

**PINELLAS COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BUREAU
INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM**

DATE: APRIL 19, 2023

TO: DISTRIBUTION

FROM: CAPTAIN DEANNA CAREY *DC*
Professional Standards Bureau

SUBJECT: SHERIFF'S FINDING

Per Sheriff Gualtieri, Deputy Chinedu Ulasi, #58836, will receive the following as a result of AI-22-037:

1. Forty (40) hour Suspension to be served on:

May 2, 2023 (11.5 hours), May 5, 2023 (11.5 hours), May 6, 2023 (11.5 hours) and May 7, 2023 (5.5 hours).

DISTRIBUTION:

Sheriff Bob Gualtieri
Chief Deputy Paul Halle
Assistant Chief Deputy Dave Danzig
Assistant Chief Deputy Dennis Komar
Colonel Paul Carey
Major Adrian Arnold
Major Dennis Garvey
Major Joe Gerretz
Major Nick Lazaris
Major Jennifer Love
Director Jennifer Crockett
Director Susan Krause
Director Tom Lancto
Director Jason Malpass
Director Michelle Posewitz
Shannon Lockheart, General Counsel
Payroll
Purchasing-Uniform Supply
Deputy Chinedu Ulasi

DC/blb

**PINELLAS COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM**

DATE: APRIL 17, 2023
TO: DEPUTY CHINEDU ULASI #58836
FROM: SHERIFF BOB GUALTIERI
SUBJECT: CHARGES RE: AI-22-037

An investigation has been conducted by the Administrative Investigation Division, Professional Standards Bureau, of the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office. As a result of this investigation, the Administrative Review Board has determined you committed the following violation:

On, but not limited to, December 4, 2022, while on duty in Pinellas County, Florida, you violated the Pinellas County Sheriff's Civil Service Act Laws of Florida, 89-404 as amended by Laws of Florida 08-285, Section 6, Subsection 4, by violating the provisions of law or the rules, regulations, and operating procedures of the Office of the Sheriff.

1. You violated Pinellas County Sheriff's Office General Order 3-1.1, Rule and Regulation 5.4, Duties and Responsibilities.

Synopsis: On December 4, 2022, while on duty at the Pinellas County Jail, you were assigned to a post within housing unit 2H3. At approximately 1927 hours, you and three other members began zone inspections within 2H4, a single-cell housing unit that consists of inmates on suicide risk, close and/or medical observation, and contact isolation.

Prior to entering cell 2H4-A4, the inmate was ordered to sit on his bunk so an inspection of his cell could be conducted. The inmate complied with the order and sat on his bunk with both of his feet on the floor. When you entered, you immediately walked to the area where the inmate was seated and attempted to sweep the floor. At least one member verbally told the inmate to lift his feet so the floor could be swept, but the inmate did not immediately respond. While sweeping, you brushed over the inmate's left foot with the broom several times, which resulted in the inmate pushing the broom away with his foot. Although in your report you stated the inmate "aggressively kicked the push broom," at the time you did not react nor verbally notify the other members within the cell of the action. Your statement that the inmate aggressively kicked the broom was inaccurate. Another member, who saw the inmate push the broom, reacted and directed the inmate to lie prone on the bunk with his hands behind his back; however, this member did not see you sweep over the inmate's foot, which provoked the action. When the other member went to take control of the inmate's arm to handcuff him, the inmate displayed active resistance and a use of force ensued.

During the use of force, you were not working in concert with the other two deputies and were not following the orders of the corporal, which were to move the inmate to the floor. Because you were working against the other members, the use of force was prolonged, but eventually the inmate was secured in handcuffs. The lieutenant responded and approved the inmate's placement in the Pro-Strait Safety Chair so he could deescalate.

During the Pro-Strait Safety Chair placement, you took a position at the rear of the chair at the inmate's head. While two members were securing the inmate into the chair with the restraint straps from the sides, you attempted to reposition the inmate's body by maneuvering his head. Although the member in this position may use control techniques to keep the inmate from spitting or biting members, the inmate was not actively trying to do any of these actions, and members are not trained to manipulate the head to reposition an inmate in the Pro-Strait Safety Chair. You were also seen placing your hands around the jawline and mouth area of the inmate, which is also not an acceptable control technique.

When writing your supplement report, you inaccurately described the inmate's action towards the broom with his foot in the cell and omitted manipulating the inmate's head while in the Pro-Strait Safety Chair. You did not watch the video that was available to you, which would have assisted in accurately completing your report.

During your Administrative Interview, you testified you were unaware the broom brushed over the inmate's foot. However, admitted you "just didn't react" to the inmate pushing the broom back with his foot even though you claimed to be unaware of what prompted that reaction.


When questioned about what occurred in the Pro-Strait Safety Chair you stated, "I wasn't supposed to move his head. It was a mistake." You testified you did not document moving the inmate's head because "I didn't recall doing it. The whole intense situation, you know, adrenaline, I just didn't remember any of those things happened." You stated no other members requested you assist in repositioning the inmate and did so on your own accord. You acknowledged you have received additional training in Pro-Strait Safety Chair placements and other situations through the two-week Corrections Response Team Academy you attended; however, this training was not applied in this incident.

During the Administrative Review Board, you testified having your hands on the inmate's jawline was an "honest oversight" and that "tunnel vision" may have contributed to what occurred.

Disciplinary Points and Recommended Discipline Range:

You were found to be in violation of one (1) Level Five Rules and Regulations violation totaling fifty (50) points. These points, which were affected by no modified points from previous discipline, resulted in fifty (50) progressive discipline points. At this point level, the recommended discipline range is from forty (40) hours Suspension to Termination.

Disciplinary action shall be consistent with progressive discipline, for cause in accordance with the provisions of the Pinellas County Civil Service Act.



COLONEL PAUL CAREY
DEPARTMENT OF DETENTION AND CORRECTIONS
FOR BOB GUALTIERI, SHERIFF

I have received a copy:

Date 04/19/2023

Time 0650



SIGNATURE

BG:DC