

Approved as  
Final Disposition

~~DRAFT~~ 2/1

September 5, 2025

TO: L. Bercaw  
Chief of Police

ATTN: R. Cate  
Assistant Chief of Operations

L. Richardson, Major  
District III

FROM: R. Zeigler, Captain  
District III

SUBJECT: Internal Affairs Case #FN2025-0265; Involving Officer Bryan Velazquez

**Synopsis:**

On April 14, 2025, Officer Bryan Velazquez engaged in a foot pursuit with a suspect, who was fleeing from a traffic stop. Officer Velazquez made contact with the subject in the backyard of a residence. Prior to taking the subject into custody, Officer Velazquez kicked the subject in the head as he was in a kneeling position with both his hands raised and visible. As part of the department's commitment to quality assurance, a supervisory level review of the video was conducted and raised concerns about the response to resistance during the incident.

**Case Summation:**

On April 14, 2025, Officers from Squad 333 attempted a traffic stop on a vehicle for a traffic infraction. The vehicle fled and then stopped in front of 905 E. New Orleans Ave., where the driver and sole occupant exited the vehicle and fled on foot. Air Service continued to provide real-time updates on the subject's movements to responding units.

Velazquez engaged in a foot pursuit and located the subject in the backyard of 5010 N. 9th Street. Upon initial contact, Velazquez gave loud verbal commands at gunpoint, ordering the subject to the ground. The subject complied by dropping to his knees, raising his hands and asking what he had done. Despite having no information that the subject was armed, Velasquez continued to hold the subject at gunpoint further commanding him to "get on the ground, get on your fucking stomach."

Approximately three seconds after giving those commands, Velazquez delivered a roundhouse-style kick to the subject, causing him to fall onto his side. This kick was delivered while the subject was on his knees and while Velasquez still had him at gunpoint. Officer Velasquez indicated he believed the

subject to have attempted a burglary, be armed and be non-compliant, making it necessary for Velasquez to kick him in an effort to get the subject in custody.

Velazquez did not use de-escalation techniques based on the level of resistance presented by the subject and the immediacy of the threat presented as outlined in departmental policies. The passive resistance of the subject did not warrant Velasquez kicking him.

When looking at the video, it is evident that Velazquez failed to attempt to utilize de-escalation techniques such as dialogue, time, or distance. Upon evaluation, it was concluded that Velazquez's actions—specifically the use of a kick—was not consistent with departmental policy. Velazquez had alternate and less forceful options available to him during the encounter, including maintaining control of the subject by continuing to hold him at gunpoint until backup arrived.

**Disposition:**

In conclusion, Velazquez's use of force was unreasonable, excessive, and was not necessary to safely take the subject into custody. Velasquez failed to temper his actions with good judgment, common sense, restraint, and understanding as required by department policy. Furthermore, Velazquez failed to utilize any de-escalation techniques to effectively stabilize the situation as well as take the subject, who was not an immediate threat, into custody.

Velazquez's conduct reflects a failure to adhere to established protocols, ethical standards, and departmental policy. It also falls short of the standard of conduct for the officers of the Tampa Police Department who are expected to serve with integrity, show courtesy, demonstrate respect, and uphold public trust at all times. After further consideration, I determine that the violations of MOR 1210 Courtesy to the Public and MOR 1602 Response to Resistance will not be sustained, as the underlying conduct supporting these violations is sufficiently addressed as violations of SOP 536 Philosophy of Enforcement and SOP 538 Response to Resistance.

This case was unbiased and comprehensive, providing the reviewer with the facts needed to render an impartial decision. Based on the facts presented in this case, I find the following:

A violation of MOR 1005-Standard of Conduct- **SUSTAINED**

A violation of MOR 1210-Courtesy to the Public- **NOT SUSTAINED**

A violation of MOR 1602 Response to Resistance-**NOT SUSTAINED**

A violation of MOR 1807-Failure to comply; Departmental Policies, to wit: and SOP 536- Philosophy of Enforcement-**SUSTAINED**

A violation of MOR 1807-Failure to comply; Departmental Policies, to wit: SOP 538-Response to Resistance and Legal Bulletin #2014-3-Use of Force Issues-**SUSTAINED**



Regina Zeigler, Captain  
District III