

DISCIPLINE OBJECTION

To: Chief Lisa Davis, Austin Police
From: Director Gail McCant, Austin Police Oversight
Date: April 15, 2026
Subject: 2025-2482 Discipline Objection

Dear Chief Davis:

On October 19, 2025, Austin Police Oversight (APO) received an anonymous online complaint, #2025-2482, alleging that Austin Police Department (APD) Officer Garritt McGraw, AP9087, had made an inappropriate social media post stating he was “pro running over protesters in the street”.

On October 23, 2025, the complaint was forwarded to APD Internal Affairs Division as a Notice of Complaint without a formal affidavit due to the nature of the allegations.

Disposition by APD Chain of Command

On March 12, 2026, APO was notified that IAD had forwarded their completed summary to Officer McGraw’s chain of command. On April 9, 2026, APO was notified that the complaint was closed and that Officer McGraw had received an Oral Reprimand. The chain of command made the following findings:

- 972.4 Prohibited Speech, Expression and Conduct: **Sustained**
- 900.3.2 Acts Bringing Discredit Upon the Department: **Unfounded**

APO Disposition Objection:

Upon reviewing the investigative file, I believe that IAD conducted a straightforward, unbiased investigation that collected and analyzed the pertinent information regarding the incident. However, given the context of the social media post, I object to the discipline and the Unfounded finding issued by Officer McGraw’s chain of command.

The screenshot posted by Officer McGraw states, “I’m not pro violence but the snot nose lib moved quick this morning blocking the road when I didn’t slow down coming in. I’m very very pro hit a roadblock with my F250.”

During his IAD interview, Officer McGraw confirmed he has a private Facebook account he has maintained since high school and stated his comment was meant to be comical between him and his family. When asked if he believed he was responsible for ensuring the content he posts does not reflect negatively on the Department, Officer McGraw acknowledged he was and stated, “I grew up

DISCIPLINE OBJECTION

in Austin, so people know I'm a police officer, so I have to act professionally because they know my background."

When asked to explain his reasoning and how the public could perceive his comment, Officer McGraw affirmed the comment was an off-the-cuff remark between him and his family and friends but acknowledged it could be interpreted negatively. Officer McGraw further explained the comment could be interpreted to mean he has violent intentions, which is untrue.

During his IAD interview, Officer McGraw admitted to violating APD Policy 972.4, Prohibited Speech, Expression, and Conduct, and APD Policy 900.3.2, Acts Bringing Discredit Upon the Department. Officer McGraw stated, *"I believe that what I said in hindsight could be viewed negatively towards not only me as a police officer but the department."*

After reviewing the IAD digital case file, I believe Officer McGraw's comments reflect poorly on the Austin Police Department, and he failed to uphold the standard of professionalism expected of officers who serve the community. I recommend a finding of Sustained for GO 972.4, Prohibited Speech, Expression, and Conduct, and 900.3.2, Acts Bringing Discredit Upon the Department, and that Officer McGraw should receive discipline of a **Written Reprimand**.

In compliance with Section 2-15-5(B) of the City Code, I request that the Chief "provide a detailed public, written explanation if the Chief does not follow a recommendation of the Office of Police Oversight to impose discipline."

Sincerely,



Gail McCant
Director
Austin Police Oversight