Citizen or . Employee Complaint Form

Initial Supervisor: As Control of Land Sycological Supervisor Supervisor: Address: 3/05 Work Place: Numane Secretary Humane S	Complaint # 9907 26 1422-44 Date: 7 /26/99
Name: Humani Society Affections Counce Sayers Address: 3/05 (1) of Affection St. 38501 Work Place: Numane Society Phone: (Bome) 598.0332 (Work) 596-3647 Complaint Against: (Department or Employee) Aman Society Type of Complaint: (Separtment or Employee) Aman Society (SEE NETT FASE) Referred to Investigating Supervisor: (Sevent Land SGT or D.I.A. Initial Supervisor's Comments: Conclusion of Fact (Police) Exonerated: The incident complained of occurred; however, the actions of the employee were lawful and proper. Sustained: The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence to believe the incident complained of occurred and is in violation of department policy or procedure. Policy Failure: The allegation is supported; but, the employee was in compliance with policy. Therefore the policy may need to be modified. Not Sustained: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support of disprove the allegation. Unifounded: The hearing disclosed that the alleged incident never occurred and therefore, is false. Administrative Use Only The above information and all documentation of this complaint file is complete.	Initial Supervisor: Sol Onto Bill
Address: 2/05 (Work) 526-3647 Phone: (Home) 528-0332 (Work) 526-3647 Complaint Against: (Department or Employee) Amas Spariacle Type of Complaint: (Separtment or Employee) Amas Spariacle The incident complaint of Complaint Office Complaint of Complaint of Complaint Office Complaint O	COMPLAINANT
Work Place: Namana Sacrat Phone: (Home) 538 0332 (Work) 536-3647 Complaint Against: (Department or Employee) Amas Spanlack Type of Complaint: Complaint: Complaint Greek Land Cot or Disc. Referred to Investigating Supervisor: Bruck Land Cot or Disc. Initial Supervisor's Comments: Conclusion of Fact (Documented by Investigating Supervisor or Chief of Police) Exonerated: The incident complained of occurred; however, the actions of the employee were lawful and proper. Sustained: The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence to believe the incident complained of occurred and is in violation of department policy or procedure. Policy Failure: The allegation is supported; but, the employee was in compliance with policy. Therefore the policy may need to be modified. Not Sustained: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support of disprove the allegation. Unfounded: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support of disprove the allegation. Month of the support of disprove the allegation.	Name: Humane Society of Putnam Co une Vane Byer
Phone: (Home) 538 0332 (Work) 536-3647 Complaint Against: (Department or Employee) Amas Spurlack) Type of Complaint: (SEE MINT AGE) Referred to Investigating Supervisor: (SEE MINT OF	dm
Complaint Against: (Department or Employee) Aman Spinlock Type of Complaint: (SEE MINTENDED COMPLAINT) Referred to Investigating Supervisor: Source Land (GT or DIA. Initial Supervisor's Comments: Conclusion of Fact	Work Place: Numane Society
Referred to Investigating Supervisor: Bruck Land GGT or D.A. Initial Supervisor's Comments: Conclusion of Fact —— (Documented by Investigating Supervisor or Chief of Police) Exonerated: The incident complained of occurred; however, the actions of the employee were lawful and proper. Sustained: The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence to believe the incident complained of occurred and is in violation of department policy or procedure. Policy Pailure: The allegation is supported; but, the employee was in compliance with policy. Therefore the policy may need to be modified. Not Sustained: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support of disprove the allegation. Unfounded: The hearing disclosed that the alleged incident never occurred and therefore, is false. Administrative Use Only The above information and all documentation of this complaint file is complete.	Phone: (Home) 538-0332 (Work) 536-3647
Referred to Investigating Supervisor: Bruck Land GGT or D.A. Initial Supervisor's Comments: Conclusion of Fact —— (Documented by Investigating Supervisor or Chief of Police) Exonerated: The incident complained of occurred; however, the actions of the employee were lawful and proper. Sustained: The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence to believe the incident complained of occurred and is in violation of department policy or procedure. Policy Pailure: The allegation is supported; but, the employee was in compliance with policy. Therefore the policy may need to be modified. Not Sustained: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support of disprove the allegation. Unfounded: The hearing disclosed that the alleged incident never occurred and therefore, is false. Administrative Use Only The above information and all documentation of this complaint file is complete.	Complaint Against: (Department or Employee) Omes Spundock)
Initial Supervisor's Comments: Delegation Delegation Conclusion of Fact —— (Documented by Investigating Supervisor or Chief of Police) Exonerated: The incident complained of occurred; however, the actions of the employee were lawful and proper. Sustained: The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence to believe the incident complained of occurred and is in violation of department policy or procedure. Policy Failure: The allegation is supported; but, the employee was in compliance with policy. Therefore the policy may need to be modified. Not Sustained: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support of disprove the allegation. Unfounded: The hearing disclosed that the alleged incident never occurred and therefore, is false. Administrative Use Only The above information and all documentation of this complaint file is complete.	Type of complaint: January Duty, Creedly to animals
Conclusion of Fact — (Documented by Investigating Supervisor or Chief of Police) Exonerated: The incident complained of occurred; however, the actions of the employee were lawful and proper. Sustained: The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence to believe the incident complained of occurred and is in violation of department policy or procedure. Policy Failure: The allegation is supported; but, the employee was in compliance with policy. Therefore the policy may need to be modified. Not Sustained: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support of disprove the allegation. Unfounded: The hearing disclosed that the alleged incident never occurred and therefore, is false. Administrative Use Only The above information and all documentation of this complaint file is complete.	Referred to Investigating Supervisor: BRUCE LANG SGT OF DI.A.
Conclusion of Fact —— (Documented by Investigating Supervisor or Chief of Police) Exonerated: The incident complained of occurred; however, the actions of the employee were lawful and proper. Sustained: The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence to believe the incident complained of occurred and is in violation of department policy or procedure. Policy Failure: The allegation is supported; but, the employee was in compliance with policy. Therefore the policy may need to be modified. Not Sustained: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support of disprove the allegation. Unfounded: The hearing disclosed that the alleged incident never occurred and therefore, is false. Administrative Use Only The above information and all documentation of this complaint file is complete.	
Conclusion of Fact —— (Documented by Investigating Supervisor or Chief of Police) Exonerated: The incident complained of occurred; however, the actions of the employee were lawful and proper. Sustained: The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence to believe the incident complained of occurred and is in violation of department policy or procedure. Policy Failure: The allegation is supported; but, the employee was in compliance with policy. Therefore the policy may need to be modified. Not Sustained: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support of disprove the allegation. Unfounded: The hearing disclosed that the alleged incident never occurred and therefore, is false. Administrative Use Only The above information and all documentation of this complaint file is complete.	
Conclusion of Fact —— (Documented by Investigating Supervisor or Chief of Police) Exonerated: The incident complained of occurred; however, the actions of the employee were lawful and proper. Sustained: The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence to believe the incident complained of occurred and is in violation of department policy or procedure. Policy Failure: The allegation is supported; but, the employee was in compliance with policy. Therefore the policy may need to be modified. Not Sustained: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support of disprove the allegation. Unfounded: The hearing disclosed that the alleged incident never occurred and therefore, is false. Administrative Use Only The above information and all documentation of this complaint file is complete.	Social Control of the
Conclusion of Fact (Documented by Investigating Supervisor or Chief of Police) Exonerated: The incident complained of occurred; however, the actions of the employee were lawful and proper. Sustained: The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence to believe the incident complained of occurred and is in violation of department policy or procedure. Policy Failure: The allegation is supported; but, the employee was in compliance with policy. Therefore the policy may need to be modified. Not Sustained: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support of disprove the allegation. Unfounded: The hearing disclosed that the alleged incident never occurred and therefore, is false. Administrative Use Only The above information and all documentation of this complaint file is complete.	
Conclusion of Fact —— (Documented by Investigating Supervisor or Chief of Police) Exonerated: The incident complained of occurred; however, the actions of the employee were lawful and proper. Sustained: The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence to believe the incident complained of occurred and is in violation of department policy or procedure. Policy Failure: The allegation is supported; but, the employee was in compliance with policy. Therefore the policy may need to be modified. Not Sustained: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support of disprove the allegation. Unfounded: The hearing disclosed that the alleged incident never occurred and therefore, is false. Administrative Use Only The above information and all documentation of this complaint file is complete.	FACILITY ON Co. 1225 Form
Conclusion of Fact (Documented by Investigating Supervisor or Chief of Police) Exonerated: The incident complained of occurred; however, the actions of the employee were lawful and proper. Sustained: The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence to believe the incident complained of occurred and is in violation of department policy or procedure. Policy Failure: The allegation is supported; but, the employee was in compliance with policy. Therefore the policy may need to be modified. Not Sustained: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support of disprove the allegation. Unfounded: The hearing disclosed that the alleged incident never occurred and therefore, is false. Administrative Use Only The above information and all documentation of this complaint file is complete.	
Conclusion of Fact (Documented by Investigating Supervisor or Chief of Bolice) Exonerated: The incident complained of occurred; however, the actions of the employee were lawful and proper. Sustained: The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence to believe the incident complained of occurred and is in violation of department policy or procedure. Policy Failure: The allegation is supported; but, the employee was in compliance with policy. Therefore the policy may need to be modified. Not Sustained: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support of disprove the allegation. Unfounded: The hearing disclosed that the alleged incident never occurred and therefore, is false. Administrative Use Only The above information and all documentation of this complaint file is complete.	
Exonerated: The incident complained of occurred; however, the actions of the employee were lawful and proper. Sustained: The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence to believe the incident complained of occurred and is in violation of department policy or procedure. Policy Failure: The allegation is supported; but, the employee was in compliance with policy. Therefore the policy may need to be modified. Not Sustained: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support of disprove the allegation. Unfounded: The hearing disclosed that the alleged incident never occurred and therefore, is false. Administrative Use Only The above information and all documentation of this complaint file is complete.	Conclusion of Fact (Documented by Investigating Supervisor or Chief of
Delieve the incident complained of occurred and is in violation of department policy or procedure. Policy Failure: The allegation is supported; but, the employee was in compliance with policy. Therefore the policy may need to be modified. Not Sustained: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support of disprove the allegation. Unfounded: The hearing disclosed that the alleged incident never occurred and therefore, is false. Administrative Use Only The above information and all documentation of this complaint file is complete.	Exonerated: The incident complained of occurred; however, the actions
Policy Failure: The allegation is supported; but, the employee was in compliance with policy. Therefore the policy may need to be modified. Not Sustained: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support of disprove the allegation. Unfounded: The hearing disclosed that the alleged incident never occurred and therefore, is false. Administrative Use Only The above information and all documentation of this complaint file is complete.	believe the incident complained of occurred and is in violation of
Not Sustained: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support of disprove the allegation. Unfounded: The hearing disclosed that the alleged incident never occurred and therefore, is false. Administrative Use Only The above information and all documentation of this complaint file is complete.	
Unfounded: The hearing disclosed that the alleged incident never occurred and therefore, is false. Administrative Use Only The above information and all documentation of this complaint file is complete.	Policy Failure: The allegation is supported; but, the employee was in compliance with policy. Therefore the policy may need to be modified.
Administrative Use Only The above information and all documentation of this complaint file is complete.	Not Sustained: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support of disprove the allegation.
Administrative Use Only The above information and all documentation of this complaint file is complete.	Unfounded: The hearing disclosed that the alleged incident never occurred and therefore, is false.
complete.	Administrative Use Only
Administrative Commander or Chief of Police:	The above information and all documentation of this complaint file is complete.
	Administrative Commander or Chief of Police:
Date Filed: //	

WP-COMFORM-4/95

Citizen or Employee Complaint Form

	COMPLAINANT
Name	JANE BYERS
Addr	8:
Work	lace:
Phon	(Home) (Work)
Comp	int Against: (Department or Employee) Amos Spurlock
	s complaint: FAILURE TO PERFORM PUTY
	ed to Investigating supervisor: RRUCE LAMB 567 OF DI.A. 1 Supervisor's Comments:
	1 CANALTY No.
	The state of the police. See the state of th
	- * 1.例如如此中国** Pt
	Tributation of the second of t
Service	1 40 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
o Ø	sion of Fact (Documented by Investigating Supervisor or Chief of Police) Exonerated: The incident complained of occurred; however, the actions of the employee were lawful and proper. Sustained: The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence to believe the incident complained of occurred and is in violation of
o	sion of Fact (Documented by Investigating Supervisor or Chief of Police) Exonerated: The incident complained of occurred; however, the actions of the employee were lawful and proper. Sustained: The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence to believe the incident complained of occurred and is in violation of department policy or procedure. Policy Failure: The allegation is supported; but, the employee was in
	sion of Fact ——— (Documented by Investigating Supervisor or Chief of Police) Exonerated: The incident complained of occurred; however, the actions of the employee were lawful and proper. Sustained: The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence to believe the incident complained of occurred and is in violation of department policy or procedure. Policy Failure: The allegation is supported; but, the employee was in compliance with policy. Therefore the policy may need to be modified. Not Sustained: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support of disprove the allegation. Unfounded: The hearing disclosed that the alleged incident never occurred and therefore, is false.
o 2	sion of Fact ——— (Documented by Investigating Supervisor or Chief of Police) Exonerated: The incident complained of occurred; however, the actions of the employee were lawful and proper. Sustained: The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence to believe the incident complained of occurred and is in violation of department policy or procedure. Policy Failure: The allegation is supported; but, the employee was in compliance with policy. Therefore the policy may need to be modified. Not Sustained: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support of disprove the allegation. Unfounded: The hearing disclosed that the alleged incident never

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

Case Number: 016

Assigned To/

HS EAO

County City ACO ACO

Baxt ACO Mont ACO

Date: 4-6-99

Time: 2:35 (approx)

From: Humane Society of Putnam County:

Subject: Animal Abuse/Animal Control:

Description/Type of Abuse: Chain into shin of Dog

Date/Time of Incident:

Date: 4-6-99 Time: 2:00 (approx)

Description of Animal(s)

med Blb Dog

Location of Animal(s)(address, if possible):

1515 Yord Dr got 75

Name of Animal(s) Owner: Mr. Fultons

Description of Abuser: Clothing description:

Age: 20'S Height: 5-9 Weight: 120

License Plate #

Description of Vehicle:

Complainants Information:

Name: David Danuelo

(DOES ENFORCEMENT - CKL

Address:

Telephone #: 520-5233

Was complainant an eyewitness:

No:

(if yes) will complainant testify in court: Yes:

No:

Additional Comments:

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

\cap	F	FI	CE	RS	П	SF	O	NI.	Υ
u		Г.	UE	NO	v	JL.	\mathbf{v}	1 1	- 1

		_		
Date/	[ime	Ot	Investig	ation:

Date: 4-6-99 Time: 2:55 pm approx

Location of Investigation: 1515 Ford Dr. Lot 75

Condition of Animal(s) and Animal(s) Habitat:

Weather Conditions: Summy

Was shelter present:

(Yes:)

No:

Describe: Under house

Was food present:

Yes:

(No:)

Was water present: Yes:

Was rabies license current:

Yes:

Was contact made with owner:

(if yes) give a brief report:

Yes:)

No:

Were there children present: (if yes) describe their welfare:

Jooked OK

No:

Action taken (if any)

(a) Pictures taken:

b. Citations written:

(is yes) code Verbal warning:

'd) Other: – ചല്

attachment A

Yes:

Yes:

No:

Follow up (if any):

Action taken (if any):

Del attachment

see attacher

Date: 4-7-99 Time: 4:15 pm app 4-9-99

He attachnen De moved no known forwarding address 421-99-Subfacts have moved no known forwarding address Officer Signature: Jane Ellen Byers Date: 4-8-99

Attachment: A

On April 4, 1999 I was advised of a possible animal abuse case (dog) located at 1515 Ford Drive, Lot 75. Upon arrival I identified myself and ask to speak with Mr. Fulton. I was advised by a white female with blonde hair, that Mr. Fulton was not there. I then asked said female if she was Mrs. Fulton, at which time she advised me she was. I again told Mrs. Fulton who I was and that we had received a complaint. Mrs. Fulton then advised me that they were going to take the dog in question to the shelter to be put down tomorrow. I advised Mrs. Fulton that I still needed to see the dog at this time. Mrs. Fulton then took me to the back or the residence, where I observed a small black (what looked to be a puppy), a calico cat, both running at large and a medium black dog tied with a chain around its neck. Upon further investigation of the tied dog I observed that the chain had lacerated the neck approximately 1/4 to 1/2 inch depth, 3/4 of the way around the neck. Upon seeing this I advised Mrs. Fulton that this was animal cruelty and that since she wanted to give up the dog, if she would sign a release form I could take the animal today, and that I could get medical treatment for said dog. Mrs. Fulton agreed, and I told her I would be back, that I had to go get a transport crate, and that I would return, Mrs. Fulton agreed to wait for my return. Upon leaving, an unknown subject (appeared to be consuming an alcohol beverage) became belligerent, so I decided to advise the police and to have them with me upon my return. Upon returning to the above address Mr. Fulton meet with myself and the police officer, he advised us that a man had given him this paper (showed us a orange paper that had violation codes on it and some hand writing but was not dated or signed) I asked the officer if he had any knowledge of the paperwork, he did not. So I explained to Mr. Fulton that I was not aware of what it was, but I would look into it. I explained the situation with his dog and he advised he would sign the relinquish form, since he was going to be taking the dog to the Humane Society anyway the next day. Mr. Fulton showed concern for the animal, but was doing what he thought was the right thing. Mrs. Fulton then advised me that she had been treating the area in question with medication, but it was not helping due to the animal being on the chain.

I then left and took the dog to the Humane Society and took pictures before bedding it down.

Attachment: B

On April 7, 1999 I spoke with Amos and asked him if he had some type of form that he left with people if he did not write them a warning or a citation, or if they were not at home. Amos then produced they same orange paperwork that I saw at Mr. Fulton's residence. I asked Amos if I could have a copy of it (see attached copy).

Attachment: C

On April 7, 1999 at approximately 4:20pm I returned to 1515 Ford Dr. Lot 75 and spoke with Mr. Fulton. I asked him what the person looked like that had given them the orange paperwork. Mr. Fulton advised that it was a older man dress in a blue uniform and driving a truck with a city round circle on it. I asked Mr. Fulton if he still had the piece of paper, he said he thought he did, but it was in his van and his wife would not be back until late. Mr. Fulton then said I could have it so we made arrangements for me to pick it up on April 9, 1999 around 5pm. Mr. Fulton also advised me that he thought it was not right what the man had done, since his wife had shown the man that the dogs neck was sore, and that he man said he did not care that the dog had to be tied up or pen up. Mr. Fulton said since we did not have a pen I had to tie her (meaning the dog) back up. I just did what I was told.

Attachment D

On April 9, 1999 I returned to 1515 Ford Dr. Lot 75 at approximately 4:45PM, I spoke with Mr. Fulton. Mr. Fulton showed me the paperwork where he had his cat vaccinated for rabies, and said he would be doing his puppy the next day. Mr. Fulton then gave me the orange paperwork that we had spoke about on April 7, 1999. See attached.

Violation Notice

While you were away a Cookeville Rabies Control Officer or City Police Officer visited your residence to talk with you about the following municipal ordinances violated by your dog(s),

- Section

 2.201 Dog(s) not vaccinated or registered

 3.202 Dog(s) not weating vaccination or registration tag

 3.203 Dog(s) not weating vaccination or registration tag

 3.204 Dog(s) running at large.

 3.204 Dog(s) believed to be victous and not securely restrained,

 3.205 Dog(s) too noisy

 3.206 Dog(s) suspected of being rabid, must be confined

 3.206 Dog(s) setzed by officer and impounded.

Railure to correct these violations will result in court action.

Your cooperation in working with us to correct these violation will be greatly appreciated. If you dog has been impounded, please call the Police Department during the hours of 7.00 a.m. until 3:30 p.m. Monday through Friday. If you have any questions or if we can be of further assistance,

Rabies Control Officer

Cookeville Police Officer

Violation Notice

all I	
生態	经 图制
Ō	S V
	00
8	0
IS	J O
	0
ಶ	の試
္က	6
田島	0 3 8
\circ	0
ė,	智慧
Ξ	20
0	59%
2	S
3	8 ,
13	5
	D X
0	-J.
·	5
ಶ	
田	公司
\circ	F 30
1000	ii l
100	
	日朝
O	60 V
O.	日日
SS	BUN
10	200
9	0
8	100
9	3
三	經過
io.	7 5
*	0
ŏ	at
O	3
d	0
-	21
a	#
3	8
್ಷಡ	45
5	7
e	4
1	2
2	0
X	2
0	residence to talk with you about the following inducipal ordinances violated by your dog(s).
语	D
5	SS
>	4

3-202 Dog(s) not wearing vaccination or registration tag
3-203 Dog(s) running at large.

3-204 Dog(s) believed to be vicious and nor securely rest

3-205 Dog(s) too noisy.

3-206 Dog(s) suspected of being rabid must be confined

3-207 Dog(s) seized by officer and impounded. ☐ 3-201 Dog(s) not vaccinated or registered. Section:

Failure to correct these violations will result in Fract action.

Your cooperation in working with us to correct these violation will be greathed dog has been impounded, please call the Police Department during the hours of 3:30 p.m. Monday through Friday. If you have at y questions or if we can be of please call us at 526-2125.

Rabies Control Officer

Cookeville Police Officer



Jane Byers

On April 28, 1999 the Humane Society RTO (returned to owner) a dog to a Rena Huddleston at 379 Whitson, Cookeville. At that time she was told to bring back proof of rabies vaccination by May 8, 1999. On May 10, 1999 she was called by the Humane Society and left a message, and again on May18th. On May 20th I contacted Rena Huddleston and left word with her Aunt to have her contact us in reference to the rabies vaccination. I also talked with Amos and asked him if he could write her a citation for NO rabies vaccination. He told me that he could not, because he did know if she did or did not have a rabies vaccination. I then explained to him, again, the above situation and asked, how are we to make these people follow the law. Amos replied with a shrug of his shoulders. I then suggested that if I contacted the District Attorneys Officer and asked them how, would he follow their advice? Amos said he would, so on May 25th I told Amos what the District Attorney had said, and that he could in fact write this lady for no rabies vaccination. Amos then said he could not, but maybe one of the Officers would. On June 2, 1999 I contacted Amos to see if he made contact with Mrs. Huddelston. He said that she wasn't home and again took all the information down. (I had to explain everything again to him including address, and pass history). On June 9, 1999 I went to Amos again asking about Mrs. Huddelston, again I had to repeat the entire story. Amos then said he had not been there for a while, but she was never home.

Hane Byen

On June 14, 1999 Amos picked up a DOA (shepherd killed on roadway) (front of DA office on spring) he tied the dog to the tailgate of the city truck and brought it to the Humane Society. He never covered the animal, so any child could observe this animal. Upon arrival Amos brought the animal in to the back for cremation, but failed to advise the Shelter staff that he had taken a blue collar off the dog. We take numerous lost calls a day and possibly this collar could have helped us locate an owner. Also the Shelter Manager had to run him down to find out what he was bring in, when she asked him he was walking away with his head down, mumbling and was inaudible. He never stopped, he just continued on until she yelled at him again.

Yone Byeis

On June 21, 1999 Amos arrived at the Humane Society at about 7:50 am with (12) dead animals from the veterinarians, and two other animals (road kills). When asked what the road kills were, he responded one was a fox the other he could not remember. We ask for this information with our lost and found data. When asked why he brought the vet cremations on Monday (knowing Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, are the days for vet cremations) he responded he did not know what day it was.

Jane Byers

On June 30,1999 Amos brought in two kittens before the shelter opened, when asked what he had, he replied "cats 10-7". He was then asked where he got them (location), he replied he could not remember. When I arrived at the shelter later that morning I was told he had brought to kittens in and that one had been shot in the head. I then went and examined the bodies, one did appear to have been shot. I then contacted a veterinarian and asked if an autopsy could be done, one was scheduled for the following day. On July 1, 1999 the autopsy was preformed and the results were a shot to the head. A 22-caliber jacket was removed from the cat.

Jane Byers

On July 1, 1999 I gave to rabies checks to do. (See attachments) I then asked him to let me know if they in fact had their new rabies vaccinations. As of today's date Amos has not replied.

10 Number: 0.5	99-2	U .	Yennel: Hold	BB1	·.	Building	:
	/pe		2™ Kennel:	<i> </i> -		ID Numb	×r.
Dog Puppy	Cat	Kitten	3™ Kennel:		Kennel Numbers		
Sex	Approxima	ite Age	Breed			1ª Kenne	1:
Male Female	7.3	/m (/vr	Shih Top			2 nd Kenne	sł:
Collar	Type of (Collar	Collar Color			3rd Kenne	Ŀ
Yes No - N/A	NylonAcath	ст/Пса	Blive		LC.O Owner - Found In	formation	
	Animal fr	-Take		Name: AMOS	Sovelock	Reason:	
Drop Box Stray	A.C.O.	Own	er Surrender Other	Address/Area Found:	1148 tust	10th-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Color: Le	with	3rey		City of Cookeville P White-Smith Other.	umam –Overton-Pickett-Ja	ickson-Clay-	Phone #:H-W
1¤ Va∞ination: ∧	6	2 [№] V88	cination:		Euthanization Inform	ation	
Housebroken: Y-N?	Good w/Chi Y-N-?		Neutered/Spayed:	Euthanized: Y-N		Reason:	
Good with Cats: Y-N		Good W	ith Dogs: Y-N 7_				····
Date of Arrival: 5	2099	Adoption	n Date:	Date of Euthanization	n:	Administer	ed By:
Drop Box - Stray - A.	.C.O. – 3 day	hold (do	not count the day of ar	rival or Sunday)	•		
Owner Surrender:							
I hereby relina	nish all o	wnersl	nin rights to the	animal describ	ed herein to the	custody o	of the
Humane Societ	ty of Putr	iam Co	o., Inc. for dispo	osition at their	discretion. I cert	ify said a	nimal has
not bitten anyo	ne during	the la	ist 14 days, to n	ny knowledge.			
Signature:	715 715 715				Date:		<u></u>
Notes:					. 4		
	_		. ,	5 70	// /	Farl	Per
Robies		. บ	- Pun. Ky.	RIGHT	Marla 955 Sha	,	
			run "	5/2	955 Sha	n Ks A	ne
	•			1	CKUI, TN		
					528-13		
				•			
				•	0	v t	6
Name of In-Take Emp	-				Owner ag ng rabic to Shel SAT 5	Va	
☐ Made Collar	niormation On			Dri	ng Tobic	ح. ک	/
	nimal Before (e Card to Cag	_	o Cage		to Shel	ter	Dy
					SAT 5	129/99	i _
•	-			2	1/0/2-0	M	
				1/	1, 1. (You		

ID Number: O	599-134	1 st Kennel:		•	Building:	
	Type	2™ Kennel: ATZ	-		ID Numb	cr.
Dog Puppy	Cat Kitten	3™ Kennel:		lennel Number	S. J.	
Sex	Approximate Age	Breed .			1st Kennel:	
Male Female	3_w/mo/m	CollieX			2 nd Kennel	: .
Collar	Type of Collar	Collar Color			3'd Kennel:	
Yes No N/A	Nylon/Leather/Flea		AC.00	mer-Found in	formation.	
	Animal In-Take		Name: 7 AMOS SC	welset	Reason:	
Drop Box Stray	AC.O. Our	er Surrender Other	Address/Area Found: HWW		ccan	o Pal
Color: Sak	ole/white co	llar, front leg	City of Cookeville-Putnam -Ov			Phone #:H-W
1ª Vaccination:	/g 2 [™] Vac	chation:	Euthan	ization Inform	ation ,	
Housebroken: Y-N-?	Good w/Children: Y-N-?	Neutered/Spayed: Y-N	Euthanized: Y-N		Reason:	
Good with Cats: Y-N	Good W	th Dogs: Y–N				
Date of Arrival: 5-			Date of Euthanization:		Administered	By:
	C.O 3 day hold (do i	not count the day of ar	rival or Sunday)			
Owner Surrender:						
I hereby relinqu	iish all ownersh	ip rights to the	animal described here	in to the c	ustody of	the
Humane Societ	y of Putnam Co	., Inc. for dispo	sition at their discretion	on. I certi	fy said ani	mal has
not bitten anyor Signature:	ie during me ia:	st 14 days, to m		ate:		
Notes:	\(\)	. 1 ()		M 2A	77	5/
200	1 rapped	+ left	- @ Shelter	1 20 Am	Ihurs	//3
Ourage	Debra O	1 Reins	w f	su "		•
Wher.		Brown ST				
	Ckul, TX) - 38501		0 -	N. 4	46
	No phon			1057 3	ee AM	os Release.
Sister -	Helind	a Hussi	en D	DAG L	-0 OW	7 bC
Name of In-Take Emplo					0 000	,021
☐ Entered All Info	ormation On Cage Card	ie's 19	8			
Made Collar Vaccinated Anii	nal Before Going Into Q	age 70 2/14/		N1212C	of Lea	ins ad
Aliached Cage (ormation On Cage Card mal Before Going Into Q Card to Cage	wt SAT 5/	29/98.			
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	fiest h	ove a	bore sas
\sim \cap \cap	0			610+10	۱۱۱ <i>۵ د</i> ۲.	Hwy 70.g C. Campa
(V) (V). V	ra Br				(i camp a

MEMORANDUM FROM Sgt. Bruce Lamb

DATE: July 26, 1999

TO: Complaint File

SUBJ: Byers vs. Spurlock

Today, Jane Byers, Putnam County animal abuse officer, came into the station and made a formal complaint against Amos Spurlock, animal control officer. I told Captain J. T. Bennett and he said that I was to investigate it.

The type of complaint is failure to perform duty and cruelty to animals. The cruelty to animal complaint stems from an incident at the Ford trailer park on April 4, 1999. Byers says that she investigated a possible animal abuse case at lot 75. She found a dog, that was chained up, that had a lacerated neck. The chain that was around the dog's neck evidently caused the laceration. Even though the statement does not say, I assume Byers is claming that since Spurlock told the person to put the dog in a pen or chain it, and since they did chain it due to Spurlock's orders, he aided in cruelty to the dog.

The failure to perform duty claim stems from several incidents. One incident started on April 28, 1999, when Byers asked Spurlock to write a person a citation for not having a dog vaccinated. Spurlock told her that he couldn't do it. Byers contacted the DA's office who told her that Spurlock could write the offender a summons. After she told him this, he said that he couldn't, but maybe he could get a police officer to do it. As of this date, he still has not made contact with the offender yet.

On June 14, 1999, she claims that Spurlock brought in a dog that had been run over. He transported the dog on the tailgate of his truck without covering it up and also removed the collar, which could be used to help an owner locate a lost dog. Also, he didn't give the shelter manager information on the dog.

On June 21, 1999, Spurlock brought in dead animals from the veterinarians and had two other road kills. This was on Monday and dead animals from the veterinarians are supposed to be brought in on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursdays. Also, he didn't provide data on the road kills.

On June 30, 1999, Spurlock brought in two dead cats. He didn't give the shelter any information on the cats. Also, the statement tells about the one of the cats being shot with a .22 cal. bullet. Byers may be claiming that Spurlock shot the cat.

On July 1, 1999, Byers asked him to check a couple of addresses to see if their animals had their rabies vaccinations yet. As of this date, he has not replied.

Bruce Lamb

To:

Nathan Honeycutt

Cc:

J.T. Bennett

Subject:

Citizen's Complaint #9907261422-44

Byers vs. Spurlock

7-26-99

As required by GO 12-3, I am notifying you of a citizens complaint against Amos Spurlock. Today, July 26, 1999, Jane Byers, animal abuse officer, came to the station and charged that Spurlock failed to perform his duty and was cruel to an animal. Capt. J. T. Bennett instructed me to investigate. Bruce

MEMORANDUM FROM Sgt. Bruce Lamb

DATE:

July 26, 1999

TO:

Amos Spurlock

SUBJ:

Citizens Complaint

In accordance with General Order 12-3, I am advising you that a complaint has been lodged against you and that I have been instructed by Capt. J. T. Bennett to investigate.

Jane Byers, animal abuse officer, came to the station today and made charges of failure to perform duty and cruelty to animals. She cites an incident at the Ford trailer park for the cruelty to animal charge. Several incidents were cited as to the failure to perform your duty charge. I will not be back to work until Friday, July 30, 1999. I will get with you then or next week and go over these charges with you. Hold off on writing me a statement until then.

As you already know, I am required to tell you of the disciplinary possibilities associated with this complaint against you. If, after my investigation is complete, I find that you have violated any department rules or orders, then you could receive anything from counseling to dismissal. Included with this memo is a copy of the section of General Order 12-2 referring to the classes of orders, the penalty range which would apply for a violation of each class, conclusion of fact list and the appeals process. One other thing is included (I forgot to include this with the other complaint): a copy of the employee's rights that is found in General Orders 12-3.



Citizen Complaint File

cc:



General Order 12-2 Page 10

B. Under normal circumstances, this does not apply to entry-level probationary employees.

12-2.6 Rules and Regulations

General Orders Manual of the Cookeville Police Department contains both a Rules and Regulations section in addition to the various General Orders. Together, these units specify the codes for the conduct and appearance of all department employees. These codes specify the conduct expected of all employees as well as identifying prohibited employee behavior. Each employee is provided with a copy of the Police Manual. During employment orientation, the Rules and Regulations and General Orders are explained. Subsequently during the Field Training and Evaluation Program, field training officers help each new officer thoroughly understand them. Supervisors are encouraged to periodically review these Rules and Regulations and General Orders with all employees.

12-2.7 Classes of Orders

The Department has established a Class System for the Α. The State of contents of the General Orders Manual. Tennessee has identified its criminal codes as capital crimes, felonies, and misdemeanors. In a parallel manner, the Department will identify its Rules and Regulations and General Orders by Class: Class A, or Class B, or Class C. The various Classes of Orders are instituted for the purpose of promoting employees' compliance with same. The violation of a Class A order is defined as "most severe." Violation of a Class B order is defined as "severe." Violation of a Class C order is defined as "minor." These definitions are relative among the various Classes. They serve to demonstrate the Department's interest to ensure that employees conform to the Rules and Regulations and General Orders as stated in the General Orders Manual. All of the contents of the Police Manual will carry, at a minimum, a Class C designation. Numerous areas, either entire General Orders or parts thereof, may carry a higher Class designation. The overall purpose of the Class system is to identify those areas of the Policy Manual in which the Department's management has a greater interest and to promote employees' compliance with same. Some general orders, rules and regulations, and procedures have identified specific disciplinary In this case, these should be followed. Remedial training may be considered in all classes.

ADMINISTRATION

[DISCIPLINARY ACTION]

General Order 12-2 Page 11

- B. Each of the specific Classes is assigned a specific range of penalties which will attach in the event of a violation. Penalties will be administered in light of both the aggravating and mitigating circumstances surrounding the incident.
 - C. The penalty range which will apply for the violation of a Class A order will include(but not limited to) any or all of the following:
 - 1. Dismissal,
 - 2. Demotion in rank,
 - 3. Suspension from duty 1-30 work days without pay,
 - 4. Probation, or
 - 5. Written reprimand.
 - D. The penalty range which will apply for the violation of a Class B order will include (but not limited to) any or all of the following:
 - 1. Suspension from duty 1-15 work days without pay,
 - 2. Probation, or
 - 3. Written reprimand.
 - E. The penalty range which will apply for the violation of a Class C order will include(but not limited to) any or all of the following:
 - Suspension from duty 1-5 work days without pay,
 - 2. Written reprimand, or
 - 3. Counseling.

12-2.8 General Complaints

2.9.1 Some complaints, whether initiated from within or from outside the department, will be substantiated and result in disciplinary action. Others will be false or unfounded. Each allegation of misconduct brought to the attention of the supervisory personnel will contain a "conclusion of fact."



ADMINISTRATION

[DISCIPLINARY ACTION]

General Order 12-2 Page 12

2.9.2 Conclusion of fact

The supervisory personnel will classify all hearings as follows.

- A. Exonerated: The incident complained of occurred; however, the actions of the employee were lawful and proper.
- B. Sustained: The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence to believe the incident complained of occurred and is in violation of Department policy or procedure.
- C. Policy Failure: The allegation is supported; but, the employee was in compliance with policy. Therefore the policy may need to be modified.
- D. Not Sustained: The hearing disclosed insufficient evidence to either support or disprove the allegation.
- E. Unfounded: The hearing disclosed that the alleged incident never occurred and therefore, is false.

2.9.3 Appeals Hearings

- A. Appeals to punitive disciplinary actions will be processed through the Executive Board.
- B. Employees who wish to appeal punitive disciplinary action must formally request a review of Disciplinary Action by written letter.
- C. Employees must complete the request and submit same to the supervisor issuing the disciplinary action within five days after the effective date of the Notification of Disciplinary Action Form in order for the review to be conducted. Requests for review which are submitted after this time frame will not be considered.
- D. Employees may contest either the conclusion of fact on which the disciplinary action is based or the specific penalty which is prescribed.
- E. Each Division Commander will act as an voting member of the review board.



ADMINISTRATION

[DISCIPLINARY ACTION]

General Order 12-2 Page 13

- F. The Operation Commander will act as a nonvoting chairman to conduct the Administrative Hearing. He/She shall have the authority to include other members of the department as voting members of the hearing.
- G. In case of a tie the deciding vote shall be determined by the Operation Commander.
- H. The employee and the supervisor will each have their opportunity to talk before the board.
- I. Once the board has made their decision, the Operation Commander will inform both parties and the Chief of Police of the recommendation based on the "Conclusion of Fact".
- J. The Chief of Police will make the final decision on the appeal.

12-2.10 Records

The initial filing of all disciplinary action should be through the chain of command. This will ensure all necessary supervisory personnel are informed and

informal review process of the disciplinary matter has begun. The record section shall ensure proper dissemination of the documentation.

- A. All counseling sessions will be documented in writing on a Counseling Form.
 - 1. One copy will be given to the employee.
 - 2. One copy will remain with the issuing supervisor.
 - 3. One copy will be given to the Chief of Police. (Placed in the PIF)
- B. All remedial training requests and training documentation will be documented. Requests for remedial training shall be submitted on a Counseling Form. Therefore, filing will follow part A (above).
- C. All punitive disciplinary actions taken will be documented in writing on a Notification of Disciplinary Action (PF7).



General Order 12-3 Page 11

Appendix A

Employee's Rights: Internal Affairs Investigations.

- A. Employees may be ordered to submit a written response and/or submit to interrogation concerning alleged acts of misconduct. Employees will extend their total cooperation with officers who are investigating complaints of misconduct. Refusal to cooperate in an Internal Affairs investigation will constitute insubordination by the employee and subject the employee to disciplinary measures and/or dismissal.
- B. Immediately prior to any investigation, employees will be advised of the name and rank of the investigating officer and of any individual present during questioning, and the nature of the investigation.
- C. Interrogations should be conducted at the Cookeville Police Department. Interrogations should be conducted while the employee is on duty unless the allegation is of such a serious nature as to require immediate action. Employees summoned to an interrogation while off duty will be entitled to overtime pay.
- D. Interrogation will be reasonable in length with time afforded for adequate rest periods when requested by the employee.
- E. All interrogations should be tape recorded and subsequently reduced to writing. Employees may also use their own tape recording equipment.
- F. Employees who are witnesses or otherwise knowledgeable about other employees' misconduct may also be administratively compelled to submit a statement as to their knowledge, and may be compelled to submit to interrogation. Witness employees' refusal to comply will constitute insubordination and subject them to disciplinary action and /or dismissal.
- G. On occasion that a complaint at a Executive Committee Hearing is classified as showing no fault of the officer, the officer will have the right to file charges against the complainant for False Report. Employees may also council with their attorney concerning civil remedy against the complainant.
- H. No employee shall be required or requested to disclose any item of his property, income, assets, source of income, debts, or personal or domestic expenditures, including those of any member of his family or household, unless such information is necessary in investigating a possible conflict of interest with respect to the performance of his official duties, unless such disclosure is required by law, or unless such information is related to an investigation.

ATTACHMENT X

JOB TITLE:

Animal Control Officer

Job Desc Number: 6105

DEPARTMENT:

Police

EXEMPT STATUS: Nonexempt

REPORTS TO:

Captain/Uniform Svcs. Cmdr.

SAFETY SENSITIVE: Yes

PAY GRADE:

6

DATE APPROVED: 8/98

POSITION AUTHORITY: Nonsupervisory

Job Summary

Employees in this class are under general supervision. Work performed in capturing and impounding unlicensed, strays and uncontrolled animals and investigating animal attacks.

Examples of work performed: receives complaints of animal attacks or other animal-related problems; interviews complainants, animal owners, and others to determine action to be taken; may or may not issue warning or citation as a result of investigation; captures animals using trapping devices; transports animals to the shelter by truck; appears in court to testify regarding citations issued; performs related work as required.

Required Knowledge and Abilities

Knowledge of city and state animal control ordinances and regulations

Knowledge of city street locations and names

Knowledge of animal-capture techniques

Knowledge of effective interviewing techniques

Ability to react quickly and calmly in emergency situations

Ability to explain and interpret pertinent provisions of ordinances and regulations requiring effective oral and written communication skills

Ability to operate assigned motor vehicle

Ability to establish and maintain an effective working relationship with the public and other employees

Ability to safely use rifles (dart or .22 LR) as needed in populated areas

Qualifications

High school education or equivalent and a valid Tennessee driver's license are required. Experience in working with animals is preferred.

Essential Functions

Frequently requires pushing and lifting heavy animals up to 100 lbs. after being captured. Large dogs and other domestic animals may have to be chased and captured. Therefore, requires good physical conditioning, strength, and agility.

MEMORANDUM FROM Sgt. Bruce Lamb

DATE:

July 30, 1999

TO:

Complaint File

SUBJ:

Byers vs. Spurlock

Case Number 9907261422-44

I spoke to Jane Byers today on the phone to clear up some questions that I had about her complaint. Cruelty to animal charge stems from the incident on May 4, 1999, where Byers investigated a possible animal abuse case. She said that Ofc. Spurlock knew that the dog's neck was cut due to being put on a chain, but told the owner of the dog to either put the dog in a pen or chain it, with the threat of killing the dog if they didn't do one or the other. Since the owner could not afford to build a pen, the only choice they had would be to chain the dog to comply with the orders of Ofc. Spurlock. According to Byers, this constitutes cruelty because of his orders. Byers said that he should have given the owner other options instead of chaining the dog. Also, the incident on June 30, 1999, where Ofc. Spurlock brought in two kittens, one was shot and the other's spine had been severed (like someone had twisted it). She said that he brought them in but didn't give them any information about them. If he killed them, then that would constitute cruelty according to Byers. If he didn't kill them, then he failed to perform his duty because (1) he didn't give Shelter employees information on the kittens and (2) he didn't start an investigation on the obvious abuse.

The April 28 and the July 1, 1999, incidents involve Ofc. Spurlock not following up on rabies vaccination cases. Byers said that during this time, they would release animals to the owners with the promise that they would get them vaccinated. They would be required to bring back proof that they got the animal vaccinated. If proof wasn't brought back within a reasonable time, they would ask Ofc. Spurlock to check on it. On the one case, he says that he can't find them home and on the other, he has not given them any information back.

CITY OF COOKEVILLE TENNESSEE

COOKEVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT
CHIEF R. E. TERRY
P.O. BOX 849, 10 EAST BROAD STREET
COOKEVILLE, TN 38503-0849
931-526-2125
FAX 528-9368

August 2, 1999

Jane Byers
Animal Abuse Officer
Putnam Co. Human Society
2105 W. Jackson Street
Cookeville, Tennessee 38501

Dear Ms Byers,

This is in reference to your complaint against Animal Control Officer Amos Spurlock. I am writing to inform you that I will not be able to complete my investigation and notify you of the results within the required ten day period. Our General Orders authorizes me to extend the investigation period as long as I have notified you in writing. The delay is due to the complexity of the complaint and other circumstances beyond my control. I will notify you of my decision in this matter as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Sgt. Bruce Lamb

Afternoon Shift Supervisor

COPY

cc: Complaint File

Bruce Lamb

To: Subject:

Nathan Honeycutt Citizen's Complaint

Byers vs Spurlock 9907261422-44 8-2-99

This is to let you know that I can't complete my investigation within 10 days. I sent the complainant a letter advising that it will take more time to complete.

Bruce

Byers vs Spurlock4.doc

My first overtion is if this Happen on the first of April why wait Until the first of August to Complain. I Do Not Remember talking to a mr. fulto I Talked to some wo man at this Location. I aid Tell Her tys must be Coined, Chained or put in Byers her some the ki in overtion, plus a ty And a Cot Runwing at Large in the Back yard of the Trailer. If They were in the yord of the Owner They were Not At Large. The Awimo that I Tulked to the woman about was a small poodle Type ky Black with Long matter Hair. She Said she would bet it Tied.

ON the 5th of April I gave people at Lot #72 a warning about K9s Aunwing Loose.

ON the 6th of April I picked up 3 thes atThepart ON morch 30th I picked up 1 the Runwing at Large at the part.

ON morch 16th I gave the owners of the pari A working about 3 tes At Lorge.

ON April 27th I gave a warning about a Collic Dog at harge.

The violation Notice she shows does Not have any violations marked ON the middle port of the page And is Not signed by Me. How mrs Byers or mr. fulton Got the Notice I po Not know.

Amor E. In lands

Per Winlach.

AS fort Trailer park NO Longer Exist as a Trailer park I Could not find Any of the people who were Involved. Some of the Trailers Have been Destroyet.

÷ managaman kanangan panggalangan panggalangan panggalangan panggalangan panggalangan panggalangan panggalanga Panggalangan

ON JUNE 30 1999 I did Retrieve and Deliver 3 10-7 Cuts to the pound before it opened for Daily Business. All Cots were 10-7 meaning they were peak. according to mrs Byers one Had been Shot in the Head, the Other Just Dead. Hud mrs Byers understood the fact that 10-7 means Dead and Being obvious one was shot, the other being Run over by a car city & county money lould hav been saved by Not having a Ne Copsy performed ON the Awimals. Dead is Dead. A Necopsh will No! Change this fact. Did it Really matter what Kind Of Bullet was used. As much funding as the Hwimmel Shelter Asks for And Always Needing mores The Time AND Expense of a Necopsy Could be much Better spent in other ways. As for as the Bullet Bring of 22 Caliber there is No way that we can find who fired the Bullet as there Are Any Number of people in the City that own 22 calibor Rifles & pistols.

amon E. Zmlock

ſ	. п и ъ	LAINT	rarn	REULE	V	
)ate: 04/05/99 Re	ec: 7		747	Response: Total:	1 1	
Compl #: 99-04-05-07 Zone: L-17		Location: ress: 1515	CHESTNUT VI FORD			
Call Code: 102 ANIMA lote: STRAY K-9 lote: lote:		IS LOT 75				
Complainant (last): Oddress:	L. T.	75 /State	UEH ONE	hone: 615	525-3538 UEH	
lnit: 684 Report?: lack-up: 0 False?: lack-up: 0 Arrest?:	N U.	.Ī.N.	TN O		§	TN
upv.: 610 911Call? IffDuty c258 c258	: N CO	DLOR/Hold? RECKER INER		N		N
				CONTINUE	(Y/P/N) ??	Y

CO	MPLAINT C	ARD	REUIEW	1	
	1551 Arrive: 1551 Complete:	1557 1609	Response: Total:	6 18	
Compl #: 99-04-06-1551- Zone: L17-	72 Location: Address: 1515	FORD	DR		
Call Code: 162 ANIMAL C Note: HELP JANE SE Note: Note:	ALL RUE CITATION				- - - - - - -
Complainant (last): Address:			Phone: 615 1		;
	1	VEH ONE		UEH]	
Jnit: 619 Report?: N Back-un: Ø False?: N		TH			[N
Back-up: Ø False?: N Back-up: Ø Arrest?: N		0		0	
Supv.: 630 911Call?: N	COLOR/Hold?		N		N
OffDuty	WRECKER				
c265 c265	OWNER		CONTINUE (Y/P/N) ?? \	,

MEMORANDUM FROM Sgt. Bruce Lamb

DATE: August 14, 1999

TO: Complaint File

SUBJ: Byers vs. Spurlock

Case Number 9907261422-44

Today, I spoke to David Daniels, who is the code enforcement officer for the city of Cookeville. He is the complainant that contacted Jane Byers about the abused dog at the Ford Trailer Park, lot 75. He said that the dog had a chain around its neck and it was secured to a dog house by a chain. He said that he stood about 3 feet from it and he could clearly see that it had a cut around its neck. He believed that the owner, Mr. Fulton, moved to Pickett County Tennessee.

I attempted to make contact with the new owner of the trailer park, Donnie Meadows, but he was not in. I did leave a message for him to see if he had a forwarding address or phone number for Fulton.

I located a complaint card that showed Ofc. Amos Spurlock answered a call to lot 75 on 4/5/99 and the complaint card that showed where Ofc. Ken Clement accompanied Byers to Ford Trailer Park (no lot number given) 4/6/99.

MEMORANDUM FROM Sgt. Bruce Lamb

DATE: August 16, 1999

TO: Complaint File

SUBJ: Byers vs. Spurlock

Today, I spoke to Terry Hrasok, the animal shelter manager. She states that Jane Byers has a duel purpose with the Humane Society. She was appointed by the Humane Society board to be the animal abuse officer and answers only to the board concerning those duties. She is also employed with the shelter and comes under the authority of Hrasok in the performance of her duties there.

Hrasok states that she has been there about a year. She said that she has told Ofc. Spurlock what information they needed, several times. She said that she has provided him with the form that they use when doing an intake on live animals. She said that the policy was enacted by the board and that some of the information needed is required by law. As to the vaccination cases they asked him to follow-up on, she said that those cases were the ones that he brought in himself.

IN Regards to Rena Huddleston at 379 whitso. Ave. I have made several Attempts to Confact this Lady. No ONE is Erver at Home when I have been at this house. I commot write a ticket if I never see the Lady or the dog. The poond messed up by Releasing the teg in the fist place. I fell as if I have done All I cam to Rectify The poond mistate Due to My. Other Dutics.

(2)

As for the shepherd picked up on spring st. I could not Lift the kg inside the truck. So as a Result Having no cover I had to do the Best I. Could. Os to the Collar on the kg if they know it was Blue there should be No problem describing the kg. As to the mumbling AND inaudible speech. For about 3-4 months by the middle of the day I Connot hear very good or speak good.

(3)

As to tating 10-75 to pound on monday there has Never been a problem tating them Any days. Some Time She Ask me to wait for Another day which I do.

This has been Answered in other Compliant. If I need to shoot a cot or kg I will do so .

These 2 Checks should not have happen due to the pound percessing tres without proof of Rhbies shots. I did Try to Contact the people Involved & could Not do So.

Omos E. Syrlack

pookeville CITY OF COOKEVILLE TENNESSEE

COOKEVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT CHIEF R. E. TERRY

P.O. BOX 849, 10 EAST BROAD STREET **COOKEVILLE, TN 38503-0849** 931-526-2125

FAX 528-9368

August 26, 1999

Jane Byers Animal Abuse Officer Putnam Co. Human Society 2105 W. Jackson Street Cookeville, Tennessee 38501

Dear Ms Byers,

I have concluded the investigation of one part of your complaint against Ofc. Amos Spurlock. You have charged that Ofc. Spurlock failed to perform his duty and was cruel to an animal. In this letter, I will present my decision on the charge of animal cruelty. Hopefully, by the end of next week, I will have a decision rendered on the other charge. In reference to the animal cruelty charge, you refer to two incidents:

- 1. He ordered a dog chained up that had a cut around its neck from the chain. This was on April 5th at the Ford Trailer Park
- 2. He brought a dead cat in that had been shot with a .22 cal. bullet. No information was provided shelter employees. Assumption was that he shot the cat. This was on June 30th.

As to the incident at Ford Trailer Park, Ofc. Spurlock did not contribute to animal cruelty by ordering the dog to be secured. Ofc. Spurlock remembers speaking to someone at lot 75 of the Ford Trailer Park about their dog running loose, but he doesn't remember seeing a dog with a cut around its neck. Even if he was aware of the injury and he told the owner to "chain" it, that would not necessarily mean that he expected the owner to actually put a chain around its neck. The dog's owner, Mr. Fulton, had the responsibility to care for his dog and also to keep it from running loose. It was up to Mr. Fulton to decide how his dog would be secured. Responsibility for disobeying the law relating to animal cruelty rests totally with Mr. Fulton.

In reference to the incident where the cat had been shot with a .22 caliber bullet, Ofc. Spurlock could not remember if he had found the cat in that condition or if he had shot and killed it. If he did shoot the cat to death, that, intrinsically, would not constitute animal cruelty. Many times, Ofc. Spurlock is not able to catch stray animals. If the animal is a nuisance or dangerous and can't be caught, then his only recourse is to shoot the animal.

The charge of animal cruelty against Ofc. Spurlock is without merit. Conclusion of fact: UNFOUNDED.

Sincerely,

Sgt. Bruce Lamb

Afternoon Shift Supervisor

Complaint File cc:

Ofc. Amos Spurlock

Capt. J. T. Bennett, Patrol Division Commander

Capt. Nathan Honeycutt, Administration Division Commander

MEMORANDUM FROM Sgt. Bruce Lamb

DATE: September 2, 1999

TO: Captain Jefferson T. Bennett, Patrol Division Commander

SUBJ: Recommendation on Spurlock Complaint

Byers vs. Spurlock 99 07 26 1422 44

As you know, I have been investigating a complaint against Ofc. Amos Spurlock. The animal abuse officer of the Humane Society and also an employee of the animal shelter, Jane Byers, has charged that Ofc. Spurlock failed to perform his duty by not supplying needed and wanted information to the shelter employees. By his own admission, Ofc. Spurlock states that he doesn't provide data sometimes because of the following reasons:

- Persons unknown leave animals in his truck. He doesn't know where the
 animals come from in this instance and, therefore, can't provide the data to the
 shelter. This would be something beyond his control. However, if officers of
 the Cookeville Police Department are the ones putting the animals in his
 truck, then they could be instructed to leave him a note with the needed
 information.
- He forgets where he got the animal. This is an inexcusable reason, for all he
 would have to do is write the information down on a notepad when he picks
 up the animal.
- His speech is inaudible sometimes. This is another inexcusable reason. He should be able to communicate effectively with any member of the community.

I believe that all employees of the Cookeville Police Department should cooperate as much as possible with other agencies, especially, organizations such as the animal shelter that we work with on a daily basis. If the shelter employees ask for certain data, then, unless it is illegal, against department policy or unreasonable, it should be given. For example, if they ask Ofc. Spurlock to tell them the sex of the animal that he brings in, I believe that would be unnecessary because they can determine that themselves. However, if they ask where the animal was picked up, then that is not unreasonable and it should be provided them.

I recommend that Ofc. Spurlock be counseled and instructed to work with the shelter employees in a more cooperative spirit.



COOKEVILLE TENNESSEE

COOKEVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT CHIEF R. E. TERRY

P.O. BOX 849, 10 EAST BROAD STREET COOKEVILLE, TN 38503-0849 931-526-2125 FAX 528-9368

September 2, 1999

Jane Byers Animal Abuse Officer Putnam Co. Human Society 2105 W. Jackson Street Cookeville, Tennessee 38501

COPY

Dear Ms Byers,

I have completed my investigation of the complaint that you have brought against Ofc. Amos Spurlock. You charged that Ofc. Spurlock was cruel to an animal and that he failed to perform his duties. Last week I sent notice of my judgment on the animal cruelty charge. This letter will address my decision concerning Ofc. Spurlock neglecting his duties.

From your statements concerning this charge, you cite two reasons that Ofc. Spurlock failed to perform his duty:

- 1. He failed to follow-up your request for verification of vaccination of dogs that he brought to the shelter which was subsequently released back to the owner.
- 2. He refused to give information, in whole or part, to shelter employees concerning animals, dead or alive, that he brought in.

Regarding his failure to follow-up on the vaccination cases, it is his duty to investigate when complaints are received in reference to a dog not being vaccinated. Ofc. Spurlock said that he tried to locate these people, but could not find them at home. Since he had difficulty finding the parties at home during his tour of duty, he should have passed the information on to the supervisor on the afternoon shift. They may have had a greater probability of locating the persons on their shift. Because of the length of time that has elapsed from the first request to the time the complaint was filed, Ofc. Spurlock should have made more progress. While I agree that he failed his duty in this situation, I can't render a culpable judgment in this instance due to the fact that the shelter, who released the dogs without proof of vaccination, created a situation that should have never occurred. To release the dogs with a promise from the owners to have it vaccinated and then bring

in proof of such vaccination, was defective. The implementation of the new policy by the shelter (showing proof that the vaccination cost was paid before the dog is released), would indicate the inadequacy of the former policy.

As to not providing information to the shelter personnel; When working with other agencies, all employees of the Cookeville Police Department should cooperate and assist in providing requested information, as long as it is not illegal, against department policy or unreasonable. Ofc. Spurlock states that he provides the requested information most of the time. There are times when he doesn't remember where he picked up an animal, thus, he can't provide the information asked for. Also, he admits that sometimes, when communicating with the shelter employees, he speaks to the point where he is inaudible. Therefore, I find that the evidence is sufficient to indicate that Ofc. Spurlock failed his duty as to this part of the complaint.

I have recommended to Captain Jefferson T. Bennett, Jr. that he should be counseled about his communication problems with the shelter employees. Conclusion of fact: SUSTAINED.

Sincerely, Druce Lamb

Sgt. Bruce Lamb

Afternoon Shift Supervisor

COPY

cc: Complaint File

Ofc. Amos Spurlock

Capt. Jefferson T. Bennett, Patrol Division Commander

Capt. Nathan Honeycutt, Administration Division Commander

Cookeville
CITY OF COOKEVILLE
TENNESSEE

COOKEVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT CHIEF R. E. TERRY

P.O. BOX 849, 10 EAST BROAD STREET COOKEVILLE, TN 38503-0849 931-526-2125 FAX 528-9368

September 2, 1999

Jane Byers
Animal Abuse Officer
Putnam Co. Human Society
2105 W. Jackson Street
Cookeville, Tennessee 38501

Dear Ms Byers,

I have completed my investigation of the complaint that you have brought against Ofc. Amos Spurlock. You charged that Ofc. Spurlock was cruel to an animal and that he failed to perform his duties. Last week I sent notice of my judgment on the animal cruelty charge. This letter will address my decision concerning Ofc. Spurlock neglecting his duties.

From your statements concerning this charge, you cite two reasons that Ofc. Spurlock failed to perform his duty:

- 1. He failed to follow-up your request for verification of vaccination of dogs that he brought to the shelter which was subsequently released back to the owner.
- 2. He refused to give information, in whole or part, to shelter employees concerning animals, dead or alive, that he brought in.

Regarding his failure to follow-up on the vaccination cases, it is his duty to investigate when complaints are received in reference to a dog not being vaccinated. Ofc. Spurlock said that he tried to locate these people, but could not find them at home. Since he had difficulty finding the parties at home during his tour of duty, he should have passed the information on to the supervisor on the afternoon shift. They may have had a greater probability of locating the persons on their shift. Because of the length of time that has elapsed from the first request to the time the complaint was filed, Ofc. Spurlock should have made more progress. While I agree that he failed his duty in this situation, I can't render a culpable judgment in this instance due to the fact that the shelter, who released the dogs without proof of vaccination, created a situation that should have never occurred. To release the dogs with a promise from the owners to have it vaccinated and then bring

in proof of such vaccination, was defective. The implementation of the new policy by the shelter (showing proof that the vaccination cost was paid before the dog is released), would indicate the inadequacy of the former policy.

As to not providing information to the shelter personnel; When working with other agencies, all employees of the Cookeville Police Department should cooperate and assist in providing requested information, as long as it is not illegal, against department policy or unreasonable. Ofc. Spurlock states that he provides the requested information most of the time. There are times when he doesn't remember where he picked up an animal, thus, he can't provide the information asked for. Also, he admits that sometimes, when communicating with the shelter employees, he speaks to the point where he is inaudible. Therefore, I find that the evidence is sufficient to indicate that Ofc. Spurlock failed his duty as to this part of the complaint.

I have recommended to Captain Jefferson T. Bennett, Jr. that he should be counseled about his communication problems with the shelter employees. Conclusion of fact: **SUSTAINED**.

Sincerely,

Sgt. Bruce Lamb

Afternoon Shift Supervisor

cc: Complaint File

Ofc. Amos Spurlock

Capt. Jefferson T. Bennett, Patrol Division Commander

Capt. Nathan Honeycutt, Administration Division Commander