The request for the camera files

Selected correspondence and file records for the October 31, 2025 encounter

April 9–15, 2026 · CSPD acknowledges the request

The Digital Evidence Management Unit identified April 9 as the request date and linked it to tickets E1481688 and E1481689.

April 15, 7:43 a.m. MDT. CSPD wrote, “Since the associated criminal court case is active and open, we are unable to release the body worn camera footage through our department at this time.” The unit directed the requester to municipal discovery.

April 15, 7:48 a.m. MDT. The unit wrote, “Please have your attorney request discovery through the link provided, as discovery will not be provided directly to you if you have counsel on record.”

April 20 and May 16 · Dates on the copies

Two copies of the recording labeled 11:32, camera D01A8177S, carry April 20 client-modified timestamps and May 16 server-modified timestamps in the Wingo Dropbox archive. Those dates establish that copies were present there by May 16. The date and method of first delivery remain open.

Each 11:32 copy is 144,380,101 bytes. Their Dropbox content hashes match. An archive copy labeled 11:34, camera D01A9291A, has the same April 20 and May 16 date pair.

What an independent examiner can still test

The matching content hashes identify identical bytes in the two 11:32 archive copies. Establishing how an agency copy was produced requires the camera-original media or agency master, evidence ID, agency hash and the evidence system’s export, redaction and audit history. These records would also document authorized edits, if any.

Dropbox content hash, both D01A8177S copies

c223ef9e821733fbc03489df632b48e2e51187459f2eb0f077446fcf93c367cf