

Los Santos Police Department G.H.O.S.T. Unit

Operations Lieutenant:N/A

Investigations Lieutenant:

206 C. Sherwood

Introduction

This is our Standard Operating Guidelines (SOG) for the G.H.O.S.T. Unit. Please see the below items contained within this SOP.

- Discipline Structure
- Information & Policies
- Vehicle Structure
- Uniform Structure

Notice:

During an unofficial patrol a **STRIKE** may be issued to an investigator for breaking the rules stated in this SOG.

Discipline Structure

The discipline structure is used as a guide for properly punishing Investigators for issues that happen on or off duty relating to Investigations.

- 1st Warning
- 2nd Warning
- 1st Strike
- 3rd Warning
- 2nd Strike
- 3rd Strike

Note: this is subject to change case by case. This is just a guide for the command team.

Investigations Information & Policies

1.1 - As an investigator you will be expected to have a good understanding of the constitution, laws, and case laws of San Andreas(Penal Code:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Dm2ZjZEu8e4A7drjso7H0_ktfz7B1155gPvLSxII EfA/edit?usp=sharing, Constitution:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/15Inqk-LW5Bqhqu4YOm6JBznWA8vN1A6gwILKZ6u0MLA/edit)

- **1.2** While on patrol you will be required to use a GHOSTED vehicle with no lightbar.
 - **1.3** While patrolling you shall act as a normal patrol unit (making traffic stops, responding to calls for service, and patrolling around Los Santos).

Investigation Procedure

- **2.1** Once you arrive on a scene you will need to gather any information possible. That means questioning witnesses, questioning initiating officers, or analyzing the crime scene.
- **2.2** Start to gather facts of the case, this means checking any cameras in the area, any items involved in the scene and start to create a timeline of events that may have or did occur
 - **2.3** Take pictures of all of the pieces of evidence as they were found, take as many pictures as possible as you may only get one chance to visit the crime scene.
- **2.4** After pictures are taken then collect all of the physical evidence while analyzing stain patterns of liquids such as blood so you can try and re-create the scene in your head.
- **2.5** Do one more run through of the evidence to make sure you have it all, mark down evidence placed in bags, and collect any other evidence possible.
 - **2.6** You may clear the scene and start to gather any possible leads.

Uniforms

Your patrol uniform must have an identifying badge on it, a gun holster (hip or drop-down), and a patrol belt. Vests are optional, if using one it must say POLICE on it.

Male:

G.H.O.S.T. TAC Uniform



MP Ped Customisation: Masks: 52 Texture 11 Upper Body: 31

Lower Body: 31 Texture 3 Bags & Parachutes: 74

Shoes: 24

Scarffs & Chains: 111

Shirt & Accessories: 43 or 40 Body Armor & Accessories

2: 59

Badges & Logos: 0

Shirt overlay & Jackets: 220

Texture 5

Hats & Helmets: No Prop or

Any hat

Glasses: No Prop

Female:

G.H.O.S.T. TAC Uniform



MP Ped Customisation: Masks: 52 Texture 11 Upper Body: 44

Lower Body: 30 Texture 3 Bags & Parachutes: 74

Shoes: 24

Scarffs & Chains: 82

Shirt & Accessories: 28 or 30 Body Armor & Accessories

2: 7 Texture 5
Badges & Logos: 0

Shirt overlay & Jackets: 230

Texture 5

Hats & Helmets: No Prop or

Any hat

Glasses: No Prop

Vehicle and Person Inventory

Vehicle:

- 1 Remington 870 Pump Shotgun (Pump Shotgun)
- 1 Colt M4 Carbine (Carbine Rifle)
- 1 FingerPrint Kit
- 4K Photo Camera
- 20 Evidence Markers
- 20 Evidence Bags
- 1 Traffic Vest
- 1 First Aid Kit

Person:

- 1 Glock-19 (Combat Pistol) or 1 USP .40 S&W (Pistol)
- 2 Extra Pistol Magazines (3 Total)
- 1 Taser
- 3 Total Taser Cartridges (6 shots)
- 1 Tourniquet
- 2 Sets of Handcuffs
- 1 Can Pepper Spray/Mace
- 1 Baton/Billy Club

- 3 Pop up traffic cones
- 1 Police Computer
- 1 Speed Radar

- 1 Portable Radio
- 1 Flashlight
- 1 Car Key Fob

Important Case Laws

Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966)

On June 13th of 1966, the U.S. Supreme Court case docket number 759 was ruled on. Miranda v. Arizona clarified when and where the Miranda warnings must be read and what the warnings must entail.

This court case ruled that law enforcement officers must read off the Miranda warnings to any given person while being asked questions by officers that may be used in the court of law. This means that they do not have to be arrested or even detained for the warnings to be read. It also clarifies that the warnings must explicitly be read while in a police interrogation and officers must be able to prove that the suspect was warned of their warnings and were aware of what was being read. This means the person must be coherent and cannot be extremely intoxicated, under the influence of drugs to the point of disassociation and they cannot be unconscious. The miranda warnings must address the following:

- Anything said can and will be used in a court of law
- · The right to remain silent/stop answering questions
- · The right to have a lawyer present during questioning

There are several versions of the Miranda warnings but as long as they address the three points listed above, they are valid and legal binding Miranda warnings. Miranda warnings do not have to be read to any person who is making a formal complaint or statement to the department as their statement is a legally binding document that addresses the same points. The Miranda Warnings are more geared towards any person who may face legal consequences based on their answers.

In summary: Officers are legally required to read the Miranda warnings to any person who is being questioned in which the answers to the questions will be used in the court of law.

Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1 (1968)

On June 10th of 1968, the U.S. Supreme Court case docket number 67 was ruled on. Terry v. Ohio clarified the legality of officers patting down any person suspected of illegally carrying a weapon of any sort.

Rawlings v. Kentucky - 448 U.S. 98, 100 S. Ct. 2556 (1980)

On March 26th of 1980, the U.S. Supreme Court case docket number 79-5146 was ruled on. Rawlings v. Kentucky clarified the extent of evidence and action needed to be taken before searching a suspect.

Payton v. New York, 445 U.S. 573 (1980)

On April 15th of 1980, the U.S. Supreme Court case docket number 78-5420 was ruled on. Payton v. New York clarified when a search warrant is needed in regards to an arrest warrant.

Michigan v. Summers, 452 U.S. 692 (1981)

On June 22nd of 1981, the U.S. Supreme Court case docket number 79-1794 was ruled on. Michigan v. Summers clarified detaining people while serving a warrant.

Arizona v. Johnson, 555 U.S. 323 (2009)

On January 26th of 2009, the U.S. Supreme Court case docket number 07-1122 was ruled on. Arizona v. Johnson clarified when an officer can search the passenger side of a vehicle on a traffic stop.

Violating these rules will result in disciplinary action-Rules/procedures must be followed in order to remain on the G.H.O.S.T. team.

Investigators should receive continuous training so that the rules and procedures provided herein this SOG can be fresh for all Units.

If you have any questions about the SOP please see the command team.