

Case: 4:18-cv-01364-SPM Doc. #: 331-2 Filed: 08/07/23 Page: 2 of 17 PageID Lieutenant Golonel Michael Sack July 19, 202

July 19, 2023 Page 28 1 Α Yes. 2 Was it ever an -- Was it the practice for it 0 3 to be an oral statement? 4 No, it was -- The practice was for it to be Α 5 written out or typed out. 6 Why was that the case? 7 It was just what they would do. It was what Α 8 they were doing when I arrived, and so we just continued 9 that practice. 10 0 Okay. Did that change at all in the time 11 period when you were there before FIU? 12 I -- I don't remember. 13 When an officer -- When a civilian shoots 0 14 another civilian, is it typically the case that the only 15 thing you asked from that shooting civilian who is a 16 suspect is a -- is a written statement? 17 No, there -- that would be oral statement. 18 Am I correct to understand that, generally if Q 19 a civilian shoots a civilian, the shooting-suspected 20 civilian is -- you attempt to ask that person questions; 21 correct? 22 Α Yes, sir. 23 Why is that the case? Q 24 Well, that was just the practice. You want to Α

talk to them directly if they're willing to talk.

1	know, obviously we would Mirandize them, depending on the
2	circumstances at the scene, whether we presume it to be
3	self-defense or we think that it was a criminal act. And
4	then if they elect to talk to us, then we would be able to
5	elicit information from the citizen as close to the time of
6	the event whenever we get them in about what happened.
7	Q And why is it important to elicit to elicit
8	not testimony, but but oral an oral recitation of
9	what happened from the suspect?
10	A To get their side of the story and to put that
11	into the report.
12	Q Okay. Why did police officers who were
13	involved in officer-involved shootings not get questioned
14	in that same way?
15	A It was just our practice to do it in a written
16	statement. I I don't know where that came from.
17	Q Based on your experience within the
18	department, would you agree that it was it would be
19	preferable to try to get from any suspect both a written
20	statement as well as an interview statement?
21	MR. PRATT: Objection. Improper hypothetical,
22	and calls for speculation. Subject to that, you can
23	answer.
24	A So can you ask that again?
25	Q (By Mr. Waldron) Yeah.

Case: 4:18-cv-01364-SPM Doc. #: 331-2 Filed: 08/07/23 Page: 4 of 17 PageID Lieutenant Golonel Michael Sack July 19,

Page 30 1 Jamie, would you mind reading it MR. WALDRON: 2 back? 3 (The requested portion of the record read by the reporter.) 4 5 If it's possible. Α 6 (By Mr. Waldron) It would be preferable; 0 7 correct? 8 Α Yes. 9 And you may have said this already, so 0 Okay. 10 forgive me. Your testimony is that -- that you don't know 11 why it was the case that shooting officers in the pre-FIU 12 era were not asked interview questions? 13 Yeah. I don't know why. Α Correct. 14 Did you take any steps to change that process 15 during your tenure as the captain? 16 So as the years went by, I brought it to the Α 17 attention of my supervisors, hey, we probably need to do 18 this differently. But it did not change until late '14. 19 Okay. And that was with the FIU; correct? Q 20 Yes, sir. Α 21 Okay. Can you tell me about what you told 22 supervisors about -- about that -- that initial -- and if 23 I'm understanding you correctly, we're talking about the 24 fact that shooting officers were not interviewed after the 25 shooting, whereas a civilian suspect who shoots somebody

Case: 4:18-cv-01364-SPM Doc. #: 331-2 Filed: 08/07/23 Page: 5 of 17 PageID Lieutenant Golonel Michael Sack July 19, 2023

Page 69 1 Q Okay. 2 I don't -- I don't remember. Α 3 Q You said you raised this issue about 4 officer-involved shootings to Isom? 5 Α Yes. 6 What was Isom's response? 0 7 I don't recall what his response was exactly. Α 8 I mean, I don't know that he was too overly concerned. 9 Do you know why there was not something 0 Okay. 10 like FIU initiated under Isom after you were concerned 11 about this in late 2009? MR. PRATT: Objection. Speculation. 12 Subject 13 to that, you can answer. 14 I was told that there was pushback from the 15 police unit. 16 (By Mr. Waldron) Who told you that? Q 17 I don't remember. Α 18 So your understanding was that the Q Okav. 19 obstacle in starting an FIU was the police unit? 20 Α Well, not in starting an FIU, but like I said, I said, I don't care where it goes, but 21 audit advisor. 2.2 there should be somebody independent objective who does 23 only this. 24 Q Okay. 25 So to -- to go somewhere else, not just to get

Case	e: 4:18-cv-01364-SPM Doc. #: 331-2 Filed: 08/07/23 Page: 6 of 17 PageID Lieutenant Golonel Michael Sack July 19, 202
1	Page 70 rid of it. I mean, it was our responsibility. We were
2	capable of doing it and doing an honest job of it. I mean,
3	we watched it, but it needed to go somewhere.
4	Q Okay. Once Dotson took over around 2013, did
5	you express the same concern to Dotson?
6	A Yes.
7	Q Okay. What did Dotson say about it?
8	A I think it was the same thing, the the
۵	union wagn't in favor of it. It didn't go anywhore

0 Okay. Do you know how Dotson went about creating FIU once it finally began to be created, I think, 2013 and '14?

Α I don't recall what the -- set it off, but somewhere in late '13 or early '14, he agreed to do something, to create some unit, because he assigned a sergeant to the unit to go train, I want to say, in early And by -- By the fall of '14, I cannot remember '14 maybe. the name of the citizen that was shot. I believe it was on North Florissant. He was armed with a knife.

> Kajieme Powell? 0

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

That's -- Thank you. So it was after Α Yes. that event that Dotson actually activated and started transferring people down to what was known at that time as the Force Investigation Unit.

> Were you involved -- And if I understand Q

out, what do we owe the circuit attorney's office, if	Page 99
anything? So Chief Hayden can push back saying, hey,	you
can prove we delivered these reports.	
So that's when I asked if we could do som	ne

kind of audit of the unit to look at all the reports that they had done and what they're doing down here and see if we're right or if the circuit attorney is right or if we owe somebody something or if we could do a better job with this.

Q Before we talk about the audit, I want to talk about -- about that period you described before the audit where you started to look at some reports and you didn't like, I think you said, the way they were structured. Am I correct that during this initial period, Roger Engelhardt was still running FIU?

A Yes.

Q Was it your decision to get rid of Roger Engelhardt?

A It was my decision -- my recommendation that he be removed.

Q Okay. And -- And why did you make that decision?

A So he was stuck on the belief that the report should include a lot of ancillary information that wasn't germane to what happened at this particular time and place.

1	So if there were a police shooting and some for some
2	reason a stolen auto was involved in it and a stolen purse
3	from a separate event, they would scan in everything having
4	to relate to that stolen auto, lab reports, interviews,
5	everything. The same thing for the purse. And so that
6	just made the report cumbersome, more difficult to read and
7	follow because you're look because I'm looking at
8	property. I'm counting the property screens and how they
9	relate to the narrative, where are they at in the
10	narrative. It's a meticulous process. It just complicated
11	everything, and it took forever just to get that one
12	report.
13	So I didn't I didn't know why it took so
14	long for him I mean, weeks for them to to deliver the
15	report. So it just that kind of thing, I just it
16	was It was time for a separation to bring somebody else
17	in, somebody who I worked with before and trusted would be
18	able to pick this up and get it to run right, what I
19	believed to be right.
20	Q That person became was John Green; right?
21	A Yes, sir.
22	Q And we'll talk about
23	A He's a friend of mine, but he's a responsible,
24	conscientious guy, and if he couldn't do it, I wouldn't
25	pick him.

Case: 4:18-cv-01364-SPM

Doc. #: 331-2 Filed: 08/07/23 Page: 9 of 17 PageID Lieutenant Colonel Michael Sack Page 104 You talked about the fact that there 0 Okay. were numerous additional forms in the FIU investigations from the Engelhardt era. Do you remember what -- what we were discussing? Α Reports. Yeah. Q Yeah. Α And -- and that there -- there was lots of -lots of extra documentation; correct? Α Yes. Would you agree that -- that part of the difficulty with that sort of style is that it makes it more difficult to get to the heart of the shooting or the -- the incident at issue? MR. PRATT: Objection. Speculation. Improper hypothetical. Subject to that, you can answer.

Having read it myself, yes. Α

(By Mr. Waldron) Were you ever concerned that Q the purpose of doing that was to obfuscate what actually went on?

> Same objection. You can answer. MR. PRATT:

Α Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

(By Mr. Waldron) Okay. Did you ever have a conversation with Engelhardt after you made the decision to recommend his transfer?



Page 119 From the internal investigation. Α

Did you ever see evidence from the 0 internal investigation as to whether or not Lieutenant Colonel Jones routinely met with Engelhardt?

I don't remember what was -- I don't -- I Α I know that -- that those were things that don't remember. would have been discussed or questioned of her, but I don't recall what her response was.

Do you know whether or not anybody during 0 either the FIU audit or the IAD investigation talked with Rochelle Jones?

- She was interviewed, yes. Α
- Do you know who interviewed her? 0
- Lieutenant Brown and myself. Α
- 15 Was this part of the IAD investigation or part 0 16 of the FIU audit?
- 17 The IAD investigation. Α

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

And that's a good point because I MR. PRATT: am going to object to any question that has to do with the IAD investigation. Depending on the question, probably instruct the witness not to answer because Lieutenant Engelhardt still has a pending matter with the City.

MR. WALDRON: So what would be the grounds?

Well, involved in his discipline. 24 MR. PRATT:

25 So it's an ongoing in which the City is the defendant.

	π. <del>1</del> 005
1	Page 120 that would get into attorney-client privilege, that would
2	get into potentially litigation strategy. Likewise, above
3	and beyond that, Lieutenant Engelhardt has an expectation
4	of confidentiality with regard to issues of discipline and
5	things like that. At a minimum, I think he would have to
6	have an attorney here or need to be present in order to be
7	able to consent to that so that we are not exposed to
8	potential liability for discussing those confidential
9	matters.
10	MR. WALDRON: Okay. So you
11	MR. PRATT: I think the I think the FIU is
12	fair game. I think the IAD investigation is not.
13	MR. WALDRON: Okay.
14	MR. PRATT: To give you some guidance.
15	MR. WALDRON: You've said a lot, and I
16	appreciate that.
17	THE WITNESS: Can I Can I ask a question?
18	May I ask
19	MR. WALDRON: Let me Can I respond to this?
20	THE WITNESS: Sure.
21	MR. WALDRON: Just so that we've got it all
22	clear. My understanding is that the FIU that the IAD
23	investigation is going to relate to Engelhardt's tenure
24	running the Force Investigation Unit, so I think it's
25	relevant. If there are conversations that Lieutenant



Page 121 1 Colonel Sack is going to relate that involve -- that 2 involve counsel, I agree that those are attorney-client 3 privilege. I'm willing to designate this entire section of testimony as confidential under the protective --4 5 protective order, which means that anything that's filed 6 related to it or presented in court will have to be done 7 pursuant to the protective order. What I would prefer not 8 happen is that we have to cut this off, we have to litigate 9 it, and then we have to come back and do it again because I 10 think that it's highly relevant to the core issues at the 11 heart of this case, which is, to what extent was Roger 12 Engelhardt supervised, and to what extent did Roger 13 Engelhardt supervise the -- the FIU. 14 So I'm more than happy to designate it as 15 confidential. I'm more than happy to make sure that we've 16 got that on the record so that it is under seal or that is 17 confidential in the transcript. MR. PRATT: Let's take a break so that I can 18 19 talk to the witness. Here's what I am attempting to do: I'm attempting to allow you to inquire to the fullest 20 21 extent that will not violate attorney-client privilege on 22 behalf of my client, the City, or get into litigation 23 strategy regarding my client, the City. Specifically, your 24 point is well-taken about the expectation of



confidentiality. That may solve that piece of it.

Case: 4:18-cv-01364-SPM Doc. #: 331-2 Filed: 08/07/23 Page: 13 of 17 PageID

Lieutenant Colonel Michael Sack July 19, 2023 Page 151

1 objection is. 2 MR. PRATT: Okay. If your -- Ask your 3 question, if you would, please. 4 Would you mind, Jamie? MR. WALDRON: 5 (The requested portion of the 6 record read by the reporter.) 7 If your -- If your answer is it MR. PRATT: 8 went into IAD, I think you can give that answer. 9 that, no. 10 Α So there were some discussions regarding some 11 IAD matters, and I consulted with legal. So we don't have 12 a law department at the police department, so the city 13 counselor's office represents us, and we have some 14 attorneys embedded in our building, but they don't --15 they're not the police department employees, they're city 16 counsel employees. So I consulted with their legal 17 department as to how to proceed, and I was instructed to make three copies of everything. And then one copy of 18 19 the -- All the materials, more than one box, went to IAD, 20 one went to the FBI and one went to the legal department. 21 (By Mr. Waldron) Okay. And these -- You said 22 it was more than one box; correct? 23 Α Yes. 24 And these -- these materials did not solely 0 25 relate to the IAD investigation against Engelhardt,

Page 152 1 correct, but rather they were about this whole FIU audit? 2 Everything that was produced was -- was put 3 into these boxes. 4 0 Okay. Very good. Would you remember who you 5 provided that box to at the IAD? 6 Α So that would have gone to -- I mean, 7 officially, I guess it belongs to Lieutenant Brown. 8 Do you remember that, doing that, or do you 9 just know that it probably happened because you would have 10 done it? 11 I -- I remember put -- I had to -- so I put 12 them on chairs with wheels and I had to wheel it down. 13 there were six boxes so I had to wheel them down and then 14 gave them to Will. 15 0 Six total boxes or six boxes multiplied by 16 three? 17 Six total -- Six boxes multiplied by three. Α Okay. 18 0 19 18 boxes. Six went to Lieutenant Brown, six Α 20 went to legal to be retained if nothing changed or taken out, and then the other six I held, and then I forget which 21 22 one it was, but when -- The FBI didn't want to take all six 23 boxes, so when they wanted a document, I think it came out



They didn't want the whole thing.

of mine and then -- So mine was sixfold minus this or that.

24

1	Q Right. And I'd ask you to look at at the
2	bottom of 8176 and the top of 8177. And this relates to
3	IAD allegations.
4	MR. WALDRON: And, Larry, this sort of brings
5	this back to the unworkability because it the IAD issues
6	themselves appear to be embedded within the FIU audit.
7	Q (By Mr. Waldron) Do these do these What
8	does this section mean?
9	A So these are all separate allegations within
10	our our either police manual, in Rule 7 probably, or our
11	special orders.
12	Q Okay. And what did What did this section
13	mean as it related to the whole FIU audit?
14	A So I mean, like any audit, here's our
15	findings, here's what what needs to be looked at. So
16	it's like a letter to IAD, hey, here's the allegations, we
17	did the legwork. You know, there may be more, dot, dot,
18	dot here, like they have, but here's what we found. And so
19	they listed the allegations that they believe occurred but
20	needed to be investigated and either sustained, not
21	sustained or whatever.
22	Q Okay. And And am I correct to understand
23	that the allegations were going to be against Roger
24	Engelhardt?
25	A Yeah. I think I think all of these would

Case: 4:18-cv-01364-SPM Doc. #: 331-2 Filed: 08/07/23 Page: 16 of 17 PageID Lieutenant Colonial Michael Sack July 19, 2023

Page 170

- Q No, I'm still confused, but --
- 2 A Yeah.

Q I think the reason I'm confused is, why would there be shootings that are just being investigated by IAD now that go back to 2016 and 2017?

A I don't know. I -- I -- I wasn't down there at the time. I know they got backed up. I couldn't tell you why they weren't done. But I'm getting them -- They're being completed now. And so according to our special order, IAD will investigate and they have to look at particular things.

Those are -- Those ARTS will include so-and-so attended firearms training such a day. They reviewed and signed for the use of force special order. The last time they did it, was it a month ago, was it eight months ago. Eight months ago, that's a violation. That first offense is a written reprimand. You know, so they would go through, you know, the -- the orders and everything, if there is no criminal violation or anything associated with it, and they would look at is there anything wrong with it, did they go -- Like I said, did they go to training, did they use an approved weapon, did they use approved ammunition, that -- that kind of thing.

So the ARTS might only be three pages long. So it's -- it's not some big all-inclusive thing. They're

Case: 4:18-cv-01364-SPM Doc. #: 331-2 Filed: 08/07/23 Page: 17 of 17 PageID

Lieutenant Colonel Michael Sack Page 171 1 relying on the FIU report. And I understand the Engelhardt 2 era calls a lot of that into question, the -- the quality 3 of the report in the investigation. So it's kind of a tough thing to go back and look at. 4 5 But they're working through those now, and 6 then eventually, this current circuit attorney has agreed 7 to review and provide some kind of determination, not 8 saying, hey, the officer's completely clear, but they 9 agreed to say, hey, if we don't see any cause to pursue 10 this, we'll tell you we don't see any cause to pursue it. 11 So we would then be able to say, okay, well, you can always 12 open that case up again. Our internal policies, you know, 13 were followed and the case could be solved or maybe they 14 There's some discipline. weren't. 15 Q Okay. Let's go back to, let's say, 2015. 16 Α Okay. 17 We're in the Engelhardt area for FIU; 0 Okay. 18 correct? 19 Α Yes. 20 I'm an officer who is involved in an Q officer-involved shooting, and not only am I involved, 21 22

I'm -- I'm the officer who shoots somebody; correct?

Α Right.

23

24

25

I know that that case is going to be Q investigated by FIU for any criminal matters; correct?