

**VENICE POLICE DEPARTMENT
EMPLOYEE DISCIPLINARY ACTION FORM**

Name: **Ralph Adrian**

Date: 6/5/06

Job Title: Sergeant

Department: VPD – Patrol, Evenings

Verbal Warning Written Warning Suspension YES Number of Days = 4 Discharge
Tardy Absence Conduct Attitude Disobedience Carelessness
Substandard Performance Dress/Grooming

Count 1: Committing Unsafe Acts or Endangering Self or Others SOP 114.4.6 / 114.4.6.4

City Rules & Regulations Section 1.21, Group Two Offenses #16 and #17.

Count 2: Official Departmental Business SOP 102.3.2

City Rules & Regulations Section 1.21, Group Two Offenses #9.

Count 3: Individual Department SOP 110.3.1

City Rules & Regulations Section 1.21, Group One Offenses #26 and #27.

Count 4: Conflict of Interest SOP 114.4.7

City Rules & Regulations Section 1.21, Group One Offenses #20 and #27

Statement of facts and cite specific violation of department or city rules.

Count 1: Refer to Summary of Findings report for details. Sgt. Adrian did commit an unauthorized and unnecessary release of information concerning an on-going narcotics investigation in violation of **SOP 114.4.6 and 114.4.6.4 and City Rules & Regulations Section 1.21, Group Two Offenses #16 and #17.**

Count 2: Refer to Summary of Findings report for details. Sgt. Adrian did communicate with a non-department/non-law enforcement individual information concerning departmental matters without the approval of commanding officer(s) in violation of **SOP 102.3.2 and City Rules & Regulations Section 1.21, Group Two Offenses #9.**

Count 3: Refer to Summary of Findings report for details. Sgt. Adrian’s conduct was not free from impropriety and created a work environment not conducive to operational goals of the city in violation of **SOP 110.3.1 and City Rules & Regulations Section 1.21, Group One Offenses #26 and #27.**

Count 4: Refer to Summary of Findings report for details. Sgt. Adrian did compromise the active narcotics investigation and the working relationship of the Department with the Sarasota Sheriff Office S.I.B. in violation of **SOP 114.4.7 and City Rules & Regulations Section 1.21, Group One Offenses #20 and #27.**

In total, the violation of the above listed SOP’s and City Rules & Regulations thwarted and contaminated an on-going investigation and posed a serious potential to directly jeopardized the safety of law enforcement personnel involved in the investigation and narcotics operation. It adversely impacted the working relationship of the Venice Police Department with the Sarasota Sheriff’s Office and members of the Special Investigations Bureau. Conduct of this nature is inexcusable and highly dangerous.

Employee comments/ explanation:

EMPLOYEES' PRIOR COUNSELING OR DISCIPLINE:

• Any prior counseling(s)

• Any discipline(s) imposed

Please describe (if any)

No prior formal discipline or counseling.

RECOMMENDATION: Total discipline = 4 days (32 hours) suspension without pay

Count 1 = 1 day suspension without pay (8 hours)

Count 2 = 1 day suspension without pay (8 hours)

Count 3 = 1 day suspension without pay (8 hours)

Count 4 = 1 day suspension without pay (8 hours)

Employee Signature: Sgt. Ron Johnson Date: 6/5/06

Supervisor Signature: Robert L. Lt Date: 5 June 06

Department Head Signature: Chief Julie Williams Date: 6-5-06

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
Human Resources Director Signature: Renee Rojas Date: 6-5-06

Signing this form does not indicate agreement, but only signifies that you have been informed of the action and you have received a copy of this disciplinary statement. For additional space, use attachments. **NOTE:** A copy of this form will be placed in your personnel file.

Summary of Findings

Sgt. Adrian's taped I.A. interview places his meeting with [REDACTED] as occurring anywhere from March 1 - March 15/16, 2006. On page 2 (4th paragraph) of Sgt. Adrian's I.A. interview, he states the conversation with [REDACTED] took place the middle of March. [REDACTED] alleges the conversation occurred sometime in February (I.A. interview, p.2). Then on page 9 (I.A. interview), [REDACTED] states it occurred the first or second week of March... "I'm just assuming, 3 weeks ago." (The latter statement makes the date of the conversation April 7, 2006.)

The Sgt. Adrian/Mr. Murphy brief states the conversation between Sgt. Adrian and [REDACTED] took place on March 3, 2006. During the pre-determination hearing, Sgt. Adrian stated he was on duty on the date of the conversation with [REDACTED]. However, records show he was not working on March 3, 2006. Neither Sgt. Adrian nor [REDACTED] can state to a certainty exactly when this conversation took place.

Facts: The dates of the drug buys were January 30, March 8, and March 22, 2006. Each of these buys involved purchases of oxycontin from the primary target of this investigation who is a long-time heroin user. The actual date of the conversation involving Sgt. Adrian and [REDACTED] is unknown.

The Sgt. Adrian/Mr. Murphy brief contends Adrian's conversation with [REDACTED] was "nothing more than 'fatherly advice' to a young woman." It is important to note that Sgt. Adrian's I.A. statement concerning his conversation with [REDACTED] (as found on page 2, final paragraph) reads, "That's what I said... we were going to come, search her apartment, and tell mom and dad. That's all I remember telling her. Period. Telling her we're coming to search her apartment." It is significant to point out that [REDACTED] stated (I.A. interview, p.2, final paragraph) "I just talked to my cop friend and he says something's gonna go down." [REDACTED] identified the cop friend as Sgt. Adrian. [REDACTED] also stated the same thing later on in her interview (page 7), "All I heard from Ralph was that something was gonna go down, simply put."

The conversation between Adrian and [REDACTED] involved disclosure of an impending police action (i.e., "something's gonna go down"). This constitutes more than a "fatherly type" conversation. The content of the I.A. statements of Sgt. Adrian and [REDACTED] do not match. The only similarity in their statements involved an inability to identify the actual date of their conversation to a certainty.

The confirmation that residents of the target address were aware of the original raid date is derived from [REDACTED] based on statements made at/about the raid scene the night of the raid. Since these individuals were present and we were not, we have no standing to refute the fact these statements were in fact made. This information is credible based on over 20 years' combined experience working narcotics by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

What happened in this incident was *not normal* and it involved knowledge beyond that which could be acquired through non-police channels.

[REDACTED] performed surveillance on [REDACTED] with the knowledge of VPD patrol supervisors and officers. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] told Sgt. Adrian a male was purchasing pills from [REDACTED]. On January 25, 2006, a VPD

afternoon shift officer made a traffic stop on a subject who bought at the target address. The VPD officer [REDACTED] Sgt. Adrian [REDACTED] the subject could work with S.I.B. This means specifics were known by VPD and Sgt. Adrian as to which building and address was involved. This constitutes knowledge by Sgt. Adrian. Additionally, Sgt. Adrian was told by [REDACTED] of the postponed raid and of the subsequent planned raid for April 3, 2006. They discussed on April 2 the specifics on VPD involvement in the raid. It is absolutely false that Sgt. Adrian was not aware or given any information "until the day of the actual raid date" (brief, p.3). Sgt. Adrian knew the raid was postponed prior to the actual raid date.

The fact that [REDACTED] was hesitant to provide a taped I.A. statement is not unusual – given the inability to protect her in the event information concerning wrongdoing by a local law enforcement official was disclosed. Many law-abiding citizens are reluctant or refuse to lodge complaints or make taped statements against officers or criminals out of fear of retaliation. It does not mean that possible misconduct did not occur. It does, at times, afford one an opportunity to hide behind a reluctant witness.


Facts: Sgt. Adrian and [REDACTED] had a conversation in which Sgt. Adrian disclosed official Department business concerning a drug investigation on [REDACTED]. This information was subsequently shared with the target of the investigation. Sgt. Adrian did have specific information about the drug investigation prior to the actual raid date. A long gun was located inside the raid location during the raid operation, thus creating an unsafe situation that endangered others.

Sgt. Adrian made the VPD officer assignments for this raid and he was the VPD uniform command officer present for the raid briefing. By standard protocol for these types of situations, Sgt. Adrian *should* have been present at the scene of the raid. Given this, one wonders where Sgt. Adrian was when the raid went down and what he was doing that was more important than raid site sergeant duties. This is especially critical because Sgt. Adrian should have been and was expected to be the uniform site sergeant. During the pre-determination hearing, Sgt. Adrian stated he did not go to the raid scene because he wanted to stay available in case anything happened. This leads one to question a possible dereliction of duty if Sgt. Adrian was not present at the scene during the raid when he should have been there. The involvement of Sgt. Adrian in assigning VPD officers to the raid and his presence at the briefing - followed by his absence at the raid was highly unusual and without adequate explanation or justification. It is completely illogical that Sgt. Adrian wanted to have VPD SRT members partake in this raid as a learning/training experience (under his SRT leadership) to the point that he made the assignments to the raid and attended the briefing to then mysteriously not be at the raid scene, making it impossible for him to observe the training/learning taking place for his SRT officers and/or to perform as the site sergeant. One could argue that he knew there was no reason to be at the raid because of the information he divulged to [REDACTED] that was subsequently shared with the target individual.

In the brief, it is alleged that "there is absolutely nothing that Sgt. Adrian did or for the fact could have done to fatally compromise this investigation." This belies the realities of this case as violations of individual department and conflict of interest were committed, as well as, unsafe acts and disclosure of official departmental business.

To assert in the brief that the statement "There are drugs in every apartment in the City of Venice" is "closer to the truth than not" . . . "given the average age of the population of Venice" and that Sgt. Adrian was not referring to illicit/illegal drugs is not only an insult to the population of Venice and the taxpayers who pay Sgt. Adrian's wages, it is a gross mischaracterization of what Sgt. Adrian was, in fact, referring to; namely, illicit drugs. Sgt. Adrian stated in his I.A. interview (p.2, final paragraph) "I said there's drugs in apartments everywhere . . . the narcotics guys do a great job of arresting people and searching places and doing all that." Sgt. Adrian's statements about drugs in apartments in Venice are, without a doubt, referring to illegal drugs. To assert otherwise is to also confer an intent on Sgt. Adrian's part to condone illegal searches, seizures, and arrests of the "average" citizen of Venice for legally prescribed medications. If this is the position Sgt. Adrian desires to take in defense of his statements about drugs in Venice apartments, then there would be civil and criminal ramifications to be expected for any such conduct. Ironically, in an effort to dispel culpability of whitewashing by Sgt. Adrian, another act of whitewashing has been committed therein.

It has been proven that Sgt. Adrian is guilty of all charges levied against him in this matter. Refer to Venice Police Department Employee Disciplinary Action Form for counts and sanctions.



Chief of Police



Date