

(EXPERIMENTAL)

USE OF PRE-STRUCTURED PARAGRAPHS

PROJECT NO. 72-110-1

7-1-72 to 6-30-73

FINAL REPORT

17126

T

ARIZONA STATE JUSTICE PLANNING AGENCY
PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. ASJPA GRANTEE: CITY OF SCOTTSDALE | 2. PROJECT TITLE: (EXPERIMENTAL) USE OF PRE-STRUCTURED PARAGRAPHS |
| | 3. PROJECT NO.: 72-110-1 |
| 4. DATE OF REPORT: JUNE 30, 1973 | 5. PERIOD COVERED: 7-1-72 TO 6-30-73 |

SUBMITTED HEREWITH IS THE PROGRESS REPORT FOR THE PERIOD SHOWN ABOVE:

PROJECT DIRECTOR (SIGNATURE)

W. C. NEMETZ, CHIEF OF POLICE
(TYPED NAME AND TITLE)

"(EXPERIMENTAL) USE OF PRE-STRUCTURED PARAGRAPHS"
POLICE DEPARTMENT
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA

FINAL REPORT

This Project is supported in part by a grant from the U.S. Department of Justice through the Arizona State Justice Planning Agency. Persons or organizations undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to freely express their professional judgment, findings, and conclusions. Therefore, views or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the U.S. Department of Justice or the Arizona State Justice Planning Agency.

PREPARED BY:
City of Scottsdale Police Department

WALTER C. NEMETZ
Chief of Police, Project Director

JACK W. ALLEN, Project Supervisor

PHILIP A. HAMM, Assistant

CONTENTS

| | | |
|-------|--|-------|
| I. | PROJECT BACKGROUND | 1 - 1 |
| II. | PROJECT METHOD | 2 - 1 |
| III. | PROJECT GOALS | 3 - 1 |
| IV. | PREPARING PRE-STRUCTURED FORMS | 4 - 1 |
| V. | ACQUIRING EQUIPMENT | 5 - 1 |
| VI. | COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PRE-STRUCTURED/ HANDWRITTEN REPORTS | 6 - 1 |
| VII. | SIDE BENEFITS | 7 - 1 |
| VIII. | CONCLUSIONS | 8 - 1 |

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

| | |
|---|--------------|
| INCIDENT TYPES SUITABLE FOR PRE- STRUCTURING | Figure 4 - 1 |
| SAMPLE INCIDENT REPORT FORM | Figure 4 - 2 |
| SAMPLE PRE-STRUCTURED SUPPLEMENT | Figure 4 - 3 |
| SAMPLE FINISHED REPORT | Figure 4 - 4 |
| PRE-STRUCTURED REPORT FORMS | Appendix A |
| WORTHLESS DOCUMENT REPORT | Appendix B |
| INDICTMENT/COMPLAINT SUMMARY | Appendix C |

I PROJECT BACKGROUND

Written reports have long been an integral part of police operations. Now, more than ever, the needs of modern law enforcement agencies demand that reports be detailed, accurate, and thorough.

The initial incident report is the foundation upon which a case is built, prosecution is secured, and justice is rendered. A poor incident report often means that follow-up officers must waste valuable time gathering information that was available at the scene; or if the case goes to court, the reporting officer may have his credibility challenged for lack of factual information.

Report writing is the most tedious time consuming task a patrolman faces. The patrol officer usually begins this lengthy procedure at the incident scene and continues writing after advising headquarters he has finished his initial investigation. Although the officer is available for another call, he is not accomplishing preventive patrol nor enforcing traffic laws. The only negligible side benefit of a police officer sitting in a patrol car finishing up a report might be to slow down a motorist who fears he has just run a radar check.

As the population, crime, and the crime rate continue to rise, so does the need for information and the portion of time a police officer spends writing reports. Unfortunately, the number of department reports increases at a greater rate than population, and the number of uniformed patrolmen.

For purposes of illustration let's look at Scottsdale. Scottsdale is a rapidly growing community in Central Arizona. The current population is around 90,000. Scottsdale Police Department consists of 101 employees, 72 sworn personnel and 29 civilian. In a recent 5 year period Scottsdale recorded a population increase of 55%. At the same time the number of uniformed patrolmen increased only 13%, yet the number of department reports increased an astonishing 73%. The problem continues to worsen; based on current projections the number of department reports is expected to increase 172% between 1973 & 1980.

Before the role of the patrol officer could be reduced to that of a scribe, Scottsdale Police Department undertook the task of searching out ways to transfer some of the writing from the

officer in the field to the typist in the office. With the help of a grant from the Arizona Criminal Justice Planning Agency, a one (1) year project was begun in July 1972 to design a pre-structured reporting system.

II PROJECT METHODS

The formulation, testing and implementation of the project was conducted mostly through the personnel and facilities of the Scottsdale Police Department. One research writer was employed part-time to assist in the preparation.

The pre-structured reports and the automatic typewriter system were tested by Department personnel under actual working conditions.

The project was completed in one year of grant approval and the results are documented in this final report.

Scottsdale, Arizona, with its dynamic, innovative, and progressive form of public administration provided an excellent test site for this project. There was enthusiastic support and cooperation for the project within the City and throughout this Department.

III PROJECT GOALS

1. Develop a pre-structured method of police reporting.
2. Transfer the bulk of writing time from the officer in the field to a typist in the office.
3. Use automatic typing equipment to improve typist's production.

The potential combinations of facts which go into police reports, are almost limitless. No two police reports are exactly alike; nevertheless, word patterns emerge. There are certain elements common to specific incidents. It was our objective to identify these elements, structure them into sentences, then make them available to officers for use in writing reports; at the same time, maintaining high standards of accuracy and completeness. Officers using pre-structured sentences could indicate blocks of information by merely jotting down a few numbers together with the required informational elements.

The actual writing of this narrative information is done by a typist in the office allowing the officer to return to his primary duties.

IV PREPARING PRE-STRUCTURED FORMS

In Scottsdale, police reports generally consist of a front form sheet and a narrative supplement. On the form sheet listed in block formation is the basic non-recurring factual information about the incident, i.e. time, date, location, victim/s, witness/es, suspect/s, property, etc. The supplement narrative then tells the story.

The arduous task of analyzing and categorizing recurring elements in department reports began in July 1972. Thousands of 1971 reports were individually scrutinized by incident type to determine overall reporting styles and identifying recurring word patterns suitable for pre-structuring. Some unnecessary reporting practices not actually related to the pre-structuring project were noted. For example, it was observed that there is a significant amount of repetition and duplication in police reports, i.e., time, location, etc. were being repeated in the report narratives. Eventually word patterns began to emerge and incident types were selected as suitable for pre-structuring, refer Figure 4-1.

Using the general information derived from this

study, the basic format for a pre-structured report system was established:

Two approaches were considered:

1. Eliminate the current report forms and pre-structure the entire report.
2. Retain the current report forms and merge the pre-structured method into the present system.

Due to the basic factual requirements of every incident report, the second approach was selected as the more efficient.

Each incident report contains certain basic, variable information which must always be written or dictated; e.g. name, addresses, descriptions, etc. In Scottsdale, the assigned officer usually takes this information at the scene of the incident and records it onto an Incident Report Form.

Using approach number 1 (eliminate the current report forms and pre-structure the entire report); this information could easily be put in narrative form.

For purposes of illustration, imagine an officer making a report at the scene of a burglary. The officer refers to his pre-structured form book, B-Burglary and sees:

1. On _____ date _____, at _____ time _____, _____
reported a _____ incident _____ at _____ location _____.

The Officer writes: Burglary

#1 1-1-73
 0200
 Joe Victim
 Burglary
 2100 Security Lane

The officer would continue selecting paragraphs and reporting variable information until he finished his inquiry. This information is forwarded to the typist at the station. At the automatic typewriter she selects Burglary, Sentence #1. At each automatic stop point on the magnetic card, the typist manually types in this variable material. She would continue selecting sentences and manually typing variable information until the report was completed.

In this example, the final report would begin:

On January 1, 1973 at 0200 hours
Joe Victim reported a burglary at
2100 Security Lane, Scottsdale, etc.,

This pre-structured sentence relates the same information contained on the Incident Report Form; however, this method has three major drawbacks:

1. More time is required to read this basic information in narrative style than to read it on the report form.
2. Reporting officers and follow-up officers are familiar with the existing report forms and know exactly where to write or read a specific piece of information.
3. The pre-structured system had not saved the officer in the field any writing time over the use of a form. In addition, the same information has to be typed in the final report causing unnecessary duplication and more writing time.

By retaining the Incident Report Form, the basic recurring variable information need be written only once. On the Incident Supplement, the officer writes a narrative account of the incident. It is in the narrative description that pre-structural information is found, writing time reduced, and unnecessary duplication avoided. Thirteen (13) incident types covering approximately 80% of all Incident Reports were pre-structured (refer Appendix - for Forms & Instructions). Officers have found the forms easy to use. For purposes of illustration suppose Officer Friendly is

dispatched to take a report of a theft from auto. The officer after making his investigation at the scene begins his report. First he completes the Incident Report Form, refer Figure 4-2. Then he turns his Pre-Structured notebook to "Theft From Auto" to write the report narrative. He chooses the appropriate sentences and fills in any necessary information. If there is information which is not pre-structured the officer simply makes a check mark and inserts this information in the appropriate place in the story. Words like victim, suspect, listed property, person securing, etc. refer to the information listed on the Incident Report Form. Refer Figure 4-3. The officer turns this report into his Watch Supervisor who reviews and forwards it to the typist. The typist using the automatic typing machine types the report and forwards it to the Detective Division. Refer Figure 4-4.

INCIDENT TYPES SUITABLE FOR PRE-STRUCTURING

| 1971 INCIDENT TYPE | # of 1971 REPORTS | % 1971 REPORTS | ADAPTABLE TO PRE-STRUCTURING COMMENTS |
|--|----------------------|-------------------|--|
| 1. <u>HOMICIDE</u> | 13 | 0.19% | |
| a. Murder or non-negligent manslaughter | 0 | 0 | <u>No</u> - Insufficient data |
| b. Manslaughter by negligence (includes Traffic Accidents) | 13 | 0.19% | <u>No</u> - Insufficient data |
| 2. <u>RAPE</u> | 14 | 0.19% | <u>No</u> - Most information is the result of transcribed taped interview. Intensive examination is often necessary to determine if rape actually occurred, so common recurring sentence patterns are in victim's own words. |
| 3. <u>ASSAULT</u> | 235 | 3.20% | <u>Yes</u> - Appears to be common elements in instrument used, history of incidents, relationships of parties, and condition of parties. |
| 4. <u>ROBBERY</u> | 27 | 0.37% | <u>No</u> - 2/3 of robberies were armed, no patterns ascertainable; possible recurring patterns in strong armed robbery. |
| 5. <u>BURGLARY</u> | 966 | 13.14% | |
| a. Residential | 616 | 8.38% | <u>Yes</u> - Adaptable to some pre-structuring, much variable information requiring writing. |
| b. Non-residential | 350 | 4.76% | <u>No</u> - Method and premises too varied, minimum information suitable for pre-structuring. As pre-structured method developed and refined, non-residential burglary may prove adaptable. |
| 6. <u>LARCENY</u> | 3564 | 48.49% | |
| a. Pocket Picking | 0 | 0 | <u>No</u> - Insufficient data |
| b. Purse Snatching | 3 | 0.04% | <u>No</u> - Insufficient data |

FIGURE 4-1 INCIDENT TYPES SUITABLE FOR PRE-STRUCTURING

INCIDENT TYPES SUITABLE FOR PRE-STRUCTURING

| 1971 INCIDENT TYPE | # of 1971 REPORTS | % 1971 REPORTS | ADAPTABLE TO PRE-STRUCTURING COMMENTS |
|---|----------------------|-------------------|---|
| c. Shoplifting | 336 | 4.57% | <u>Yes</u> - Highly suitable |
| d. From auto (not parts or accessories) | 429 | 5.84% | <u>Yes</u> - See 6-e, auto parts or accessories. |
| e. Auto parts or access- ories | 422 | 5.74% | <u>Yes</u> - Common elements similar to 6-d, from auto (not parts or accessories). |
| f. Bicycle | 1323 | 18.00% | <u>Yes</u> - See 6-j, Automobile |
| g. From building (not shoplifting or coin machines) | 277 | 3.77% | <u>Yes</u> - Partially adaptable to pre-structuring. |
| h. From coin machine | 19 | 0.26% | <u>Yes</u> - Highly suitable |
| i. All others (except autos) | 395 | 5.37% | <u>Yes</u> - Suitable |
| j. Automobile (include Joyriding) | 360 | 4.90% | <u>Yes</u> - Includes motorcycles, similar to bicycles - common elements, see 6-f. |
| 7. CLASS TWO OFFENSES | 1467 | 19.82% | |
| a. Arson | 12 | 0.15% | <u>No</u> - Insufficient data |
| b. Forgery and Counter- feiting | 61 | 0.81% | <u>Yes</u> - Suitable for forgery, Insufficient data for counterfeiting. |
| c. Fraud | 262 | 3.55% | <u>Yes</u> - Highly suitable for worthless documents, insuf- ficient data for defrauding innkeeper. |
| d. Embezzlement | 34 | 0.45% | <u>No</u> - Information on 1971 reports too varied for pre- structuring, however a new Arizona embezzlement statute changing elements of proof may make this incident adapt- able for pre-structuring in future. |

INCIDENT TYPES SUITABLE FOR PRE-STRUCTURING

| 1971 INCIDENT TYPE | # of 1971 REPORTS | % 1971 REPORTS | ADAPTABLE TO PRE-STRUCTURING COMMENTS |
|--|----------------------|-------------------|--|
| e. Vandalism | 700 | 9.49% | <u>Yes</u> - Suitable |
| f. Prostitution and Commercialized Vice | 4 | 0.04% | <u>No</u> - Insufficient data |
| g. Sex Offenses | 84 | 1.14% | <u>No</u> - Information appears too variable for initial phase of project, refinement of pre- structured system may allow for incorporation in future. |
| h. Opium or cocaine & derivatives | 2 | 0.03% | <u>No</u> - See 7-k, Dangerous Drugs, non-narcotic drugs |
| i. Marijuana | 37 | 0.50% | <u>No</u> - See 7-k, Dangerous non- narcotic drugs |
| j. Synthetic narcotics | 5 | 0.06% | <u>No</u> - See 7-k, Dangerous non- narcotic drugs |
| k. Dangerous non-narcotic drugs | 16 | 0.21% | <u>No</u> - Information too varied, combine 7-h, i, j, and k, for possible pre-structuring in future. |
| l. All Other Part II Offenses | 250 | 3.39% | <u>No</u> - Most incidents too var- table, possible pre-struct- uring of trespass reports at future date. |
| 8. NON-CRIME D.R.s | 1077 | 14.61% | |
| a. Courtesy report | 2 | 0.03% | <u>No</u> - Insufficient data |
| b. Dead Body | 61 | 0.83% | <u>Yes</u> - Suitable |
| c. Fugitive Report | 0 | 0 | <u>No</u> - Insufficient data |
| d. Impound | 487 | 6.63% | <u>No</u> - Present form sufficient |
| e. Information received | 42 | 0.55% | <u>No</u> - Information varied |

INCIDENT TYPES SUITABLE FOR PRE-STRUCTURING

| 1971 INCIDENT TYPE | # of 1971 REPORTS | % 1971 REPORTS | ADAPTABLE TO PRE-STRUCTURING COMMENTS |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--|
| f. Injury | 19 | 0.24% | No - Method and injuries too variable |
| g. Lost or Found (includes bicycles) | 77 | 1.05% | Yes - Moderately adaptable |
| h. Missing Persons | 373 | 5.07% | No - Present form sufficient. Information too varied. |
| i. Sick Persons | 2 | 0.03% | No - Insufficient data |
| j. Suicide | 0 | 0 | No - Insufficient data |
| k. All Other | 14 | 0.18% | No - Insufficient data |
| TOTAL | 7350 | 100.00% | 75.76% ARE SUITABLE FOR SOME DEGREE OF PRE-STRUCTURING, ANOTHER 10.54% MIGHT PROVE ADAPTABLE FOR PRE-STRUCTURING AS THE SYSTEM IS DEVELOPED AND REFINED. |

3.1
Rev 11-72

POLICE DEPARTMENT
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA

INCIDENT REPORT

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------|--|
| Date & Time Reported 5-31-73 | Type of Report THEFT FROM AUTO | NCIC No. | TWX No. | DR. No. 73-0000 |
| Date & Time of Occurrence 5-30-73 / 5-31-73 1300-0900 | Location of Occurrence 1000 E SUN DRIVE (APTS #202) | | | RD No. 00 |
| Victim's Name (Firm Name if Business) VICTIM, JOE E | | Residence Address (Business Address if Firm) S/A | | Res. Phone 999-1111 |
| Victim's Occupation SALESMAN | | Sex M | Age 46 | Race W |
| Business or Other Address 2000 W. 1ST AVE | | Res. Phone 888-1111 | | Phone |
| Reported By S/A | | Residence Address | | Res. Phone |
| Person who Secured Premises S/A | | Residence Address | | Res. Phone |
| Discovered By S/A | | Residence Address | | Res. Phone |
| Type of Premises AUTO | | Point of Entrance LEFT DOOR + HOOD | | Instrument or Force Used UNK. TOOLS |
| Method of Entry or Assult | | Investigative Person Responding | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MOTOR VEH. | Year 1972 | Make PLYMOUTH | Model or Size DR. | Style Sedan | Color(s) P. JUN | Vin or Serial No. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> LICs ONLY | Lics No. | Lics State / City | Lics Exp Yr. | Lics Type | No. of Speeds (Bike) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> BIKE-BOYS | APX 316 COLORADO 1973 | | | | Value (Bike) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> BIKE-GIRLS | Identifying Characteristics & Identifying Numbers | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> BIKE-convertible | | | | | | |

| ITEM NO. | QUANTITY | PROPERTY | DESCRIBE: | INCLUDE SERIAL AND OTHER IDENTIFYING NUMBERS | VALU |
|----------|----------|----------------------------|------------------|--|----------|
| 1 | 1 | Mopar 12 Volt auto BATTERY | APP. 1 1/2 R OI' | | \$ 30.00 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

TOTAL VALUE \$ 30.00

| | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|------------|------------|
| Witness Name 1. NONE | Residence Address | Res. Phone | Bus. Phone |
| 2. | Residence Address | Res. Phone | Bus. Phone |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|---------|--------|--------|--------|------|------|-------|----------|
| SUSP. | Sex | Descent | d.o.b. | Height | Weight | Hair | Eyes | Compl | Clothing |
| NO. 1 | Name & Address, Identifying Characteristics [If Arrested include ID No. and Charges] UNK Figure 4-2 Sample Incident Report Form | | | | | | | | |

A-05
Reference Code

5-31-73
Date of this Supplement

73-0000
D. R. Number

1, 1116

3, WAS VICTIM

4, IN NORTH PARKING LOT, WEST OF PARKWAY

6,

✓, VICTIM FOUND LEFT DOOR OPEN AND HOOD UNLATCHED
THERE WAS NO VISIBLE DAMAGE TO VICTIM'S
VEHICLE

9, 1/ UNDER THE HOOD

10, POSSIBLY A SCREWDRIVER / 1

13,

17,

73-0000

Assigned Officer was dispatched by radio to location of occurrence, on date reported at 1116 hours. Present at scene when Assigned Officer arrived was victim. Listed vehicle was parked in the north parking lot, west of parkway. Person securing locked vehicle. Victim found left door open and hood unlatched. There was no visible damage to victim's vehicle. When taken, item/s #1 located under the hood. Possibly a screwdriver was used to remove item #1. Person reporting has no suspects in mind. Victim will sign complaint.

Officer Friendly, #007

B-93

Reviewing Supervisor Ser. No.

OFFICER FRIENDLY # 007
Reporting Officer Ser./No.

46.0
Rev. 1/73

POLICE DEPARTMENT
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA

SUPPLEMENT

Figure 4-3 Sample PRE-STRUCTURED Supplement

FIGURE 4-4 FINISHED REPORT

V ACQUIRING EQUIPMENT

Transferring report writing to the office places an added burden on a busy clerical staff. To require the clerical staff to retype already prepared sentences smacks of unnecessary duplication.

Fortunately, pre-structured sentences are ideally suited to the operating capabilities of an automated typewriter system. An automated typewriter system is the combination of an electronic memory with an electric typewriter. The memory stores typed characters on magnetic cards or tapes. Paragraphs, sentences, or phrases can be stored in the memory along with type-out instructions; stop codes for manual insertion of variable non-structured information, etc. On operator instruction, the machine types the stored information at a speed three times faster than that of the average typist; yet the system is not so sophisticated that extensive operator training is required. The system is inexpensive in the

sense that it can be leased for slightly less than one-half the salary of a typist; yet, (depending on application), increases productivity equal to the normal output of two to four persons.

Note: There is a secondary cost advantage to be realized from this procedure. The average patrolman in Scottsdale receives \$4.61/hr to enforce the law. The average clerk-typist receives \$2.91/hr to type reports. By transferring report writing on a one-to-one basis from the field to the office a net savings of \$1.70/hr for writing reports is derived.

Scottsdale Police Department conducted a market survey of automatic typewriter systems currently available in the local area. After comparing machines for function, cost, downtime, and availability the choice was narrowed to either an IBM Magnetic Card/Selectric Typewriter (MC/ST) or a Magnetic Tape/Selectric Typewriter (MT/ST). The typing staff experimented with both machines.

They found the MC/ST faster, easier to train on,
and requiring fewer operating steps than the MT/ST.
An IBM MC/ST is currently in use in this department.
It is used both for preparing pre-structured
reports and general office typing.

AUTOMATIC TYPEWRITER SYSTEMS EXAMINED

1. FRIDEN
Flexowriter
2. IBM
MC/ST
MT/ST
3. REDACTRON
Dual Card Data Secretary
Dual Cassette Data Secretary
Single Card Data Secretary
Single Cassette Data Secretary
4. TY-DATA
Single Cassette Word Processor
Dual Cassette Word Processor
5. CPT
Dual Cassette Word Processor

VI COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PRE-STRUCTURED/HANDWRITTEN REPORTS

To evaluate the effectiveness of using a pre-structured report system, testing procedures which compared longhand report writing to semi-automated report writing were used. The testing procedures were designed to measure

1. quantity
2. time, and
3. quality.

The most accurate, and yet the most tedious way to measure the quantity of words written in longhand is to count the words. Reports taken in the first six months of 1972 were selected by incident types to be used in the pre-structured program. The average number of handwritten words per report was computed from 50 randomly selected reports of each incident type. Incident types having fewer than 50 reports were not included in the analysis even though they are pre-structured. These same test procedures were run on the pre-structured reports for final comparison and analysis.

Report writing time was measured by officers in the field. Actual writing times more accurately reflect the advantages/disadvantages of a pre-structured

report system than simulated time tests administered by project personnel. Simulated time tests fail to reflect the distractions and delays found in field reporting.

As noted in the section on Preparing Pre-Structured Reports, a certain amount of duplication within reports was detected. Additional data was gathered to measure the amount of duplication.

This duplication, common to reporting methods of many police departments, consists mostly of repeating information in the report narrative which is already listed on the report form. Such duplication is both unnecessary and time consuming. If the report form contains the time, date, location, type of occurrence, stolen property, etc., it is not necessary to repeat the information in the report narrative. There is no need for sentences like, "On 1/1/73 at 1200 hrs. Joe Victim reported a burglary at his residence on 1000 State Street." As a by-product of this project, Scottsdale Police Department took steps to reduce the amount of this unnecessary writing.

QUANTITY-TIME ANALYSIS OF HANDWRITTEN & PRE-STRUCTURED REPORTS

| <u>Incident Type</u> | <u>HANDWRITTEN REPORTS</u> | | | <u>PRE-STRUCTURED REPORTS</u> | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---|
| | <u>Avg. Hand-written Wds/Report</u> | <u>Avg. Writing Time</u> | <u>Avg. Wds Duplicated Information/Report</u> | <u>Avg. Hand-written Wds/Report</u> | <u>% Change</u> | <u>Avg. Writing Time</u> | <u>% Change</u> | <u>Avg. Wds Duplicated Information/Report</u> |
| THEFT VEHICLE - including Auto, Bicycle, Motorcycle | 121 | 16.3 min | 21 | 73 | -39.5% | 8.0 min | -50.9% | negligible |
| LARCENY - all others | 131 | 16.1 min | 14 | 82 | -37.5% | 12.5 min | -22.4% | " |
| MALICIOUS MISCHIEF | 131 | 17.9 min | 30 | 65 | -50.8% | 7.8 min | -56.3% | " |
| BURGLARY residential | 222 | 28.5 min | 37 | 124 | -44.2% | 18.2 min | -36.1% | " |
| SHOPLIFTING | 185 | 29.8 min | negligible | 116 | -37.2% | 17.5 min | -41.3% | " |
| THEFT FROM AUTO | 159 | 14.2 min | 29 | 86 | -45.8% | 10.8 min | -23.8% | " |
| THEFT FROM BUILDING - not Burglary, Shoplifting or Coin Machines | 148 | 20.8 min | 10 | 100 | -32.0% | 10.8 min | -48.2% | " |
| ASSAULT & BATTERY | 240 | n/a | 22 | 182 | -24.2% | n/a | n/a | " |
| WEIGHTED AVERAGES BY FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE 1972 DATA | 156 | 19.2 min | 25 | 92 | -41.0% | 11.0 min | -42.7% | negligible |

Naturally, the pre-structured reports are going to have the greatest impact on the people using them. A qualitative questionnaire was given to all members of patrol and detective divisions who either write or read the pre-structured reports. To get as complete and honest an evaluation as possible, persons answering the questionnaire were not required to identify themselves. Even though the pre-structured report system had only been in use a little over two (2) months when the survey was made, members of both patrol and detective divisions expressed an overwhelming preference for the pre-structured system over the old longhand method of writing a report. Not only do the reports reduce the writing time for officers in the field, but follow-up officers report that they are receiving more complete reports with additional information. In other words patrol officers are spending less time writing more investigative information than under the old method of report writing.

PATROL DIVISION

1. Do the pre-structured reports reduce writing time?

| | | |
|-----------|----|-------|
| Yes | 34 | 89.4% |
| No | 3 | |
| Undecided | 1 | |

2. Are the report forms easy to use?

| | | |
|-----------|----|-------|
| Yes | 35 | 92.1% |
| No | 2 | |
| Undecided | 1 | |

3. Do you prefer using the pre-structured reports to writing reports longhand?

| | | |
|-----------|----|-------|
| Yes | 32 | 84.2% |
| No | 5 | |
| Undecided | 1 | |

4. Do you think the department should continue using the pre-structured reports after the test period ends?

| | | |
|-----------|----|-------|
| Yes | 32 | 84.2% |
| No | 4 | |
| Undecided | 2 | |

DETECTIVE DIVISION

1. Are you receiving more investigative information in reports?

Yes 5

No 2

Undecided 1

2. Do you think the department should continue using the pre-structured reports after the test period ends?

Yes 5

No 1

Undecided 2

VII SIDE BENEFITS

Many side benefits accrued as a result of the pre-structured project. Unnecessary duplication in police report writing was virtually eliminated. A single page Worthless Document report was designed which has greatly facilitated the workload of the detectives. Reference Appendix B.

The MC/ST made it convenient to use triplicate paper to copy reports. Previously, reports were copied on a photocopy machine. By using triplicate paper, this department has reduced copying costs.

The MC/ST is also being used for general office typing. Its easy correction features reduce typing time and virtually eliminates the need to manually retype drafts of documents.

Since the reports move through the system so quickly, and often times it is difficult for Watch Supervisor to correct mistakes, a correction memo was developed to send reports back to the originating officer where the correction responsibility belongs. Follow-up

officers using the memo to clarify pieces of information are assured that the return product is first hand information from the original officer.

As this department becomes more familiar with pre-structured reporting, it is developing more uses for the method. A Complaint/Indictment Summary (Reference Appendix C) has been developed, and a Missing Persons Report, and an Investigation and Identification Report are currently in the making. This department anticipates expansion and experimentation along these lines in the future.

VIII CONCLUSIONS

Although it is difficult to draw specific conclusions about the total effectiveness of the pre-structured project at this early date, it would not be an exaggeration to say that the system has been successful in its early stages. The minor problems common to most new developments can be easily remedied. Some of the report forms need to be revised, most notably the Assault & Battery Report Form. A few of the officers need more training in the use of the forms. On the whole, though, the system has significantly reduced the field officer's writing time; introduced the benefits of another modern piece of efficient office equipment and related techniques to police operations; and has improved the quality of police reporting in general. It is hoped that the groundwork developed in this experimental project can be improved upon and expanded to further upgrade the quality of police reporting and informational flow.

INSTRUCTIONS

The term "Incident Report", as used in these instructions, applies to all types of incidents reported, including Worthless Documents, Death, Missing Person, etc.

A. Revised Reporting Methods

1. As a general rule, do not repeat information on the Incident Report Form in the report narrative.
2. When an arrest record or juvenile referral is made in conjunction with an incident recorded, or to be recorded, on an Incident Report, the officer shall:

Record only the facts of the arrest in the narrative portion of the Arrest Record or Juvenile Referral Report.

3. When no Incident Report is required and two or more juveniles are referred on the same incident, and the officer wishes the same narrative to appear on the juvenile referrals, the officer shall:
 - a. Write "see attached supplement" in the narrative.
 - b. Write the narrative (one time only) on a Supplement Form and clip it to the juvenile referrals. Personnel of the Records Section will copy and attach Supplement Forms before forwarding.
4. An "Investigative Leads" sheet is provided to communicate suspicions and opinions, to follow up officers, which cannot or should not be written in the report itself. (e.g., field officer suspects victim is trying to defraud insurance company and reasons why.) The "Investigative Leads" sheet is confidential, not shown to press, separate from any file in Records Section, forwarded to Detective Division and eventually destroyed.

- B. Definitions - the following terms in the Incident Narrative refer to the information contained in the blocks on the front of the Incident Report:

Item
Person Discovering
Person Reporting
Person Securing
Property
Suspect/s - includes person/s unknown
Victim
Vehicle - use vehicle block to describe stolen, theft from, or vehicle used in

The following terms underlined in the Incident Narrative are used to identify:

area - specific area, not address or type of premise.
person/s - can include assigned officer, victim, witness, suspect, others, or any combination thereof.

- C. Use of Incident Narrative and Supplement
1. Complete front of Incident Report.
 2. List additional property, suspects, victims, etc. on a separate supplement sheet.
 3. Locate "Incident Narrative" by type of offense or incident.
 4. Record the reference code of the "Incident Narrative" in the top left hand corner of the supplement.
 5. Select sentences which apply to your case.
 - a. Record the sentence number in the left hand column.
 - b. If the sentence you selected contains a blank space, write the information needed to fill the blank to the right of the number.

- c. If a sentence contains more than one blank space, separate the information that goes in each blank with a slash mark /.
 - d. All blanks must be filled. You may use UNK when appropriate.
6. You may use any sentence as many times as you wish.
 7. When you wish to add information which is not pre-structured, make a check mark ✓ in the left hand column. Enter the information to the right of the check mark.
 8. If you make a mistake, draw a line through the mistake, initial it, and continue.
 9. Use as many words as necessary to complete a sentence. If words such as was, were, and, etc., are needed to make the sentence grammatically correct, put them in. The typist will only type the words you have written.

47.1
Rev. 2/73
A-01 (Reference Code)

POLICE DEPARTMENT
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA

INCIDENT NARRATIVE
THEFT - VEHICLE,
INCLUDES AUTO,
BICYCLE, MOTORCYCLE

1. Assigned Officer was dispatched by radio to location of occurrence, on date reported at time dispatched hours.
2. At stated date and time Undersigned Officer took this report at Scottsdale Police Department.
3. Present at scene when Assigned Officer arrived was/were suspect, victim, officers, etc.
4. Person securing parked listed vehicle area.
5. Person securing left keys in vehicle.
6. Person securing did not lock vehicle.
7. Person securing locked vehicle.
8. Vehicle has steering mechanism that locks when keys are removed from ignition switch.
9. Motorcycle was secured by fork-lock.
10. Vehicle was secured by a chain lock.
11. Vehicle was chained to fixed object.
12. Chain lock appeared to have been cut by boltcutter, hacksaw, etc.
13. Assigned Officer impounded item/s for evidence, refer Impound Sheet this D.R.
14. Vehicle was possibly removed from area on another motor vehicle; Assigned Officer found evidence of evidence, e.g. tire tracks.
15. Person/s searched neighborhood for stolen vehicle with negative results.
16. 1/2, 3/4, etc. tank of gas was estimated as being in the vehicle when parked.
17. Person reporting estimated that when vehicle was stolen the odometer reading was .
18. Person reporting states listed property was in vehicle when last secured.
19. Person was instructed by Assigned Officer to contact Scottsdale Police Department with information to complete vehicle/property description.
20. Person reporting has no suspects in mind.
21. Name/s, address/es, neighbor/s, friend/s, etc., contacted by Assigned Officer about seeing any suspicious activities; results negative.
22. Assigned Officer attempted to contact neighbors about seeing any suspicious activities; no one was home at address.
23. Vehicle used by suspect/s was described as a make, model, color/s, etc.
24. Assigned Officer forwarded information to Scottsdale Police Department ACIC/NCIC terminal operator for entry.
25. Victim will sign complaint.
26. Victim will not sign complaint.

47.2
Rev. 2/73
A-02 (Reference Code)

POLICE DEPARTMENT

INCIDENT NARRATIVE
THEFT (EXCEPT
VEHICLE, SHOPLIFT-
ING, AND FROM: AUTO,
COIN BOX OR BUILDING)

1. Assigned Officer was dispatched by radio to location of occurrence, on date reported at time dispatched hours.
2. At stated date and time Undersigned Officer took this report at Scottsdale Police Department.
3. Present at scene when Assigned Officer arrived was/were suspect, victim, officers.
4. Suspect/s removed listed property from area.
5. At time of occurrence, victim was at home, on vacation, etc.
6. Person/s searched area for missing property with negative results.
7. Person reporting has no suspects in mind.
8. The apparent motive was self gain.
9. The apparent motive was malicious mischief.
10. Name/s, address/es, neighbor/s, friend/s, etc., contacted by Assigned Officer about noticing any suspicious activities; results negative.
11. Assigned Officer attempted to contact neighbor/s about seeing any suspicious activities; no one was home at address.
12. Suspect/s used listed vehicle to _____.
13. Victim will sign complaint.
14. Victim will not sign complaint.

47.3
Rev. 2/73
A-03 (Reference Code)

POLICE DEPARTMENT
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA

INCIDENT NARRATIVE
MALICIOUS MISCHIEF

1. Assigned Officer was dispatched by radio to location of occurrence, on date reported at time dispatched hours.
2. At stated date and time Undersigned Officer took this report at Scottsdale Police Department.
3. Present at scene when Assigned Officer arrived was/were suspect, victim, officers, etc.
4. Suspect/s used listed instrument to damage property.
5. Suspect/s used listed instrument to break property.
6. When incident occurred listed vehicle was parked area.
7. No one was home when incident occurred.
8. When incident occurred, person was location.
9. Damage to property estimated to be \$_____.
10. Person reporting has no suspects in mind.
11. Person reporting states incident/s of this type previously occurred once, twice, 3 times.
12. Person reporting stated prior incident/s reported to Scottsdale Police Department approximate date/s.
13. Person reporting did not report prior incident/s to police.
14. Name/s, address/es, neighbor/s, friend/s, etc., contacted by Assigned Officer about seeing any suspicious activity; results negative.
15. Assigned Officer attempted to contact neighbor/s about seeing any suspicious activities; no one was home at address.
16. Suspect/s used listed vehicle to _____.
17. Victim will sign complaint.
18. Victim will not sign complaint.

47.4
Rev. 2/73
A-04 (Reference Code)

POLICE DEPARTMENT
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA

INCIDENT NARRATIVE
BURGLARY -
RESIDENTIAL

1. Assigned Officer was dispatched by radio to location of occurrence, on date reported at time dispatched hours.
2. At stated date and time Undersigned Officer took this report at Scottsdale Police Department.
3. Present at scene when Assigned Officer arrived was/were suspect, victim, officers, etc.
4. Person reporting stated that at time of burglary premise was locked, unlocked.
5. No one was home when burglary occurred.
6. When burglary occurred, person reporting was in room, shopping, etc.
7. Assigned Officer found no evidence of forced entry.
8. It appeared suspect/s attempted but were unsuccessful in entering at point. Assigned Officer found scratches, footprints, etc.
9. Throughout the house, drawers and closets had been opened, and contents scattered.
10. room was ransacked.
11. room was disarranged and appeared to have been searched.
12. Item # was located specific location in room.
13. No other rooms appear to have been disturbed.
14. Left behind were valuable items such as items.
15. Person reporting is unable to determine if anything is missing.
16. Assigned Officer instructed person reporting to contact Scottsdale Police Department with information, serial number/s, etc., to complete description of missing items.
17. Person reporting does not have serial numbers of missing item/s.
18. Suspect/s apparently exited at point & method.
19. Person reporting has no suspects in mind.
20. Assigned Officer impounded property for evidence, refer Impound Sheet this D.R.
21. Assigned Officer observed footprints area and description.
22. Person unable to find any identifiable latent prints.
23. Name/s, address/es, neighbor/s, friend/s, etc, contacted by Assigned Officer about noticing any suspicious activities; results negative.
24. Assigned Officer attempted to contact neighbor/s about seeing any suspicious activity; no one was home at address.
25. Suspect/s used described vehicle to .
26. Victim will sign complaint.
27. Victim will not sign complaint.

47.5
Rev. 2/73
A-05 (Reference Code)

POLICE DEPARTMENT
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA

INCIDENT NARRATIVE
THEFT FROM AUTO

1. Assigned Officer was dispatched by radio to location of occurrence, on date reported at time dispatched hours.
2. At stated date and time Undersigned Officer took this report at Scottsdale Police Department.
3. Present at scene when Assigned Officer arrived was/were suspect, victim, officers, etc.
4. Listed vehicle was parked area.
5. Person securing left vehicle unlocked.
6. Person securing locked vehicle.
7. Vehicle was still locked when listed property was discovered missing.
8. There were no visible signs of forced entry.
9. When taken, item/s # located where in vehicle.
10. Instrument was used to remove item # .
11. Person reporting will contact Scottsdale Police Department with serial number/s of missing property.
12. Person reporting does not have serial number/s of missing property.
13. Person reporting has no suspects in mind.
14. Person/s unable to find any identifiable latent prints.
15. Name/s, address/es, neighbor/s, friend/s, etc., contacted by Assigned Officer about seeing any suspicious activity; results negative.
16. Assigned Officer attempted to contact neighbor/s about seeing any suspicious activity; no one was home at address.
17. Victim will sign complaint.
18. Victim will not sign complaint.

47.6
Rev. 2/73
A-06 (Reference Code)

POLICE DEPARTMENT
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA

INCIDENT NARRATIVE
SHOPLIFTING

1. Assigned Officer was dispatched by radio to location of occurrence, on date reported at time dispatched hours.
2. Present at scene when Assigned Officer arrived was/were suspect, victim, officers, etc..
3. Person was working in the store area.
4. Suspect/s entered the area at approximately time.
5. Person/s observed suspect #1 take listed property and conceal it by method.
6. Person/s observed suspect #2 take listed property and conceal it by method.
7. Number items were selected from the sales area and taken into the dressing room by suspect #1.
8. Number items were selected from the sales area and taken into the dressing room by suspect #2.
9. Number items were brought from the dressing room by suspect #1.
10. Number items were brought from the dressing room by suspect #2.
11. Suspect #2 accompanied suspect #1.
12. Number empty hangers were found when the dressing room was inspected by person/s.
13. During this time suspect #2 appeared to be acting as a lookout.
14. Person/s observed suspect/s leave store without paying for or offering to pay for listed property.
15. Suspect/s used listed vehicle to _____.
16. Person/s apprehended suspect/s in area.
17. Suspect/s asked to return to store for questioning.
18. Suspect/s held for arrival of police.
19. Person/s found item/s # _____ on suspect #1 concealed area.
20. Person/s found item/s # _____ on suspect #2 concealed area.
21. Suspect #1 admitted taking property for personal gain, admission was made to person/s.
22. Suspect #2 admitted taking property for personal gain, admission was made to person/s.
23. Assigned Officer recited the Miranda warnings to suspect/s # _____.
24. Assigned Officer marked for evidence and left at business, item/s # _____.
25. Suspect #1 cited for Shoplifting, refer citation # _____.
26. Suspect #2 cited for Shoplifting, refer citation # _____.
27. Victim will sign complaint.
28. Victim will not sign complaint.

47.7
Rev. 2/73
A-07 (Reference Code)

POLICE DEPARTMENT
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA

INCIDENT NARRATIVE
THEFT FROM BUILDING

1. Assigned Officer was dispatched by radio to location of occurrence, on date reported at time dispatched hours.
2. At stated date and time Undersigned Officer took this report at Scottsdale Police Department.
3. Present at scene when Assigned Officer arrived was/were suspect, victim, officers, etc.
4. Between stated times suspect/s removed listed property from area.
5. During time of theft victim was activity.
6. Person/s didn't notice any suspicious activity between stated times of occurrence.
7. Left undisturbed were other items such as items.
8. Theft occurred during regular business hours.
9. Victim will contact Scottsdale Police with serial number/s of missing item/s.
10. Victim does not know serial number/s of missing item/s.
11. Victim has no suspect/s in mind.
12. Suspect/s used listed vehicle to _____.
13. Victim will sign complaint.
14. Victim will not sign complaint.

47.8
Rev. 2/73
A-08 (Reference Code)

POLICE DEPARTMENT
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA

INCIDENT NARRATIVE
ASSAULT & BATTERY

1. Assigned Officer was dispatched by radio to location of occurrence, on date reported at time dispatched hours.
2. At stated date and time Undersigned Officer took this report at Scottsdale Police Department.
3. Present at scene when Assigned Officer arrived was/were suspect, victim, officers, etc..
4. The assault was reported to have taken place area.
5. At the time of the incident victim and suspect/s # _____
 6. were married.
 7. were separated and in the process of getting a divorce.
 8. were divorced.
 9. were neighbors.
 10. were strangers.
 11. were acquaintances.
 12. were landlord and tenant/s.
13. Person reporting states the motive stemmed from _____.
14. Person reporting states the apparent motive was sexual.
15. Person reporting states there was no apparent motive.
16. Person reporting states this type of incident has previously happened once, twice, three times.
17. Person reporting stated prior incident/s reported to Scottsdale Police Department approximate date/s.
18. Person reporting did not report prior incident/s to police.
19. At the time of this incident, it appeared to person that person was under the influence of drugs/alcohol.
20. Suspect/s # _____ left scene method before Assigned Officer arrived.
21. Person reporting doesn't know name but can identify suspect/s # _____.
22. Assigned Officer recited the Miranda warnings to suspect/s # _____.
23. Assigned Officer saw no visible marks on victim.
24. Assigned Officer observed type marks on victim's body area.
25. The marks do not appear photographable.
26. Person photographed marks on victim (on file I.D. Section).
27. Person took victim to Scottsdale Memorial Hospital.
28. Victim was examined by Doctor _____.
29. Xray examination revealed no broken bones.
30. Assigned Officer impounded property for evidence, refer Impound Sheet.
31. Victim will sign complaint.
32. Victim will not sign complaint.

47.9
Rev. 2/73
A-09 (Reference Code)

POLICE DEPARTMENT
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA

INCIDENT NARRATIVE
LOST PROPERTY

1. Assigned Officer was dispatched by radio to location of occurrence, on date reported at time dispatched hours.
2. At stated date and time Undersigned Officer took this report at Scottsdale Police Department.
3. Person reporting last saw listed property area.
4. Victim first noticed loss in City of Scottsdale, however exact location is unknown, possibly lost in _____.
5. Person was in company of victim when property was lost.
6. Person was in immediate area of victim when property was lost.
7. Victim searched area with negative results before contacting Scottsdale Police Department.
8. Victim will contact Scottsdale Police Department with a more complete description of missing property.
9. Victim is not certain whether listed property was lost or removed by person/s unknown.

47.10
Rev. 2/73
A-10 (Reference Code)

POLICE DEPARTMENT
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA

INCIDENT NARRATIVE
DEATH

1. Assigned Officer was dispatched by radio to location of occurrence, on date reported at time dispatched hours.
2. Present at scene when Assigned Officer arrived was/were suspect, victim, officers, etc.
3. Person observed victim collapse while working, etc.
4. Person administered emergency treatment but failed to revive victim.
5. Person contacted firm name ambulance which removed victim to name of hospital.
6. Victim was declared dead at location by Dr. name.
7. Victim was tentatively identified from papers found on body.
8. Named person (#12 on Death Report) viewed body at location.
9. Named person (#12 on Death Report) identified victim at approximately time and date.
10. Doctor name, victim's personal physician, was notified but refused to sign death certificate.
11. Person stated victim had a history of disease.
12. Name & Title, Coroner, Judge requested an autopsy.
13. Assigned Officer placed an identification tag on the body at address.
14. Clothing was left on victim when body was removed to mortuary.
15. Victim's personal belongings were impounded by Scottsdale Police Department for future disposition, see Property Invoice this D.R. number.
16. Firm removed body to Maricopa County Post Mortem Laboratory.
17. For any further information regarding deceased, police personnel may contact person, phone, address.

47.11
Rev. 2/73
A-11 (Reference Code)

POLICE DEPARTMENT
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA

INCIDENT NARRATIVE
THEFT - FROM COIN
BOX

1. Assigned Officer was dispatched by radio to location of occurrence, on date reported at time dispatched hours.
2. At stated date and time Undersigned Officer took this report at Scottsdale Police Department.
3. Present at scene when Assigned Officer arrived was/were suspect, victim, officers, etc.
4. Between listed times suspect/s removed listed property from
 5. a cigarette machine.
 6. a laundromat machine.
 7. a coin changer.
 8. a newspaper vending machine.
 9. a _____ machine.
10. The machine was located area.
11. Suspect/s used listed instrument to force open machine.
12. Assigned Officer found no signs of forced opening.
13. Estimated damage to machine is \$ _____.
14. Person will contact Scottsdale Police Department and report exact amount stolen.
15. Person reporting has no suspects in mind.
16. Suspect/s used listed vehicle to _____.
17. Assigned Officer was unable to find identifiable latent prints.
18. Assigned Officer impounded item/s for evidence; refer Impound Sheet this D.R.
19. Victim will sign complaint.
20. Victim will not sign complaint.

POLICE DEPARTMENT

SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA

WORTHLESS
DOCUMENT
REPORT

9.5
Rev 11-72

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|---------------------------|----------|------------------------------|----------------|------------|--|
| Date & Time Reported | | Date & Time of Occurrence | | | N.C.I.C. No. | | TWX No. | | DR. No. | |
| Location of Occurrence | | | | | Type of Premises | | | | RD No. | |
| Victim's Name [Firm Name if Business] | | | | Residence Address [Business Address if Firm] | | | | | Phone | |
| Victim's Occupation | | Sex | Age | Race | Business or Other Address | | | | Phone | |
| Reported By | | | | Residence Address | | | | | Res. Phone | |
| Type of Property Obtained <input type="checkbox"/> Cash <input type="checkbox"/> Merchandise <input type="checkbox"/> Services | | | Type of Document or Check | | | | Method Used in Writing | | | |
| Reason not Honored | | | Name of Bank | | | Bank No. | | City or Branch | | |
| Date | | Check No. | | Numerical Amount on Check | | | Written Amount on Check | | | |
| Pay to the Order of | | | | Investigative Person Responding | | | Person Reporting [Signature] | | | |

I certify to the following, to-wit:
(Initial)

_____ This check was received in exchange for cash merchandise services at the time the check was cashed.

_____ This check was not post-dated or a "Hold" check, and passer did not advise me that he did not have sufficient funds in the bank at the time the check was cashed.

_____ I have not accepted any payments, nor will I accept any payment on this check after a complaint has been filed.

_____ I have not started any civil action, and agree to appear in a Court of Law as a witness in regards to this check.

_____ Once a Complaint has been filed, I agree to prosecute until a determination has been made by a Court.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 19__.

Officer _____ Complainant _____

Other Details Relating to Crime

Vehicle Used by Suspect(s): Year Make Body Type Color(s) License No. Identifying Characteristics

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--------------------|--|--|--|--------------------|--|
| Identification Used to Pass Check | | | Firm Name on Check | | | | Signature of Maker | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--------------------|--|--|--|--------------------|--|

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------------------|--|------------|--|
| Witness - Person Who Accepted Check or Order | | | | Could Identify Suspect | | Residence Address | | Res. Phone | |
| 1. _____ | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO | | _____ | | _____ | |
| 2. _____ | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO | | _____ | | _____ | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|--|---------|--------|--------|--------|------|------|--------|----------|
| SEARCHED | Sex | Descent | d.o.b. | Height | Weight | Hair | Eyes | Compl. | Clothing |
| | Name and Address, Identifying Characteristics [If Arrested Include ID No. and Charges] | | | | | | | | |

47.13
New 4/73
A-13 (Reference Code)

POLICE DEPARTMENT
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA

INDICTMENT/COMPLAINT
SUMMARY

1. The following is a summary for an attempt to obtain a complaint, reference: charge # count/s.
2. The following is a summary for an attempt to obtain an indictment, reference: charge # count/s.
3. Count/s charge
4. Defendant/s: name/s
5. Date of Offense: date
6. Time: time
7. Location of Offense: address, City of Scottsdale, County of Maricopa, State of Arizona
8. Victim/s: name, address, phone
9. Witness/es: name, address, phone
10. Investigator/s assigned to case: name, department
11. Supplements will be completed by same investigator/s.
12. Above victim/s and witness/es contacted by Scottsdale Police Officers, name/s.
13. All victim/s and witness/es are permanent residents of the State of Arizona.
14. Not all victim/s and witness/es are permanent residents of the State of Arizona.
15. Statements available from all victim/s and witness/es.
16. No statement available from witness, victim/s name.
17. Defendant admitted offense in writing to name, title, location.
18. Defendant admitted offense verbally to name, title, location.
19. No foreseeable problem reference admissions made by Defendant.
20. Priors on Defendant known to date: priors.
21. Defendant/s in custody.
22. Defendant/s not in custody.
23. There are no foreseeable problems reference chain of evidence, search or seizure in this case.
24. Identification of Defendant obtained by photo lineup.
25. Identification of Defendant obtained by visual observation.
26. Defendant known to victim.
27. Description of evidence available: fingerprints, photos, etc.
28. Evidence in custody of Scottsdale Police Department.
29. Attachments:
 30. D.R.
 31. Arrest Sheet
 32. Mug shot
 33. Rap sheet
 34. Lab report
 35. Search warrant
 36. other
37. Complaining witness: name
38. The following is the summary of the investigation for charge.

END