2025

Joplin Police Department

Annual Report

2025 Year End Report

January 1 to December 31

Prepared by Office of Internal Affairs

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

The main purpose of this information is to get as much information as possible out to the members of the Department and the public to avoid unnecessary rumors, which have a negative effect on the Department. The annual report will provide a statistical analysis of the lethal, less lethal, and non-lethal force used by the JPD Officer and JPD Detention Officers; and enhance transparency between the Department and its stakeholders within the City of Joplin.

MISSION STATEMENT

Our mission is to provide professional service and protection through leadership and partnership with the community.

VALUE STATMENT

Honor - without compromise
Courage - with compassion
Commitment - to community
Service - with understanding

Contents

Use of Force Policy and Definitions 4

Use of Force Overview 5

2025 Type of Force Tally 6

Taser Usage 7

Yearly Type of Force Comparison 7

Type of Force Comparison Graph 8

Citizen Resistance Tally 9

Arrests and Charges 10

Injuries 10

Reason for Use of Force and Type of service being rendered at the time 11

Detention Officer Use of force 13

Detention Use of Force Continued 14

Injuries (Detention Officers) 14

Internal Affairs Report 15

Complaints Received 16

Early Warning System 17

Investigations (Monthly Breakdown) 17

FIRST QUARTER INVESTIGATIONS 18

SECOND QUARTER INVESTIGATIONS 18

THIRD QUARTER INVESTIGATIONS 19

FOURTH QUARTER INVESTIGATIONS 19

Bias-Based Complaints (Breakdown) 19

Types of Discipline 20

Crashes and Pursuit Policy 20

Crashes 21

Pursuits 22

Use of Force Policy and Definitions

Officers are confronted daily with situations requiring the use of force to affect an arrest or ensure public safety. The degree of force used depends on what the officer perceives as reasonable and necessary under the circumstances at the time he or she decides to use force. Except for deadly force, the application of any degree of force is justified only when the officer reasonably believes that it is necessary:

- To prevent the escape from custody, make an arrest or an investigative detention of a person the officer believes has committed a crime.
- To defend him or herself or another from what the officer believes is the use of force while trying to arrest another, prevent the suspect's escape, or otherwise lawfully take the person into custody.
- To disperse persons participating in an unlawful assembly.

Deadly force: Any force applied in any manner by any means that could reasonably be expected to cause death or serious physical injury. (RSMo 563.011)

Non-deadly force: Force employed which is neither likely nor intended to cause death or serious physical injury.

Firearms: Any weapon from which a projectile is forcibly ejected by an explosive.

Reasonable belief: When facts or circumstances the officer knows, or should know, are such as to cause an ordinary and prudent person to act or think reasonably in a similar way under similar circumstances.

Serious physical injury: Bodily injury which creates a substantial risk of death or which is likely to cause serious permanent disfigurement or loss, or extended impairment of the function of anybody member or organ.

Objectively Reasonable Force: The "reasonableness" of a particular use of force must be judged from the perspective of a reasonable officer on the scene, rather than with the 20/20 vision of hindsight. The calculus of reasonableness must embody allowance for the fact that police officers are often forced to make split-second judgments - in circumstances that are tense, uncertain, and rapidly evolving - about the amount of force that is necessary in a particular situation. The question is whether the officers' actions are "objectively reasonable" in light of the facts and circumstances confronting them, without regard to their underlying intent or motivation. Because “the test of reasonableness under the Fourth Amendment is not capable of precise definition or mechanical application," however, its proper application requires careful attention to the facts and circumstances of each case, including the severity of the crime at issue, whether the suspect poses an immediate threat to the safety of the officers or others, and whether he is actively resisting arrest or attempting to evade arrest by flight.

Use of Force Overview

In 2025, Joplin Police Department employed some level of force 101 times to effect an arrest or assist with a prisoner/medical patient. There were 297 officer involvements, meaning that in some arrests more than one officer was involved. During 2024, Joplin Police Department employed some level of force 101 times to effect an arrest or assist with a prisoner/medical patient.

The analysis provided is based upon averages. The actual use of force by individual officers can be influenced by several factors such as assignment, patrol area, shift, number of hours worked and other variables.

Joplin Police Officers arrested 4,696 people on a total of 11,034 criminal charges during 2025.
Joplin Police Officers arrested 4,642 people on a total of 10.779 criminal charges during 2024.

- When at full strength the Joplin Police Department has 115 officers.

Use of force occurred an average of once in every 46.5 arrests during 2025.
Use of force occurred an average of once in every 46 arrests during 2024.

- Use of Force Incidents broken down by race:

  White- 73
  Black- 11
  Hispanic- 3
  Asian- 1
  Native American- 0
  Other- 8
  Unknown- 5

  *Comments: Some use of force incidents involved multiple subjects

Profile of Use-of-force Incidents received between January 1st, 2025, and December 31st, 2025

Total number of use-of-force incidents:	**101**
Total number of officers involved:	**161**

2025 Type of Force Tally

The following statistics are a comprehensive breakdown of individual use of force events. As such, they are representative of the dynamic and fluid nature of such events wherein a single use of force event is comprised of phases of escalation and de-escalation. Several levels of force and methods of force are utilized to bring about a successful resolution to the event. The following numbers reflect the multiple efforts in use of force events and do not represent a change in the total use of force events listed above.

	Type of Force	Total #		Type of Force	Total
1	Active Pointing of Weapon	36	22	Knife	0
2	Alternative Impact Weapon	2	23	Lateral Vascular Neck Restraint	0
3	Arm bar	0	24	Leg Strike(s)	1
4	ASP	0	25	OC Spray	5
5	Canine	8	26	Open-Hand Strike	3
6	Clamp	0	27	Pepper ball Gun	0
7	Come Along	1	28	Physical Restraint	7
8	Control Hold	14	29	Pressure Point(s)	4
9	CS Gas	0	30	Push	1
10	Elbow Strike(s)	3	31	Rifle	0
11	Empty Hand Control	21	32	Shotgun	0
12	Escort	4	33	Strike(s)	2
13	Fist	4	34	Strikes in Furtherance	0
14	Foot	0	35	Take to Ground	12
15	Handgun	1	36	Taser	40
16	Headlock	1	37	Taser Arc Display	0
17	Hobble Restraints	0	38	Thrust Kick	0
18	Impact Munitions	1	39	Tinsley	0
19	Joint Lock	0	40	Verbal Direction	27
20	Kicks	1	41	Wrist Lock	0
21	Knee Strike(s)	1			

Taser Usage

Tasers were deployed 40 times in 2025.
Tasers were deployed 55 times in 2024.


Tasers were deployed an average of once in every 117 arrests in 2025.
Tasers were deployed an average of once in every 84 arrests in 2024.

The average number of Taser deployments was 3.5 times per month in 2025.

Yearly Type of Force Comparison

It should be noted that there were 101 use of force events in 2025. There were 101 Use of Force events in 2024. One should take into consideration that many force events have more than one type of force used. For example, if verbal direction is given, and the party still fails to comply with the officer, that officer will move to a different type of force.

See following page for Graph.


Chart Title
Wrist Lock
Verbal Direction
Tinsley
Thrust Kick
Taser
Take to Ground
Strikes in furtherance
Strikes
Push
Pressure Point(s)
Physical Restraint
Open-Hand Strike
OC-Spray
Knee Strikes
Joint lock
Impact Munitions
Hobble Restraints
Headlock
Handgun
Escort
Empty Hand Control
CS Gas
Control Hold
Canine
Armbar
Allternative Impact Weapon
Active Pointing of a Weapon
0
20
40
60
80
100
2024
2025

Citizen Resistance Tally

Types of Resistance

Psychological Intimidation – Verbal and Non-Verbal cues indicative of a subject's mental or physical preparedness to resist and/or assault the officer or others.

Non-Compliance - Noncompliance or verbal responses or threats of non-compliance to officer's directions.

Passive Resistance - Dead weight; no active participation, not influencing, not exerting any force (internal or otherwise)

Active Resistance - Clinging to objects to prevent the officer from gaining control, exerting influence by physical effort or action. (i.e. using muscle tension to prevent movement.)

Escape Resistance - Fleeing, pushing, or pulling away from the officer to avoid control, however, not attempting to harm the officer.

Active Aggression - Physical actions of assault.

Deadly Force Threat – Assaults with the perceived intent and apparent ability to cause death or great bodily harm.

Reason	Count	Percent of total
Active Aggression	73	14.7%
Active Resistance	146	29.5%
Deadly Force Assault on Citizen	0	0%
Deadly Force Assault on Officer	1	.2%
Escape Resistance	69	13.9%
Felony Car Stop	12	2.42%
Handgun	1	.2%
Knife	1	.2%
Non-Compliance	125	25.3%
None	4	.8%
Passive Resistance	24	4.8%
Psychological Intimidation	20	4.0%
Self-Harm	3	.6%
Showed Great Strength	14	2.8%
Spit	1	0.2%
Total	**494**	

Arrests and Charges

Citizen arrested in conjunction with use-of-force (# incidents):

	Count	Percent of total
No	26	25.74%
Yes	75	74.25%
Total	**104**	

Tally of charges against involved citizens:

Charge	Count	Percent of total
96-hour Mental Commit	22	4.1%
Assault	23	4.3%
Assault on Officer	27	5.0%
Compliance with request for information by Ofc.	9	1.6%
Domestic Assault	22	4.1%
DWI/DUI	10	1.8%
Felony Resisting Arrest	50	9.3%
Felony Warrant	18	3.3%
Misdemeanor Warrant	18	3.3%
Not Arrested/Charged	25	4.7%
Obstructing service of Officer/Resisting	79	14.8%
Other Felony PC	30	5.6%
Other Misdemeanor PC	49	9.1%
Peace Disturbance	10	1.8%
Possession of Controlled Substance	19	3.5%
Possession of Drug Paraphernalia	17	3.1%
Resisting Arrest	88	16.5%
Safe Keep	0	0.%
Traffic Violations	15	2.8%
Violation of Ex-Parte/Full Order of Protection	2	0.37%
Total	**533**	

Injuries

Injury- The Missouri Criminal Code defines injury in Chapter 565.070 as *physical pain, illness, or any impairment of physical condition*. Our current category for injuries only includes injured or not injured. For reporting purposes, injuries include visible injuries such as contusions and bruises, lacerations, punctures, scratches, and abrasions. It will also include any complaint of

physical pain, illness, or any impairment of physical condition which may not be clearly visible, however an Officer reasonably believes is caused from the type of force that was used on the Officer or Subject. Officers and subjects may have more than one visible injury (i.e., a contusion and an abrasion) however these are only counted as one "injury" in relation to the use of force event. This data will not include pre-existing injuries in relation to the use of force event.

Taken to Hospital- Subject or Officer was taken to hospital for treatment because of the use of force event. This may occur for several reasons and may sometimes be required by Departmental Policy due to the type of force that was used.

Citizen was injured in conjunction with use-of-force (# incidents):

	Count	Percent of total
No	46	45.5%
Yes	55	54.5%
Total	**101**	

Citizen taken to hospital in conjunction with use-of-force (# incidents):

	Count	Percent of total
No	84	83.1%
Yes	17	16.8%
Total	**101**	

Officer injured in conjunction with use-of-force (# incidents):

	Count	Percent of total
No	95	94%
Yes	6	5.9%
Total	**101**	

Officer taken to hospital in conjunction with use-of-force (# incidents):

	Count	Percent of total
No	101	100%
Yes	0	0%
Total	**101**	

Reason for Use of Force and Type of Service Rendered

Reason for use-of-force:

Reason	Count	Percent of total
Jail cell extraction	0	0.0%
Jail failure to comply	17	3.1%
Jail inmate movement	18	3.3%
Jail to enforce jail rule	0	.0%
Felony car stop	3	.55%

To assist another agency	3	.55%
To defend another officer	33	6.1%
To defend another person	3	.55%
To defend self	84	15.6%
To disperse an unlawful assembly	0	0%
To effect arrest	318	59.1%
Investigative detention	33	6.1%
To prevent a violent felony	6	1.1%
To prevent a violent misdemeanor	2	.37%
To restrain for subject's safety	0	.0%
Transport Prisoner	18	3.3%
Total	**538**	

Type of service being rendered at time of use-of-force:

Service type	**Count**	**Percent of total**
(Jail) detention	40	7.4%
Crash investigation	0	0%
Attending court	0	0%
Bar check	0	0%
Call for service	99	18.4%
Criminal investigation	36	6.7%
Disturbance	75	13.9%
Felony car stop	31	5.7%
Foot pursuit	80	14.8%
Medical assistance call	0	0%
Mental	8	1.4%
Off duty	0	0%
Pedestrian check	41	7.6%
Prisoner handling	14	2.6%
Prisoner transport	3	.55%
Suspicious activity	38	7.0%
Traffic Stop	24	4.4%
Vehicle Pursuit	27	5.0%
Warrant Service	22	4.0%
Total	**538**	

Detention Officer Use of Force

During the end of 2012, the Joplin Police Department began to track Police Officer use of force stats separate from Detention Officer use of force stats. This was to give the most practical data for officers working in a street environment vs. inside a jail. Detention Officer stats no longer reflect such data such as Officer use of force vs. arrest, Officer use of force vs. use of force rate, Taser deployments vs. arrest, reason force was used, and type of service being rendered. This data will be documented separately to give the most accurate number.

In 2025, Joplin Detention Officers employed some level of force 25 times to defend themselves, enforce a jail rule, or move a prisoner. In 2024, Detention Officers used force 22 times.

The analysis provided is based upon averages. The actual use of force by individual detention officers can be influenced by several factors such as assignment, shift, number of hours worked and other variables.

The following statistics are a comprehensive breakdown of individual use of force events. As such, they are representative of the dynamic and fluid nature of such events wherein a single use of force event is comprised of phases of escalation and de-escalation. Several levels of force and methods of force are utilized to bring about a successful resolution to the event. The following numbers reflect the multiple efforts in use of force events and do not represent a change in the total use of force events listed above.

Profile of Jail Use-of-force Incidents received Between January 1, 2025, and December 31, 2025

Total number of use-of-force incidents: **25**
Total number of officers involved: **96**

Type of Force	Total #		Total #
Alternative Impact Weapon	0	Lateral Vascular Neck Restraint	0
Arm bar	0	Leg Strike(s)	0
ASP	0	Open-Hand Strike	3
Clamp	0	Physical Restraint	12
Come-Along	0	Pressure Point(s)	0
Control Hold	18	Push	0
Elbow Strike(s)	0	Strike(s)	6
Empty Hand Control	24	Strikes in Furtherance	0
Escort	3	Take to Ground	8
Fist	3	Taser	10
Foot	0	Taser Arc Display	0
Headlock	0	Thrust Kick	0
Hobble Restraints	0	Tinsley	0
Joint Lock	0	Verbal Direction	11
Kicks	0	Wrist Lock	0
Knee Strike(s)	0		

Detention Officer Use of Force Continued

Citizen Resistance	Count
Active Aggression	28
Active Resistance	32
Deadly Force Assault on Citizen	0
Deadly Force Assault on Officer	0
Escape Resistance	0
Handgun	0
Knife	0
Non-Compliance	31
None	0
Passive Resistance	0
Psychological Intimidation	0
Self-Harm	0
Showed Great Strength	9
Spit	0
Total	**100**

Injuries (Detention Officers)

Citizen was injured in conjunction with use-of-force (# incidents):

	Count
No	25
Yes	0
Total	**25**

Citizen taken to hospital in conjunction with use-of-force (# incidents):

	Count
No	24
Yes	1
Total	**25**

Officer injured in conjunction with use-of-force (# incidents):

	Count
No	22
Yes	3
Total	**25**

Officer taken to hospital in conjunction with use-of-force (# incidents):

	Count
No	25
Yes	0
Total	**25**

Internal Affairs Report

During 2025, 45 cases were forwarded to the Office of Internal Affairs for investigation. There were 43 cases that involved sworn personnel and 2 cases that involved non-sworn personnel. Comparatively, for 2024, 47 cases were forwarded to the Office of Internal Affairs for investigation. There were 42 cases that involved sworn personnel and 5 cases that involved non-sworn personnel.

The 47 cases involving department personnel are broken down by quarter and graphs are completed to give an indication of how many complaints have been investigated, from where the complaints were generated, how many have been sustained, and what types of disciplinary actions have been handed out for those violations.

In 2025, the Joplin Police Department was authorized for 115 sworn officer and 53 civilian positions in the police department. There are currently 17 jail employees and 20 dispatch employees. This makes 167 authorized employees that fall under the Police Department.

The main purpose of this information is to get as much information as possible out to the members of the Department to avoid unnecessary rumors, which have a negative effect on the Department. The Office of Internal Affairs understands and respects each individual employee's right to confidentiality and will uphold that standard. However, it is important that generic information be shared Department wide to provide expectations and equality for every employee. The Office of Internal Affairs will assure you that each complaint will be investigated in accordance with department policy and as expeditiously as possible.

As illustrated in SOG 2-08, Internal Affairs, I have listed the disposition classifications of internal investigations for your convenience. Disposition classifications are as follows:

1. Unfounded - no truth to allegations.
2. Exonerated - allegations true but result of adherence to proper and appropriate procedures and techniques.
3. Not sustained - unable to verify the truth of the matters under investigation.
4. Sustained - allegations true.
5. Policy Failure - The allegation is true, but employee's action was not inconsistent with policy and there is an indication of a need for policy review and revision.
6. Withdrawn – Complainant withdraws their complaint.
7. Inactivated – There is not enough information to investigate and no way of obtaining more information. The case may have to be inactivated until more information is available.

Complaints Received

The following is a breakdown of all complaints received by Internal Affairs for 2025:


- 45 complaints were received.
- 8 complaints were generated by citizens.
- 39 complaints were generated within the agency.
- 29 complaints were sustained or partially sustained.
- 16 complaints resulted in findings that were other than sustained.
- JPD received an average of 1.5 citizen complaints per month.
- JPD received an average of 3.25 internal complaints per month.

In 2025, the Joplin Police Department responded to 79,532 calls for service. Included in that number is 15,402 vehicle stops. JPD Officers made 4,696 arrests resulting in 11,034 charges.

In 2024, the Joplin Police Department responded to 79,571 calls for service. Included in that number is 12,648 vehicle stops. JPD Officers made 4,642 arrests resulting in 10,779 charges.

Early Warning System

In addition, a comprehensive Personnel Early Warning System is an essential component of a well-managed law enforcement agency. The Joplin Police Department is committed to this concept, and I have implemented threshold limits into our Internal Affairs software (IA Pro) to manage this process. As a result of threshold limits recommended by the officers of the department and set by the Chief of Police, officers' activities will be reviewed (by their immediate supervisor) when threshold limits are met. The threshold limits have been set as follows, to cover a twelve (12) month period; Citizen Complaints = 3, Use of Force = 12, Pursuits = 4, Bias Based Profiling = 1, and Vehicle Crashes = 2. The purpose of the Personnel Early Warning System shall be a means to identify and assess employees' performance in high-risk incidents and intervene where appropriate.



Investigations (Quarterly Breakdown)

FIRST QUARTER INVESTIGATIONS

14 Investigations (11 internal complaints received, 3 citizen complaints received)

Complaint Type	***Results***	***Investigator***
Training Violation	Sustained	Supervisor
Fail to Complete Reports	Sustained	Supervisor
Fail to Complete Reports	Sustained	Supervisor
Rules of Conduct	Sustained	IA
Late for Duty	Sustained	Supervisor
Training Violation	Sustained	Supervisor
Vehicle Operations	Sustained	IA
Safeguard Property	Sustained	IA
Safeguard Property	Sustained	Supervisor
Lost Property	Sustained	Supervisor
Vehicle Operations	Exonerated	IA
Damage to City Property	Sustained	Supervisor
Rules of Conduct	Sustained	IA
Administrative Review	Sustained	IA

SECOND QUARTER INVESTIGATIONS

10 Investigations (7 internal complaints received, 3 citizen complaints received)

Complaint Type	***Results***	***Investigator***
Damage to City Property	Sustained	Supervisor
Vehicle Operations	Sustained	IA
Damage to City Property	Sustained	Supervisor
Insubordination	Sustained	IA
Missing or Late for Duty	Sustained	Supervisor
Rules of Conduct	Sustained	IA
Racial Profiling	Exonerated	IA
Excessive Force	Unfounded	IA
Law Violation	Unfounded	IA
Rules of Conduct	Sustained	IA

THIRD QUARTER INVESTIGATIONS

7 Investigations (6 internal complaints received, 1 citizen complaint received)

Complaint Type	***Results***	***Investigator***
Lost Property	Sustained	Supervisor
Fail to Perform Duties	Sustained	IA
Vehicle Operations	Sustained	IA
Vehicle Operations	Sustained	Supervisor
Lost Property	Sustained	Supervisor
Rudeness	Exonerated	IA
Law Violation	Sustained	IA

FOURTH QUARTER INVESTIGATIONS

6 Investigations (5 internal complaints received, 1 citizen complaint received.


Complaint Type	***Results***	***Investigator***
Rights Violation	Sustained	Supervisor
Vehicle Operations	Sustained	Supervisor
Rules of Conduct	Sustained	Supervisor
Vehicle Operations	Unfounded	IA
Rules of Conduct	Sustained	Supervisor
Failure to Secure Property	Sustained	IA

The following is a breakdown of Bias-Based complaints received for the year 2025:

- 2 Complaint received based on Race
- 0 Complaints received based on Gender
- 0 Complaints received based on Religion
- 0 Complaints received based on Economic Status
- 0 Complaints received based on Age
- 0 Complaints received based on Ethnicity
- 0 Complaints received based on Sexual Orientation

*****It should be noted that there may be more complaint types and investigations than actual complaints received. This is a result of multiple employees being investigated for one complaint form.**

Types of Discipline



***If you see a disciplinary action that does not seem to fit the violation, keep in mind that it may be due to the severity of the case, or it could be a progressive level of discipline.**

Crashes and Pursuit Policy

In case of crash or damage to any department vehicle, the driver will immediately request the on-duty supervisor be notified. The supervisor will initiate an investigation, and the crash investigator will report the crash using the State-approved crash form. A Crash/Pursuit Review Board will then review all crashes and pursuits involving Police Department employees and vehicles.

The Crash/Pursuit Review Board is the body responsible for reviewing completed officer involved crash and pursuit reports. The Crash/Pursuit Review Board will review each report to ensure compliance with department policy and forward their findings to the Office of Internal Affairs. The Office of Internal Affairs, or his/her designee, will review the Crash/Pursuit Boards findings and initiate an investigation if appropriate. The Crash/Pursuit Review Board is a panel of three officers consisting of the Traffic Sergeant and two designees.

For tracking purposes, crashes in a city vehicle and pursuits are separated from internal and citizen complaints and are categorized in the following manner.

Vehicle Crashes

During 2025 there were 12 officer involved crashes in a city vehicle. Of those crashes, 5 of the officers were determined by the Crash Review Board to be at fault.

First Quarter Crash Discipline

Violation	***Discipline***
Vehicle Operation	**Counseling**

Second Quarter Crash Discipline

Violation	***Discipline***
Vehicle Operation	**Counseling**
Vehicle Operation	**Counseling**

Third Quarter Crash Discipline

Violation	***Discipline***

Fourth Quarter Crash Discipline

Violation	***Discipline***
Vehicle Operation	**Counseling**
Vehicle Operation	**Termination**

Pursuits

During 2025 there were 28 officer involved pursuits. Of the 28 pursuits involving officers, 3 officers were disciplined for policy violations related to the pursuits.

First Quarter Pursuit Discipline

Violation	***Discipline***
N/A	

Second Quarter Pursuit Discipline

Violation	***Discipline***
Vehicle Operations	**Counseling**

Third Quarter Pursuit Discipline

Violation	***Discipline***
Vehicle Operations	**Counseling**
Vehicle Operations	**Counseling**

Fourth Quarter Pursuit Discipline

Violation	***Discipline***
N/A	

***If you see a disciplinary action that does not seem to fit the violation, keep in mind that it may be due to the severity of the case or it could be a progressive level of discipline.**