

# **Bond Case Briefs**

*Municipal Finance Law Since 1971*

---

## **LAW ENFORCEMENT - CALIFORNIA**

### **Quezada v. City of Los Angeles**

**Court of Appeal, Second District, Division 1, California - January 8, 2014 - Cal.Rptr.3d - 2014 WL 60330**

Police officers brought action against city and police chief for civil rights violations under the Bane Act and violations of the Public Safety Officers Bill of Rights Act (POBRA) based upon their treatment during a departmental investigation into the discharge of one of the officer's weapons while the three officers were off duty and had been drinking at a bar near the police station.

The Superior Court granted summary judgment for city and chief, and officers appealed.

The Court of Appeal held that:

- Officers did not have any right under POBRA to postpone interrogation in light of the seriousness of the investigation;
- Interrogation did not violate POBRA provision allowing interrogated officers to attend to personal physical necessities;
- City did not violate POBRA when it forced officers to provide multiple public safety statements;
- Failure to wait until chosen attorney was available did not violate officers' representation rights under POBRA;
- Search of off-duty officers' personal vehicles did not violate officer's Fourth Amendment rights;
- Department did not violate Tom Bane Civil Rights Act; and
- POBRA did not prevent police captain from reassigning officer while investigation was pending.