



LEXINGTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
**PERSONNEL ORDER**  
Lexington, Kentucky

DATE OF ISSUE  
June 25, 2024

EFFECTIVE DATE  
June 24, 2024

NUMBER  
PO:24-238

TO:  
RESIGNATION

AMENDS:

INDEX AS:  
OFFICER  
RONALD SIMS / 58533

RESCINDS:

This is to advise on the resignation of Officer Ronald Sims, to be effective June 24, 2024.

*Lawrence B. Weathers*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lawrence B. Weathers  
Chief of Police

LBW/rmh



Lexington-Fayette Urban County  
Division of Police  
**MEMORANDUM**  
Lexington, Kentucky

DATE OF ISSUE  
May 14, 2024

EFFECTIVE DATE

NUMBER  
COP:  
24-0160

TO:  
Commander Jacqueline Newman  
Public Integrity Unit

SUBJECT:  
Disciplinary Review Board -  
Formal Complaint PIU.F.2024-005  
Officer Ronald Sims / 58533

FROM:  
Lawrence B. Weathers  
Chief of Police

I met with Officer Ronald Sims on May 9, 2024, in regards to a formal complaint. Officer Sims refused the recommended discipline and requested to go before the Disciplinary Review Board.

Please convene the Disciplinary Review Board.

Lawrence B. Weathers  
Chief of Police

LBW/rmh

Attachment

**LEXINGTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
FORMAL COMPLAINT FORM  
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

FORM 111 (2/24)

File #: PIU2024F-005

Employee Involved: Sims, Ronald			Employee #: 58533	Hire Date: 01/20/2020
Present Assignment: Patrol East Sector 2nd Shift				
Complainant: Lieutenant Dillan Taylor			Complainant Address: 150 East Main Street	
Complainant Phone #: (859) 258-3600	Alternate Complainant Phone #: N/A	Complainant Email: N/A		
Date of Incident: Various	Time of Incident: Various	Location of Incident: Various	Date and Time Reported: 3/6/2024	How Reported: <input type="checkbox"/> Letter <input type="checkbox"/> Phone <input type="checkbox"/> Person <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email

**DESCRIPTION OF ALLEGATIONS:**

In late January 2024, East Sector supervisors developed concerns involving Officer Ronald Sims, noting he was placing other officers in undo danger due to him leaving sector often during his shift to go to his residence for long period of times without supervisor approval, not backing officers on calls, taking an undue amount of time to respond to calls and taking extended lengths of time to complete reports.

Officer Ronald Sims did not adhere to and violated department policies and trainings specifically related to GO 2015-15C Body-Worn Cameras and SOP BOP 1991-02H Patrol Operational Order amongst others.

If the above allegation is true, Officer Sims has violated General Order 1973-02K Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 Misconduct.

I swear/affirm that the facts set out in the allegations herein are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Complainant Signature: *[Signature]* Date: 3/7/24  
 Subscribed and sworn before me this date: 3/7/24 *[Signature]* KYNP7428  
 (Date) (Notary)  
 My Commission Expires: 5/14/24

Witness:  
Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Recorded By: Bureau of Investigation, Public Integrity Unit

File #: PIU2024F-005

Employee: Sims, Ronald

**CHIEF OF POLICE**

[Finding: PC=Proper Conduct, IC=Improper Conduct, IE=Insufficient Evidence, PF=Policy Failure, UC=Unfounded Complaint]  
Finding Policy Violation

IC	General Order 1973-02K Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 Misconduct.

Chief of Police Determination:  Case Be Closed  Corrective Training  Recommend Disciplinary Action (see below)

Materials Reviewed:

Revised Red Book - Formal Summary

Comments:

Recommendation: Termination

Signature:

*Jawana B. Weather*

Date: 5/10/2024

**DISCIPLINARY REVIEW BOARD**

Finding Policy Violation


Disciplinary Review Board Recommendation:  Case Be Closed  Corrective Training  Disciplinary Action (see below)

Comments:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**CHIEF OF POLICE FINAL DETERMINATION**

Case Be Closed  Corrective Training  Recommend Disciplinary Action (see below)

Comments:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

File #: PIU2024F-005

Employee: Sims, Ronald

**ALLEGATIONS CONTINUED:**

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin black border, occupying most of the page. It is intended for the continuation of allegations. On the left side of the page, there are three black circular punch holes.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY



LEXINGTON POLICE  
DEPARTMENT  
**MEMORANDUM**  
Lexington, Kentucky

DATE OF ISSUE  
April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2024

EFFECTIVE DATE

NUMBER  
PIU 24-056

<b>TO:</b> Commander Jacqueline Newman Bureau of Investigation Public Integrity Unit	<b>SUBJECT:</b> Formal PIU.F. 2024-005 Officer Ronald Sims 58533 Summary
<b>FROM:</b> Lieutenant Jeff Jackson Bureau of Investigation Public Integrity Unit	

This memorandum will provide a synopsis of the investigation; however, other supporting documents may be viewed in conjunction with this memorandum.

**Allegations:**

On March 7<sup>th</sup>, 2024, Lieutenant Dillan Taylor signed a formal complaint that alleged the following:

*In late January 2024, East Sector supervisors developed concerns involving Officer Ronald Sims, noting he was placing other officers in undo danger due to him leaving sector often during his shift to go to his residence for long periods of time without supervisor approval, not backing officers on calls, taking an undue amount of time to respond to calls and taking extended lengths of time to complete reports.*

*Officer Ronald Sims did not adhere to and violated department policies and trainings specifically related to GO 2015-15C Body-Worn Cameras and SOP BOP 1991-02H Patrol Operational Order amongst others.*

If the above allegation is true, Officer Sims has violated General Order 1973-02K Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 Misconduct.

**Investigation**

The PIU investigation began by reviewing information provided by East Sector 2<sup>nd</sup> shift supervisors. Beginning in January of this year, Sergeants McCullough, Strong and Evely in conjunction with their supervisor, Lieutenant Dillan Taylor, researched and compiled data in order to discern a pattern of policy violations and possible misconduct by Officer Sims. This included Excel spreadsheets and memorandums summarizing their research which are available for review.

While reviewing the research conducted, it is apparent that Officer Sims had deactivated his department issued body worn camera for longer than an hour in 19 different instances while on duty since August of 2023. In the research conducted by Officer Sim's supervision, that is the farthest time period they researched. Proof was also provided in one instance that he had

deactivated his BWC for over 2 hours on January 30<sup>th</sup>, 2024. There are two additional instances where he deactivated his BWC for over 3 hours on December 6<sup>th</sup>, 2023 and on January 31<sup>st</sup>, 2024.

PIU requested that the Technical Services Unit review the MDC data for the computer assigned to Officer Sims to see if there was any correlation between when his BWC was powered off and when he was going to his residence. In two instances reviewed, the January 30<sup>th</sup> and January 31<sup>st</sup> time periods where his BWC powered down for over two and three hours, his MDC was shown to be connecting to the wireless server at his home address, indicating in both instances that he was at his residence during those times.

To confirm that the issued BWCs were experiencing no technical issues that could have led to an accidental or involuntary deactivation, PIU contacted the department's civilian BWC coordinator. The coordinator confirmed that there were no BWC malfunctions reported or apparent for the BWCs assigned to Officer Sims. The coordinator also provided documentation proving that when Officer Sim's body worn camera was powered down in those three instances, his other assigned BWC was docked and not in use. PIU further confirmed that Officer Sims was on duty in all instances where his BWC was deactivated. This was done by reviewing archived East Sector rosters.

Upon review of the provided spreadsheets noting times when Officer Sims' BWC was deactivated on duty, PIU located one call in particular where he responded to a call for service on January 1<sup>st</sup> of this year for an alarm at 8720 Hickory Hill (CR# 2024-018077). Officer Sims BWC was completely powered off prior to dispatch, and left off for the entirety of the call. The other responding officer documented the entire call on their BWC, which plainly shows Officer Sims on scene as well. There is no documented notification to a supervisor that he failed to capture the call on his BWC.

In further research of these specific instances involving BWC deactivation, PIU also reviewed 6 Body Worn Camera Error Reports that resulted from East Sector supervisors' research. A noteworthy error report was completed after Officer Sims' failed to activate his BWC while on a motorist assist on New Circle Road at Alumni on January 18<sup>th</sup> of this year at 1805 (CR# 2024-010541). In his summary Officer Sims stated that "upon arrival I got behind a vehicle that was safely off the roadway on the shoulder. I remained there for a few minutes, however due to the high call volume I left the vehicle. I did not at any time make contact with a member of the public." There was a person in that vehicle who Officer Sims did not make contact with and left on the side of the road. Sergeant Strong conducted research and made contact with the occupant of that vehicle via phone, who stated that they thought it was strange that an officer arrived, never made contact, and then left. This call was marked Code 3 (Assistance Given) at 1830, although no assistance was given, nor contact made.

Also of note in reference to the allegation of taking undo time to arrive at calls was a call for service Officer Sims was dispatched to on August 17<sup>th</sup> of 2023 (CR# 2023-158293). Officer Sims was dispatched to I-75 at the 98 mile marker for a collision. It took Officer Sims 1 hour and 7 minutes to arrive at the location of the call for service, at which point the involved vehicle could not be located and was cleared Code 13 (Gone on Arrival). The time from dispatch to clearing the call was 1841-2049.

In reference to the allegation that Officer Sims had been taking undue time to clear calls, or holding calls for service, PIU located an incident for a missing person on January 12<sup>th</sup> of this year at 1228 Venetian Court. This call for service shows the primary officer arriving at 1727 and clearing the call at 1835 with a Code 17 (Report Completed), a 1 hour and 12 minute time period. Conversely, Officer Sims arrived at 1735 and cleared with a Code 3 (Assistance Given) at 1907, a 2 hour and 28 minute time period.

PIU then reviewed the memorandums that had been submitted from the supervisors and Officer Sims. Officer Sims was asked to address numerous issues and explain the discrepancies that had been found. The first issue raised was the allegation that he had been deactivating his BWC for significant periods of time while on duty. Officer Sims' response to this was that "I believe that I have always kept my BWC in 'buffering mode' unless I am in a location where I am not likely to have official contact, and where I have a reasonable expectation of privacy." Officer Sims also made reference in that same paragraph that "I have also turned off my BWC inside of my personal residence. I have occasionally stopped by my home to retrieve food during my shift. My home is located across Nicholasville Road, about one mile west of East Sector."

This indicates that he did power off his BWC while on duty when he did not believe he would have official contacts, and that he left his assigned beat and sector to go to his residence. Officer Sims also stated "If my BWC has exited 'buffering mode' in any other situation, I can assure you that it was completely accidental." This would indicate that he believed any other time his BWC was powered down was purely accidental. There are 22 instances found since August of 2023 of his BWC powered down for longer than an hour that would create concerns about accidental or intentional deactivations.

Officer Sims next addressed the allegation that he was not responding to calls or taking undue time to arrive at calls. He believed that this was in reference to the call for service at Redding Road for a collision that occurred on February 1<sup>st</sup> of this year (CR# 2024-018830). When originally dispatched he cleared the call Code 13 (Gone on Arrival), but was dispatched back once a supervisor located the collision on the FUSUS camera system. Once he returned to the scene, Officer Sims wrote that he "immediately responded to the parking lot and handled the collision without incident." Records indicate that he logged BWC footage for an approximate 17 minute interaction on scene, then proceeded to remain marked out on that call for an additional 3 hours and 26 minutes, far beyond a reasonable time for a non-injury collision. GPS data also indicated that the time spent after that 17 minute BWC footage was spent traveling to and remaining at his residence in West sector. Upon review of the provided 10-45 collision report, it was brief, containing the following narrative:

"Unit 1 stated he was driving on Redding Road away from Tates Creek when unit 2 pulled out in front of him causing a collision. Unit 1 did not report any injuries, and sustained minor damages to his vehicle.

Unit 2 stated she was stopped at the entrance to the gas station awaiting to pull out onto Redding Road, when unit 1 turned into the gas station and struck her vehicle. Unit 2 reported no injuries, and minor damages were sustained to the vehicle."

Officer Sims next addressed the allegation that he was leaving sector without permission and staying out of sector for long periods of time. His response to this was that "I admit that I have left East Sector without express permission from my command staff; however, I have only left East Sector to stop by my personal residence. Again, I live about one mile outside of East



Sector. I have periodically exited East Sector for my lunch break or Signal 5 to eat a quick meal at my residence. I have never stayed inside of my home for longer than thirty minutes, but I have, on rare occasions, finished a report in my driveway while awaiting my next call for service.”

This indicates that he has both left sector “periodically” without permission from a supervisor or notifying dispatch, and that he has sat at his residence waiting to be dispatched. It also indicates that he believes sitting in his driveway as opposed to inside his residence is permissible when out of sector without clearing it with a supervisor. Further, his statement of waiting for a call while finishing a report assumes that he would still be marked out on that report, meaning he would not be dispatched until providing a Code 17 (Report Made) to dispatch.

Officer Sims then addressed the allegation that he was holding calls for significant periods of time. He stated “I sometimes need additional time to finish an unusual or extensive report or book evidence from a crime scene. If I have held a call for a “significant” period of time, it was entirely related to the complexity of the situation.” There are calls for service which contradict this statement. Officer Sims was dispatched to a disorder on Medlock Road on January 24<sup>th</sup> of this year for a disorder (CR# 2024-013760). The BWC footage ended after 11 minutes and 3 seconds, but he remained marked out on the call for 3 hours and 18 minutes, from 2020-2322. The call was cleared Code 20 (Trouble Settled) with no further documentation.

The aforementioned collision at Redding that Officer Sims was dispatched to also seems to contradict this statement, as it was a brief report that he was marked out on for 3 hours and 43 minutes total. This is also of interest, as mentioned above, since Officer Sims went to his residence in West Sector without permission after leaving the scene from 2045 until at least 2245. There are additional calls for service that further contradict this, in particular a call for service for a robbery that occurred on January 3<sup>rd</sup> of this year at 3401 Gatewood Court. Officer Sims remained out on this call for 2 hours and 3 minutes, completing no paperwork indicating that he assisted in the investigation, which another officer’s recruit completed the report on. Officer Sims only gave Code 3 (Assistance Given) when clearing the call for his part.

The last allegation addressed, that Officer Sims was going to his residence for significant periods of time, he explained with “if I stop by my house for my lunch break or Signal 5, I am always back in my cruiser within thirty minutes. After my lunch break or Signal 5, I have, on rare occasion, completed a report in my driveway while awaiting my next call for service. I have never ignored a call for service, and I have never avoided my duties to the public.”

Once again, this indicates that Officer Sims has “on a rare occasion” sat out of sector at his residence waiting to be dispatched. One call of note in reference to this was a dispatched call for a collision that occurred on December 28<sup>th</sup> of 2023 at Nicholasville Road and Wilhite Drive. Officer Sims’ BWC was shown to be powering on while he was responding Signal 9 from the area of Rosemont Garden and Clay’s Mill Roads in West Sector. The log for that day shows Officer Sims’ BWC powering on at 2050, the same time he was dispatched to the collision. This shows that he was out of his assigned beat and sector without permission with his BWC powered off while on duty. The logs for this call for service also shows that Officer Sims had BWC footage for this incident lasting 5 minutes and 7 seconds, but he remained out on this call for 3 hours and 16 minutes (2052- 2336) before clearing the call Code 3

(Assistance Given). The officer on this call that took the report was marked out for 2 hours and 7 minutes (2052-2245).

In order to verify that Officer Sims had been trained on the Body Worn Camera general order, research was done on his training file. On September 15<sup>th</sup>, 2020 he scored a 100% passing grade on the test associated with that document. He scored 100% again on the test associated with the same general order on August 7, 2021. Officer Sims' training record also shows that he passed the test associated with the Patrol Operational Order with 100% on October 27<sup>th</sup>, 2020. He has therefore received training for both general orders and demonstrated proficiency and knowledge of the subject matter therein.

PIU's individual interviews with the supervisors involved in this investigation are outlined below.

### **Sergeant James McCullough Interview**

Sergeant McCullough was interviewed in the PIU offices on March 27<sup>th</sup>. He is the direct supervisor for Officer Sims and has been in that role since January of 2024. Sergeant McCullough advised that he was notified by Sergeant Andrew Strong about concerns brought to his attention the day prior by officers on the shift. Based on those concerns the supervisors began monitoring Officer Sims' activity using the Axon Respond feature. Sergeant McCullough described the Redding Road collision and Officer Sims' response, similar to the other supervisor's description, with Officer Sims responding to the dispatch from the Lane Allen and Harrodsburg Road area near his residence. Sergeant McCullough also described the approximately 3 hour time frame where he was marked out at his residence following the call. The call was held long enough that two officers assigned to beat 1 in East sector were required to respond to a call for service in beat 3 where Officer Sims was assigned that date. The other beat 3 officers were assigned to calls for service at that point, leaving no one available to take the call in beat 3. When asked, Sergeant McCullough clarified that it is not unusual for officers to cross beat boundaries for calls for service in their assigned sector, but it was significant that in this instance that it was required due to Officer Sims holding a minor non-injury collision call for service while at his residence.

Sergeant McCullough stated that he brought the concerns to the attention of Lieutenant Taylor the next day when he arrived for duty. The supervisors then continued monitoring Officer Sims' activity through radio traffic and Axon Respond. At this time supervisors became aware of Officer Sims asking the E-911 dispatcher for a Signal 5 (Meal Break) over the phone instead of on the radio as required by policy. Sergeant McCullough then described driving by Officer Sims' residence to determine how long he was going to stay at his residence. He further described seeing the taillights of Officer Sims' assigned patrol vehicle activate and seeing Officer Sims' leave to return to East Sector. Sergeant McCullough then stated that he missed a call from Officer Sims after he had gone off-shift. He stated that Sergeant Evely advised him the next duty shift of a call he had received from Officer Sims asking to clarify the call for service involving the collision on Redding Road he had been dispatched to.

Sergeant McCullough then addressed the missing body worn camera footage during calls for service Officer Sims was assigned to. Sergeant McCullough required failure to activate reports be completed for all instances from Officer Sims. Sergeant McCullough stated that he recalled

five total failure to activate reports being completed for instances where Officer Sims had citizen contact with no BWC footage present.

When asked if he recalled Officer Sims being status checked by dispatch on calls that seemed longer than usual, Sergeant McCullough advised that he could not recall any, but clarified that he had only been assigned to East sector since January and was still getting used to supervising there. When asked, Sergeant McCullough stated that he does not have confidence in Officer Sims as a patrol officer based on the information that has come to light. He believed that Officer Sims had demonstrated that he was not able to perform the minimum requirements of being in his beat, answering the radio, and taking calls. He further advised that if asked, he would have had no issue with Officer Sims taking meal breaks at his residence out of sector.

Sergeant McCullough also advised that during the meeting with Lieutenant Taylor and Officer Sims to discuss the deficiencies that had been observed, he provided Officer Sims in writing the five issues that Lt. Taylor wanted Officer Sims to address in a memorandum. Sergeant McCullough also did not believe that Officer Sims adequately covered the issues that he was asked to address, and felt that the memorandum provided seemed evasive in its explanations. He also questioned if it was authored by Officer Sims, as it seemed to be in a very different writing style than he was used to seeing on Officer Sims' reports. The interview was ended shortly after that.

### **Sergeant Scott Evely Interview**

Sergeant Evely was interviewed via phone from the PIU offices on March 27<sup>th</sup>. Sergeant Evely detailed the phone call he received from Officer Sims on the evening of February 2<sup>nd</sup>, beginning with Officer Sims speaking to him about the collision report he was dispatched to on Redding the evening prior. Without being able to give an exact quote of what Officer Sims said, Sergeant Evely stated that Sims told him he knew where the collision was located, but asked questions of the dispatcher in an attempt to get her to realize that the call for service was in beat 1 of East sector, not beat 3 where he was assigned that date. This led to the Code 13 (Gone on Arrival) that Sims gave on the radio before being dispatched back to that same collision shortly after.

Officer Sims asked Sergeant Evely if he was in trouble. Sergeant Evely responded that he was not aware of any trouble at that point. That evening at roll call the sergeants had already decided based on officer concerns to monitor Officer Sims, but Sergeant McCullough had taken the lead on that as Officer Sims was assigned to his squad. Officer Sims also confirmed to Sergeant Evely that a dispatcher had called his cell phone to advise him that supervisors were calling dispatch inquiring about his location. Officer Sims also made the statement to Sergeant Evely that he observed a marked police Tahoe drive by his home as he walked back out to his patrol vehicle, confirming later that it was Sergeant McCullough using his MDC.

Sergeant Evely stated when asked that he has a low level of confidence in Officer Sims as a patrol officer based on the information that had been gathered by supervisors. He also confirmed that if asked, he would have allowed Officer Sims or any other officer to take a meal break outside of their assigned sector.

### **Sergeant Andrew Strong Interview**

Sergeant Strong was interviewed in the PIU offices on March 12<sup>th</sup> 2024. He began by verifying that he was the supervisor whom the officers approached with their concerns about Officer Sims' behavior, specifically the amount of time spent holding calls for service, and the amount of time he was spending out of sector at his residence while on duty. Sergeant Strong first advised the concerned officers that he would give them an opportunity to address the issue themselves as peers. At the end of that same shift other officers came forward expressing their concerns as well, mentioning that they had observed his BWC GPS data showing him at his home at various times. He believed this was being viewed through the AXON Respond feature. They also advised Sergeant Strong that this behavior had been going on for over a year, and that they had already attempted to address it with him.

The next date, January 31<sup>st</sup>, Sergeant Strong recalled hearing Officer Sims call out with a motorist assist at Nichols Park and Man O' War in West sector (CR# 2024-018097), but believed it was close enough to the sector line with East sector that he didn't think it out of the ordinary to jump a call nearby. He then took note that same date where Officer Sims was dispatched to a call for service (CR# 2024-018101), with him giving his location as Man O' War and Harrodsburg, noting that the location was deep into West Sector. This call is listed in the AS400 as a narcotics complaint, and logging Officer Sims' arrival 5 minutes after the other officer arrived. Sergeant Strong verified with Sergeant McCullough the next date that Officer Sims had not been given permission to go into West Sector the day prior. At that point the supervisors decided to monitor Officer Sims' activity to see if a trend emerged. The supervisors wanted to verify this before bringing it to their lieutenant's attention.

Sergeant Strong then relayed the incident involving the collision at Redding Road mentioned earlier in this summary (CR# 2024-018830). Sergeant Strong monitored the GPS for Officer Sims' BWC as it traveled from the scene to Officer Sims' address in West sector, which he recalled was for over two hours. After that Sergeant Strong advised that a dispatcher had alerted Officer Sims via phone that supervisors had called in asking about his activity, at which point the supervisors brought it to their lieutenant's attention. The supervisors then began compiling information on Officer Sims' past activity for at least three months prior. Sergeant Strong noted in particular the call for service where Officer Sims was dispatched to a collision at Nicholasville Road and Wilhite Drive, which he responded to from West sector (Rosemont Garden and Clays Mill) with his camera powering on and beginning recording immediately while in the middle of driving with emergency equipment activated. This was a call where he remained marked out noticeably longer than the reporting officer despite doing no paperwork (CR# 2023-248917). Sergeant Strong also verified that he contacted the citizen who called in the motorist assist as mentioned above (CR# 2024-010541). He verified that the citizen watched Officer Sims arrive, sit in his car behind him without making contact, then leave. When asked if he has confidence in Officer Sims as a police officer, Sergeant Strong advised that he does not due to the totality of information gathered.

### **Lieutenant Dillan Taylor Interview**

Lt. Taylor was interviewed in the PIU offices on March 13<sup>th</sup> 2024. He stated that the sergeants on his shift brought to his attention possible issues with Officer Sims after looking into concerns raised by his fellow shift officers. By the time he was notified, the sergeants had confirmed that there was a problem with his conduct on duty. The Redding Road collision call for service was referenced specifically, as well as the subsequent travel to his residence outside of sector for an extended length of time.

Lt. Taylor also verified that they had researched the BWCs assigned to Officer Sims and ensured that the supervisors were not mistaking which camera was being used and which camera was docked. Lt. Taylor also confirmed that the spreadsheet provided showing instances where the BWC was powered off for extended lengths of time was a document that he prepared.

Lt. Taylor went on to explain that the supervisors addressed this issue with Officer Sims after he had asked for a meal break over the phone and not over the radio. This was also the incident where a dispatcher contacted him via phone asking why supervisors were inquiring after him. At that time there was no point in further monitoring his activity as he was aware of the observation. A memo was requested of Officer Sims explaining the behavior that had been observed, which he completed and turned in the next day. Due to the invocation of his Weingarten rights, no further communication was had with him without his FOP attorney present. Lt. Taylor advised that Officer Sims asked his supervisor for further information in the following days, which was not communicated to him due to respecting the invocation of his rights and the absence of his attorney.

When asked his opinion, Lt. Taylor responded that he does not have confidence in Officer Sims due to the behavior he has displayed as a patrol officer. He further confirmed that if asked, and the proper course of action followed, he would have had no problem permitting Officer Sims to leave sector to go to his residence while on break.

### **Officer Ronald Sims Interview**

Officer Sims was interviewed in the PIU offices on March 28<sup>th</sup>, with Commander Jackie Newman and FOP attorney Nick Oleson present. Officer Sims was asked to go over his memorandum initially. He acknowledged when asked by Commander Newman that the memo was written by him with assistance from his attorney.

Officer Sims was first asked about instances of turning off his BWC while on duty. He responded that he was erroneously under the impression that he was allowed to do so when not in contact with the public and at roll call. Officer Sims was asked for further clarification on the fact that there were numerous instances of BWC deactivation for extended periods, specifically the 19 instances of deactivations for over an hour, and the longer three instances of over two and three hours. He was also provided an excel document with those 22 instances highlighted. Officer Sims stated that there was no excuse for it, and that it was not correct (behavior). He added further that there were instances where he forgot to turn his camera back on after switching it off, referring to it as relaxed judgement, and a bad judgement call. He did admit that it probably shouldn't have been off in the first place.

When asked about the fact that the longest time periods found where his BWC was deactivated, on January 30<sup>th</sup> and January 31<sup>st</sup>, where his MDC was found to have connected to his home WiFi, Officer Sims again responded that he thought it was okay to go to his home out of sector and turn his camera off. He advised that he now knows that is not correct. Officer Sims admitted that he did not always ask for permission to go to his home out of sector, describing it as "inexcusable." He advised that this was done on nights when there were not many calls for service or the shift wasn't busy. He added that this was not done in an attempt to be deceptive, and that he takes pride in not having other officers have to take reports in his beat. He did acknowledge that the 22 instances cited to him indicated unreasonable behavior. He also

acknowledged that he was aware that it is against policy to leave sector without permission, and particularly without getting marked out on the radio.

Officer Sims was asked about the call for service that had garnered repeated scrutiny throughout the investigation, the collision on Redding Road, and the subsequent three hours spent at his residence. He again reiterated that there was no intent of deception, only a bad judgement call. He stated that he went there to eat and finish the collision report. When asked about the repeated statements of not being deceptive, Officer Sims was asked why then he felt the need to turn his camera completely off. Officer Sims replied that it was simply common practice for him.

When asked about the dispatcher who contacted him to ask why supervisors were inquiring about him, Officer Sims clarified that it was not Amy Ross, as previously believed, but a dispatcher named Mykela.

Officer Sims was asked about calls for service that were significant to the investigation, beginning with the robbery at Gatewood Court on January 3<sup>rd</sup> (CR# 2024-001628). Officer Sims agreed that the 2 hours and 3 minutes spent on the call was an inappropriate amount of time to spend, as he marked himself Code 3 (Assistance Given) with no documentation and no explanation for what he was doing during that time period. He did recall being out on that call for service.

He was next asked about a disorder on Medlock Court (CR# 2024-13760) that was cleared Code 20 (Trouble Settled) that was held for 3 hours and 18 minutes. While he could not recall the specifics of the call, he advised he most likely held the call in order to eat. He described that as unreasonable and inappropriate. He again stated that he was not trying to be deceptive.

Officer Sims was then asked about the dispatched call for a collision on Wilhite Drive at Nicholasville Road (CR# 2023-248917) where he was marked out for 3 hours and 16 minutes. He recalled the collision involving a motorcycle and responding to UK hospital, giving that as a reason for the length of time spent on the call that he marked Code 3. Officer Sims was not asked about his recorded signal 9 response from out of sector on this call.

When asked about the missing person on Venetian Way (CR# 2024-007179) being held for 2 hours and 18 minutes, Officer Sims could not recall that call for service.

Officer Sims was next asked about the response time of 1 hour and 7 minutes to a collision on I-75 (CR# 2023-158293). He replied that he could not recall that call for service.

Officer Sims was next asked about an alarm call that he responded to on Hickory Hill (CR# 2024-018077) where his BWC was completely powered down. He described not activating his camera as a "lack of judgement," and that he did not think that since he was circulating the property that he would have citizen contact. He believed that it being powered down completely was an instance where he forgot to turn it back on after powering it off.

The final instance of the lack of body camera footage that Officer Sims was asked about involved a call for service for a stolen firearm on Highgrove Road (CR# 2023-207894). Officer Sims explained that there was no BWC footage as the report was taken over the phone. He was not aware that reports for stolen firearms require an in-person report and cannot be taken over the

phone. Officer Sims stated he was dispatched to the call to physically respond to the residence. Officer Sims called the complainant and took the report over the phone on his own accord.

Officer Sims was specifically asked if he was powering his camera off so that he would not be seen going to his residence. He advised that it was not his intention.

Officer Sims acknowledged that he is now aware that his BWC must remain activated, that a reasonable amount of time must be taken with calls for service, that you need a supervisor's approval to leave sector for a Signal 5, and that it is better to be safe than sorry when activating your BWC when in contact with the public.

When asked if there was anything in his personal life that has led him to conduct himself on duty as he has, Officer Sims advised that he has had issues with irritable bowel syndrome in the past which has caused him to need to use bathroom facilities unexpectedly. He further advised that he has not yet sought medical confirmation or treatment for this. Officer Sims was also asked if his peers had approached him about his on-duty behavior in the past. He responded that he did not ever recall anyone addressing any issues with him.

The interview was ended shortly after this.

## Conclusion

Officer Sims' actions in numerous instances over late 2023 and 2024 were violations of General Order 2015-15C Body-Worn Cameras, SOP BOP 1991-02H Patrol Operational Order, and General Order 1973-02K Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 Misconduct.

His actions had become concerning enough over the past months that his fellow officers felt the need to bring it to their supervisor's attention. The fact that officers were concerned about their safety and the conduct of a fellow officer cannot be minimized, and meant that an investigation had to be initiated to address the behavioral issues of a fellow officer. In order to fully understand the scope of the investigation and its results, each violation requires review. The pertinent portions of the General Orders are contained below, the General Orders themselves are not shown in their entirety due to their length.

### General Order 2015-15C Body-Worn Cameras

#### IV. Procedures

##### A. BWC Usage

1. Employees shall place their BWC in buffering mode when they are likely to have official contact. Examples include but are not limited to
  - a. Leaving a department owned building
  - b. Becoming available to receive calls for service
  - c. Reporting to or returning from an assignment or off-duty employment while in Fayette County
2. Employees shall place their BWC in event mode prior to their arrival on a call for service or at the initiation of any other official contact, or non-contact enforcement actions (e.g. parking enforcement). Examples include but are not limited to:
  - a. Detentions and arrests

- b. Vehicle and foot pursuits
- c. Suspicious situations
- d. All searches
- e. Interviews
- f. Disorderly subjects
- g. Motorist Assists
- h. Traffic Collisions
- i. Parking Enforcement and Towing
- j. Emergency operation of a vehicle
- k. Initial documentation of evidence that could be used in criminal or traffic prosecution
- l. Any situation deemed appropriate by the employee that is not prohibited by this policy

#### G. Supervisor Responsibilities

10. When an employee fails to activate their BWC for an official contact, event, or scene which requires BWC recording, or fails to completely record their participation in, arrival at and/or their entire involvement, they are required to verbally notify their supervisor, prior to the end of their shift or assignment, of the circumstances.

In reference to the allegation that Officer Sims violated policy regarding body worn cameras and their operation, it is demonstrably proven that Officer Sims had deactivated his department issued body worn camera in excess of an hour in 19 different instances while on duty since August of 2023, as well as 1 instance where it was turned off over two hours and 2 separate instances where it was fully deactivated for more than three hours. Officer Sims also failed to bring any failure to record calls for service to the attention of his supervisors. At least 6 Body Worn Camera Error BlueTeams were required to be completed once these absent recordings were found by his supervisors. This is a violation of the Body Worn Camera General Order.

#### SOP BOP 1991-02H Patrol Operational Order

### III. Procedures

#### C. The Duty of All Patrol Officers

3. The Bureau of Patrol operates on the philosophy of geographic responsibility. Line elements of the Bureau of Patrol are assigned to sectors, beats and sub-beats. By doing so, geographic responsibility is affixed to the sergeants and patrol officers so assigned. When not dispatched otherwise, officers' number one priority will be their geographical assignment. Their duties include, but are not limited to:

- a. Responding to calls for service.
- b. Proactively patrolling the entire area of their assignment.
- c. Making as many positive contacts with members of the public within their assigned areas as possible.
- d. To identify and seek solutions to the problems and concerns of their assigned area.
- e. To proactively pursue the details assigned by the command staff of the Bureau of Patrol.

Officer Sims has been shown through research and by his own admission to have spent significant period of time out of sector while on duty. Body Worn Camera GPS data as well as his statements demonstrate



instances where he has responded to calls from West Sector back into East Sector where he is assigned, which is a clear and demonstrable violation of the Patrol Operational General Order. Further indications of this violation are the two instances where his geographic location is shown to be outside of East Sector at his residence in West Sector by the connection of his MDC to his home WiFi.

#### G.O. 1977-01H Police Radio Procedure

### III. PROCEDURE

#### D. Communications Procedures between Department Employees and E911

##### 1. Department employees shall abide by the following radio procedures:

h. All out of service activities, including meal breaks and signal-x, will be reported or requested via radio.

1. Officers are not permitted to take themselves out of service over the telephone or through an MDC.
2. Requested meal breaks shall not exceed 30 minutes per shift and shall not be requested during the first hour or the last 1.5 hours of the shift.

### IV. CALLS FOR SERVICE RESPONSE

A. The department will respond to calls for law enforcement service in a timely and professional manner as circumstances and resources permit.

F. All officers and safety officers assigned to the Bureau of Patrol or Bureau of Special Operations are required to be in service in their assigned beats or areas and available for calls on the radio during their shifts unless exempted by other department requirements, policy, or by a supervisor.

Officer Sims admitted to asking for a Signal 5 over the phone with dispatch, stating that he was unaware that it was a violation of general order to do so. While the E-911 dispatcher should have requested he ask for his break on the radio, he also must take responsibility for not doing so. The calls for service portion of the general order outlining the requirement to be in sector and available for a timely response to calls has also been violated, as demonstrably proven throughout the above investigation. Officer Sims also admitted in his interview that he would often hold calls in order to eat, instead of taking a Signal 5. This led to calls being held for long periods. As stated above, the investigation also has shown proof that during his shift Officer Sims was not in his sector, much less his beat, for long periods of time.

#### General Order 1973-02K Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 Misconduct.

### APPENDIX B OPERATIONAL RULES

#### 1.02 Misconduct

Officers shall conduct themselves at all times, both on and off duty, in such a manner as to reflect most favorably on the department and to not cast doubt on the officer's integrity, honesty, judgment, or character. Misconduct of an officer shall include that which tends to bring the department into disrepute or reflects discredit upon the officer as an employee of the department, or that which tends to impair the operation and efficiency of the department or officer.

When viewed in its totality, this investigation shows that Officer Sims has violated this general order, specifically the misconduct section, with his actions. While he made statements during his interview that he did not intend to be deceptive, the deactivation of his BWC and going to his residence during the same period shows a pattern of actions taken to ensure his activity went unnoticed. During his interview, his repeated explanations for many of these violations were that he simply did not know that he was not allowed to conduct himself in that manner. Claiming lack of knowledge of general and special orders, as well as accepted procedures, cannot be accepted as an excuse for ignoring those same orders and procedures. Officer Sims did acknowledge that his actions were inexcusable and should be viewed as a lack of good judgement.

Officer Sims' actions violated policy, and did not meet the expectations put forth by the Lexington Police Department. It has been demonstrably proven that he has violated numerous general and special orders, and has failed to serve the public or support his fellow officers in his role as a Lexington police officer. His actions have been a poor reflection on the Lexington Police Department and has cast the agency in a bad light. I recommend that the formal charge of Misconduct be sustained.

Lieutenant Jeff Jackson  
Public Integrity Unit



Lexington Police Department  
**MEMORANDUM**  
 Lexington, Kentucky

DATE OF ISSUE

EFFECTIVE DATE

NUMBER

PIU: 24-051

<b>TO:</b> Assistant Chief Brian Maynard Bureau of Patrol	<b>SUBJECT:</b>  <p style="text-align: center;">FORMAL COMPLAINT</p>
<b>FROM:</b> Lieutenant Jeffery Jackson Bureau of Investigation Public Integrity Unit	

**COMPLAINANT:** Lieutenant Dillan Taylor

**ACCUSED OFC.:** Officer Ronald Sims

**ALLEGATION:** Violating General Order 2015-15C Body-Worn Cameras, SOP BOP 1991-02H Patrol Operational Order General Order and General Order 1973-02K Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 Misconduct.

**ALLEGED CIRCUMSTANCES:** In late January 2024, East Sector supervisors developed concerns involving Officer Ronald Sims, noting he was placing other officers in undo danger due to him leaving sector often during his shift to go to his residence for long period of times without supervisor approval, not backing officers on calls, taking an undue amount of time to respond to calls and taking extended lengths of time to complete reports.

**ACTION REQUESTED:**

- The Bureau Commander and Officer Sims should sign the Acknowledgment Sheet and process this complaint.
- The Commanding Officer should provide the attached copy of the Form 111 and the Officer's Rights Packet to Officer Sims.
- Officer Sims should contact the Public Integrity Unit to arrange for a time to provide a formal statement.

DATE

TIME

Bureau Commander David Buerschell 3/7/24 1615  
Supervisor [Signature] 3/7/24 1720  
Officer Renee Jones 3/8/24 1341

Accused officer would like the Public Integrity Unit to notify the FOP President or their designee that a formal complaint is filed against them. (Circle One) YES or NO

Returned to the Public Integrity Unit Jeff Jackson 3-11-2024

Jeff Jackson  
Lieutenant Jeffery Jackson  
Bureau of Investigation  
Public Integrity Unit

mrv

enclosures

cc: Chief Lawrence Weathers  
file - PIU2024F-005

**LEXINGTON POLICE DEPARTMENT  
FORMAL COMPLAINT FORM**

FORM 111 (2/24)

File #: PIU2024F-005

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Employee Involved: Sims, Ronald			Employee #: 58533	Hire Date: 01/20/2020
Present Assignment: Patrol East Sector 2nd Shift				
Complainant: Lieutenant Dillan Taylor		Complainant Address: 150 East Main Street		
Complainant Phone #: (859) 258-3600	Alternate Complainant Phone #: N/A	Complainant Email: N/A		
Date of Incident: Various	Time of Incident: Various	Location of Incident: Various	Date and Time Reported: 3/6/2024	How Reported: <input type="checkbox"/> Letter <input type="checkbox"/> Phone <input type="checkbox"/> Person <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Email

**DESCRIPTION OF ALLEGATIONS:**

In late January 2024, East Sector supervisors developed concerns involving Officer Ronald Sims, noting he was placing other officers in undo danger due to him leaving sector often during his shift to go to his residence for long period of times without supervisor approval, not backing officers on calls, taking an undue amount of time to respond to calls and taking extended lengths of time to complete reports.

Officer Ronald Sims did not adhere to and violated department policies and trainings specifically related to GO 2015-15C Body-Worn Cameras and SOP BOP 1991-02H Patrol Operational Order amongst others.

If the above allegation is true, Officer Sims has violated General Order 1973-02K Disciplinary Procedures of Sworn Officers, Appendix B, Operational Rule 1.02 Misconduct.

I swear/affirm that the facts set out in the allegations herein are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Complainant Signature: *[Signature]* Date: 3/7/24  
 Subscribed and sworn before me this date: 3/7/24 *Shannon Patten KYNP7428*  
 (Date) (Notary)  
 My Commission Expires: 5/14/24

**Witness:**  
 Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

File #: PIU2024F-005

Employee: Sims, Ronald

**CHIEF OF POLICE**

[Finding: PC=Proper Conduct, IC=Improper Conduct, IE=Insufficient Evidence, PF=Policy Failure, UC=Unfounded Complaint]

Finding Policy Violation


Chief of Police Determination:  Case Be Closed  Corrective Training  Recommend Disciplinary Action (see below)

Materials Reviewed:

Comments:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**DISCIPLINARY REVIEW BOARD**

Finding Policy Violation


Disciplinary Review Board Recommendation:  Case Be Closed  Corrective Training  Disciplinary Action (see below)

Comments:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**CHIEF OF POLICE FINAL DETERMINATION**

Case Be Closed  Corrective Training  Recommend Disciplinary Action (see below)

Comments:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

File #: PIU2024F-005

Employee: Sims, Ronald

---

**ALLEGATIONS CONTINUED:**

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin black border, occupying most of the page. It is intended for the continuation of allegations. On the left side of the page, there are three black circular punch holes.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY