June 11, 2020

To: Rob Low, Fox31

From: Kelli Christensen, Director of Communications

RE: Claims by Ms. Brittany Iriart

Below please find Public Safety’s response to claims made by Ms. Brittany Iriart. Please know it is outside our process to release detailed information before an investigation is conducted, we feel it is necessary in this case to correct the misinformation being shared by Ms. Iriart with members of the media.

**TIMELINE OF EVENTS:**

June 3, 2020: Fox 31 story airs story about Deputy Gentempo

June 9, 2020: A complaint was sent to PID leadership from a separate department alleging conduct unbecoming of a public safety employee. The complaint included snapshots of Ms. Iriart’s social media posts which include links to a video and excerpts from an investigation she conducted on behalf of the PID.

Ms. Iriart sent emails that appear inappropriate to her manager and text messages to members of the Conduct Review Unit.

Ms. Iriart is alleged to have made verbal threats to her manager including statements that “she was just getting started” and “I’m more dangerous as a former employee than a current one” and is alleged to have promised retribution against a staff member in the Public Safety department.

June 10, 2020: Based on the complaint and potential violation of the confidentiality agreement, along with her alleged threats, she was put on leave on Tuesday morning.

June 11, 2020: Ms. Iriart told a Denver Post reporter she was the source for the Fox31 story about Deputy Gentempo. Public Safety leadership did not know she was the source prior to reading the article this morning, nor had the department opened an investigation into the matter.

**STATEMENT FROM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MURPHY ROBINSON:**

I appreciate thoughtful discussion and feedback from all Public Safety staff however we have a process in place to address matters of concern. Ms. Iriart could have come directly to me or anyone in my office with her concerns, however, I have yet to meet her.

Sharing confidential information learned during an investigation in any manner, including via social media, is not only inappropriate, but against the confidentiality agreement she signed in the scope of her position.

To be clear, Ms. Iriart’s role as an investigator is one of fact-finding only. An investigator is to remain neutral during the course of an investigation and does not offer any discipline recommendations, nor is the investigator involved in any subsequent meetings, including the employee hearing, where discipline is discussed and reviewed.

Instead of using the process available to her to voice concerns, Ms. Iriart decided to violate the confidentiality agreement and post information on social media. Upon receipt of a complaint, an investigation was opened to review her alleged misconduct.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

* Investigatory leave letter to Brittany Iriart
* Confidentiality agreement signed by Brittany Iriart
* Social media posts

**OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC INTEGRITY DIVISION (PID):**

The Public Integrity Unit is comprised of two Units; the Administrative Investigations Unit (AIU) and the Conduct Review Unit (CRU). AIU is responsible for investigating allegations of misconduct by sworn members of the Denver Sheriff Department. Its role is to identify the facts of the case and detail them in a neutral, unbiased manner. AIU investigators do not provide an opinion on potential rule violations. That role falls to the CRU, which is responsible for reviewing the facts detailed by the investigator and identifying potential rule violations.

A Contemplation of Discipline (COD) meeting affords the subject deputy (and his representative or legal counsel) an opportunity to present additional information to correct facts in the investigation or mitigate any potential discipline under consideration.  The Sheriff, a member of DSD command staff, a member of the Office of the Executive Director of Safety, a City Attorney, and a member of the Office of the Independent Monitor attend the Contemplation of Discipline meeting. After hearing and considering additional information from the subject deputy, those individuals discuss their views on whether a rule violation has been proven and if so, what discipline is appropriate. The Sheriff considers their input, and the draft case analysis provided by the CRU, and then decides what discipline recommendation to advance to the Executive Director’s Office in the form of a final Review and Findings. The Office of the

Executive Director of Safety reviews the entire case, considers the recommendations of the Sheriff and the Office of the Independent Monitor, and then issues a final discipline determination based on the evidence presented.