# **Florida Department of Corrections**



## **Office of the Inspector General**

## ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATION Case # 12-756





#### Table of Contents

| <u>I.</u>    | AUTHORITY                         | 4 |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| <u>II.</u>   | METHODOLOGY                       | 4 |
| <u>III.</u>  | ANALYSIS                          | 4 |
| <u>IV.</u>   | DEFINITIONS                       | 5 |
| <u>V.</u>    | PREDICATE                         | 6 |
| <u>VI.</u>   | SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS | 6 |
| <u>VII.</u>  | VIOLATIONS                        | 6 |
| <u>VIII.</u> | CONCLUSION                        | 7 |



:



| Case Number:  | 12-756                              |  |  |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| Inspector:  | Inspector Robert Calamari           |  |  |
| Date Assigned or Initiated:                                       | 10-29-2012                          |  |  |
| Complaint Against:  | Inmate Delbert Campbell DC # A50843 |  |  |
| Complainant:  | Complainant: Captain Charles Smith  |  |  |
| Use of Force Number:  | N/A                                 |  |  |
| Classification of Incident:                                       |                                     |  |  |
| Confidential Medical Information Included: <u>X</u> Yes <u>No</u> |                                     |  |  |
| Whistle-Blower Investigation:                                     | Yes <u>X</u> No                     |  |  |
| Equal Employment Opportunity Investigation:YesX_No                |                                     |  |  |
| Chief Inspector General Case Number:                              |                                     |  |  |





#### I. AUTHORITY

The Florida Department of Corrections, Office of the Inspector General, is authorized to conduct internal affairs investigations pursuant to ss. 20.055 and 944.31, Fla. Statute.

The testimony references included in this report are summations of oral or written statements provided to inspectors. Statements contained herein do not necessarily represent complete or certified transcribed testimony, except as noted. Unless specifically indicated otherwise, all interviews with witnesses, complainants, and subjects were audio or video recorded.

#### II. METHODOLOGY

The investigation reviewed the derivations of the allegation advanced by the complainant. The scope of this investigation does not seek to specifically address tort(s), but violations of criminal statutes, Florida administrative rules or department policies/procedures. The criterion used to evaluate each contention or allegation was limited to the following standard of analysis:

- 1. Did the subject's action or behavior violate Florida criminal statutes?
- 2. Did the subject's action or behavior violate Florida Administrative Rules?
- 3. Did the subject's action or behavior violate policy or procedure?
- 4. Did the subject manifest action that was contrary to past precedence, which was known to management?

#### III. ANALYSIS

The standard and analysis in this investigation is predicated with the burden of proving any violation of law, policy or rule by a preponderance of evidence. The evidence considered for analysis is confined to the facts and allegations stated or reasonably implied. The actions or behavior of the subject are presumed to be lawful and in compliance with the applicable policies and rules, unless by a preponderance of evidence indicates the contrary.





IV. DEFINITIONS

#### Exonerated:

The preponderance of evidence reasonably supports facts which suggest the subject's behavior or action did occur and was consistent with law, policy or rule.

#### **Policy Deficiency:**

The preponderance of evidence suggests the subject's behavior or action did occur and was appropriate, or was not morally correct, but is not addressed by Department procedure, rule, or other authority.

#### Not-Sustained:

The preponderance of evidence does not reasonably establish the subject's behavior or action either complied with or violated or was contrary to Department procedure, rule, or other authority.

#### Sustained:

The preponderance of evidence exists to reasonably suggest the subject's behavior or action did occur and was contrary to a Department procedure, rule, or other authority.





#### V. PREDICATE

On October 17, 2012, at approximately 5:07 a.m., Officer Heath Johnson was assigned to F-dormitory. He was supervising the return of inmates to wings one and three from morning meal. While controlling the dormitories door locks, inmates began yelling that an inmate (identified as) Inmate Delbert Campbell was hanging in wing two from the top tier safety rail. Staff arrived and cut down the inmate and the inmate Campbell deceased at 5:32 a.m. Upon initial review of the information, the Office of the Inspector General initiated an investigation into the incident.

### VI. SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS

Based on the exhibits, witnesses' testimony, staff statements, and the record as a whole, presented or available to the primary inspector, the following findings of facts were determined:

On October 17, 2012, Inmate Campbell was discovered hanging in F-dormitory; wing one, from the upper tier by inmates returning from the morning meal. Inmate Campbell stayed in the dormitory on October 16, 2012, to see how many inmates did not go to the morning meal and remained inside the dormitory. He while wing one inmates were at the morning meal.

Inmate Campbell used a bed sheet was seen to be a second s

On November 7, 2012, a copy of the autopsy protocol report for Inmate Delbert Campbell was obtained. The autopsy was performed by Dr. Andrea Minyard in the District One Medical Examiner's Office located at Sacred Heart Hospital in Pensacola, Florida at 11:30 a.m. on October 19, 2012. There were management of Inmate Campbell's body.

In the Medical Examiner's report, Dr. Andrea Minyard provided her findings:

CAUSE OF DEATH:

MANNER OF DEATH: Suicide



•



#### VII. VIOLATIONS

Violation of (Florida Law, Florida Administrative Rule or Department of Correction's Policy/Procedure):

é

1. None





#### VIII. CONCLUSION

Based on the information gathered during this investigation, it is the recommendation of Inspector Robert Calamari that this case be closed, exceptionally cleared. The allegation against Inmate Delbert Campbell be termed as a;



I, Inspector Robert Calamari, do hereby swear or affirm, under penalty of perjury:

 That I have read the foregoing document and, to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, the facts stated therein are true and accurate.

Case Number: 12-756

Page 8 of 8





Page 9 of 8