident was generated by your chain of command to specifically address your interaction with the arrestee after the use of force.

Lieutenant Jason Bredehoft
Tucson Police Department
Operations Division East
C: (520) 965-7675

After my meeting with CPT Morales, I emailed this response to LT Bredehoff, SGT Pelton on April 10, 2025 (CPT Morales was copied on this email)

Thank you for getting back to me on this.

****The following is a reiteration of the conversation I had with Captain Morales.**

I understand that PPRs are not considered punishment and that they are not grievable. However, PPRs can be used to aggravate future punishment. When PPRs are deemed not effective, they can justify written reprimands and above. The issue that I have with these two PPRs is the fact that there are so many points in the PPRs that are factually inaccurate.

P2501270106: I agree that this was a highly charged and dynamic situation. However, I was misquoted in the PPR. I was quoted as saying "shut up" to the arrestee's mother. This quote is misleading. What I actually said was "Shut up and get out! Right now! Right now!" By saying that I only said "Shut up" leaves out the context needed to understand what was happening at that exact moment. The mother of the arrestee and the arrestee were yelling at each other and they spinning each other up. What I actually yelled instructed the arrestee's mother what I wanted her to do (shut up), where I wanted her to go (get out), and when I wanted her to do this (right now/ right now). By saying that I only said "Shut up," sounds argumentative and attitudinal. In reality, I was giving the arrestee's mother orders on what I wanted her to do.

The PPR stated that my intervention was not exigent or necessary. That is not correct. When I yelled at the arrestee's mother, I had just pulled the arrestee out of the bathroom where she was barricaded with multiple knives. She was not yet in handcuffs when her mother entered the apartment. The scene was still very much highly charged and dynamic at that time.

The PPR stated there were several other officers on scene to de-escalate the mother. That is partially true. There certainly were other officers on scene that could have kept the mother from entering the apartment and escalating the incident. Unfortunately, no one did. When I ordered the mother to "Shut up and get out! Right now, right now," I was not talking over any officers. I could have had twenty officers on scene to de-escalate the mother, but if no one took charge, then it doesn't really matter.

P2501040058: The PPR stated I engaged in a "yelling argument" with Mr. Tariku. It further stated my "unprofessional actions" raised concerns. I would like to first point out that reiterating to an arrestee that they are trespassing from a location does not constitute a "yelling argument." Officers can change their voice inflection during contacts with the public. It used to be described as command presence, now it's a "yelling argument?" I would also add that it is not uncommon for street cops to use course language when dealing with certain people. It so happens the Queen's English is not always an effective communication tool.

I would also like to point out that I arrested and booked Mr. Tariku on 12/25/2024. He had 14 outstanding warrants and 2 stop and arrests. He was arrested, transported and booked without incident. I gave this a lot of thought. I found it difficult to understand why Mr. Tariku would be as docile as he was on 12/25 with so many charges, but then fight like he did on 1/4/2025 when he facing nothing more than a misdemeanor trespass charge. The answer is where the subject is in his drug seeking cycle. Mr. Tariku was found to be in possession of fentanyl (powder and a pill) during his arrest on 1/4. I believe he saw me as the one thing standing in the way of him and his next high. It is clear to me that the main indicator of whether or not someone will fight during a police contact has more to do with where that subject is in their drug seeking cycle than anything else.

This made me curious. I spoke with personnel from the CRC and TPD with input from a doctor who specializes in behavioral health. I would like to compile the details of these conversations into a report that can be reviewed by department leadership. A few of the points that I learned from these discussions are listed below...

- Officers are often trying to "de-escalate" when they should be fighting
- It is impossible to de-escalate a subject unless they allow themselves to be de-escalated
- We, as law enforcement officials, overlooked the effects of repeated use of street drugs (this includes overdoses). The damage to the brain caused by the repeated use renders the addict incapable of functioning as a "normal" adult human being.

When we ignore the nature of our SUDs and the power of addiction, the street level officers are being set up for failure. I've spoken to several other officers about this issue and sadly, their go-to answer is to stop doing proactive policing. I don't think I am capable of coming to work just so I can pull a paycheck but I may be in the minority here.

**It should be noted that the subject of a leaked email authored by LT Bredehoft regarding Proposition 414 and that email being a possible violation of ARS 9-500.14 was discussed with CPT Morales. This was the email where LT Bredehoft offered OT to 2 officers and a CSO to discuss Prop 414 with constituents. I made it very clear that I did not and would not unlawfully use or disseminate ANY official department correspondence.

I believe that the recent rush of investigations was a retaliatory measure due to my speaking out publicly about what I saw to be the flawed tactics used to protect lives and property in Tucson. I was assured by CPT Morales that this was not the case. On April 21, 2025, I received the findings of the Force Review Board for P2501270106, the investigation where I received a PPR for my actions.

The incident documented under Tucson PD case number 2501270106 was reviewed by the Force Review Board (FRB) on March 13, 2025. The FRB found that my tactics were "justified and within department policy." The FRB also noted the following.

"The board noted that Officer Voss received a written, non-disciplinary Personnel Performance Report for his verbal interaction with the reporting party immediately following the use of force. While the board agrees that Officer Voss's tone during the exchange was unprofessional, members felt that additional contextual factors should be considered.

Specifically, Officer Voss had managed the majority of the interaction with the suspect throughout the incident, yet was also the one who engaged with the reporting party post-incident. The board observed that, given the number of other police personnel present at the scene, the reporting party's access to the immediate workspace reflected a lapse in scene management by the other officers. This lack of control contributed to the dynamic and placed the burden of post-incident communication disproportionately on Officer Voss."

On May 14, 2025, during the investigation of P2505140081, 1 week and 1 day after a fellow TPD Officer assigned to ODE was brutally assaulted at an east side Quik Trip, I was involved with a criminal trespasser at a different east side Quik Trip.

I was involved in a physical altercation with this subject in the men's room and I was able to detain him in handcuffs without either of us suffering serious injuries.

As I escorted him out of the men's room and outside of the business, he continued to be non-compliant. He would stop walking causing me to bump into him. When I got him outside, I attempted to place him in a seated position but he resisted by tensing up his muscles causing me to use more force to get him into a seated position. I then moved him into a position on his side where I applied a pain compliance pressure point (mandibular angle). The application of this pressure point had the desired effect.

When SGT Pelton briefed LT Bredehoft on this incident, specifically the use of the mandibular angle pressure point, LT Bredehoft stated words to the effect of "that sounds like aggravated assault." When SGT Pelton advised me of this statement, and knowing that aggravated assault is a felony, I advised SGT Pelton that I wanted an attorney and I would not be talking about this incident without an attorney. SGT Pelton spoke to LT Bredehoft again and then spoke to me. He stated that LT Bredehoft had "come down from the aggravated assault." While I do appreciate not being investigated for an on-duty felony, I believe LT Bredehoft's immediate reaction to jump to felony charges before seeing any of the evidence to include the available BWC footage shows a lack of impartiality that I believe is unacceptable at the command level.

I would also like to point out that the level of resistance needed to use the mandibular angle pressure point is passive resistance.

It is clear that Tucson is becoming more and more dangerous for the public and police personnel. A major cause for this escalation in violence is the increasingly violent and unpredictable nature of the drug addicted homeless community. When officers are forced to second guess their actions while considering potential administrative consequences, or in my most recent case, criminal consequences, when they are engaged in altercations with dangerous subjects, it becomes acutely clear that we do not have the support of our command staff. It is especially demoralizing when an officer takes action, the suspect gets arrested, the victim, victim business, and the employees of the victim business are thrilled with the officer's actions, and the only people who have a problem with the officer's actions are the officer's command staff.

NARRATIVE (Continued)

In the last few months I have been served with 2 PPRs that can best be described as factually inaccurate. I have also been investigated by Tucson PD's Office of Professional Standards. As LT Bredehoff stated, the PPRs and the complaint regarding the OPS investigation were generated by my chain of command, not by any members of the public. I have had my ability to work overtime shifts stripped by LT Bredehoff during a time when staffing is critical. As a single income household, the inability to work overtime has added undue stress to my family. After an altercation in a Quik Trip restroom on May 14, 1 week and 1 day after a fellow ODE officer was brutally assaulted at a different Quik Trip, I have been told I am not allowed to work in patrol after LT Bredehoff initially stated that he believed I committed aggravated assault on an arrestee. Finally, I have been told that me being transferred to another division is being "discussed." Why? I have been assigned to Operations Division East for nearly 10 years. With the exception of my LPO, I am the most tenured officer in this division. I believe this is yet another example of retaliation by my chain of command.

As the Vice-President of the Tucson Police Protective League, I try to stay on top of the equality in punishment with all members of the Tucson Police Department. In July of 2024, I was asked by several Tucson Police members if I had knowledge of a commander who was in "DV trouble." I had not heard of anything but I looked into it. I found that a Tucson Police Department commander was the one and only suspect in a domestic violence/ aggravated assault investigation by the Pima County Sheriff's Office (case number 240720147). This lieutenant's duty status has not changed and after looking at their OPS history sheet, I saw that they had not even been investigated by our department. Since I began looking into this investigation (or lack of an investigation), authoring a City of Tucson Memorandum that was constructively critical of the city's strategy for dealing with the drug addicted homeless community, and appearing on a local talk show/ pod cast, I have had the aforementioned investigations directed at me. I believe these investigations are clearly retaliatory and I would like them to stop.

Suber Son #43601 5/26/2025
RECEIVED Dalton #39293 5/27/2025

RECEIVED J. BREDEHOFF #46581 5/27/25
