

**Issued Date:** January 8, 2026

**From:** Director Bonnie Glenn  
Office of Police Accountability



**Case Number: 2023OPA-0273**

---

## **Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings**

### **Named Employee #1**

- 1. Allegation #1: 5.001 - Standards and Duties POL-2. Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy, and Department Policy**

**Finding:** Sustained

- 2. Allegation #2: 5.001 - Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL 10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional.**

**Finding:** Sustained

- **Proposed Discipline: One Day (9 Hours) to 3 Days (27 Hours) Suspension**
    - **Imposed Discipline: No Discipline Imposed**
- 

**This Closed Case Summary (CCS) represents the opinion of the OPA Director regarding the misconduct alleged and therefore sections may be written in the first person.**

### **Executive Summary:**

It was alleged that Named Employee #1 (NE#1) failed to report that his minor daughter (Daughter) was sexually abused over a lengthy period of time by Daughter's older brother, NE#1's son (Son). It was alleged NE#1's failure to report violated Washington's mandatory reporting law (RCW 26.44.030) and SPD's professionalism policy.

### **Administrative Note:**

The timeline of this case was significantly challenged by a miscommunication from the information provided to OPA by the Marysville Police Department (MPD). OPA was contacted by the Complainant—an MPD Sergeant—on June 20, 2023. The Complainant requested a phone call regarding a case, "that involved the children of a Seattle PD [employee]." OPA contacted the

Complainant the next day and learned MPD was investigating Son for sexually assaulting Daughter. An OPA investigator documented that MPD, “believes that [NE#1] had knowledge of the assault in October of 2022 and his status of a Police Officer makes him a mandatory reporter who did not report.” An OPA investigator emailed the Complainant the same day writing: “We recently spoke on the phone about a Marysville PD case that may involve Seattle Police employee and/or their family *and possible failure to report as a mandatory reporter.*” (emphasis added). The Complainant responded the next day with the “initial” police report, noting it was “an active investigation with our agency and a detective has been assigned the case.” On June 30, 2023, OPA tolled its investigation and sent a formal letter to MPD noting, among other things, that OPA had received a complaint alleging, “possible criminal misconduct *by a Seattle Police Department (SPD) officer* in Marysville, WA.” (emphasis added). OPA also wrote that the complaint was being sent to MPD for “criminal investigation consideration.” MPD acknowledged receipt and provided the name of the detective assigned.

Thereafter, OPA regularly requested updates from MPD and, later, the Snohomish County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office (SCPAO). On August 8, 2023, an OPA representative emailed SCPAO noting their role tracking criminal referrals that involve SPD employees, cited the MPD case number and noting it involved NE#1. The SCPAO responded the “case has been referred to our office and is in the queue for assignment and review.” SCPAO noted their significant backlog, but stated the case was requested for, “an accelerated track.” OPA continued to regularly request updates from SCPAO. On April 14, 2025, SCPAO informed OPA that their office had never been considering criminal allegations against NE#1, but that any criminal allegations related to RCW 26.44.080, as a gross misdemeanor, would have been handled by Municipal Prosecutors. OPA immediately sought clarification from MPD that same day. On May 29, 2025, MPD confirmed by formal memorandum that neither MPD nor SCPAO had ever considered investigating or charging NE#1, writing in relevant part:

It was previously understood by the Office of Police Accountability that there was an active investigation involving [NE#1]. However, there was a miscommunication between our office and the information provided to you.

....

A review of the case report indicated that upon learning of the incident, [NE#1] took appropriate corrective action. The disclosure of the sexual assault involving his daughter was made during [medical treatment with a different mandatory reporter].

OPA restarted its administrative investigation on May 29, 2025. OPA takes the position that MPD notified OPA directly about this incident because of concerns NE#1 may not have timely reported the allegation of sexual abuse in a timely manner as required by law. OPA then explicitly referred the allegations of potential criminal misconduct by NE#1 to the MPD, which had appropriate jurisdiction. OPA diligently followed up with both MPD and SCPAO and, at every stage, was clear it was tracking its criminal referral related to NE#1’s potential criminal misconduct. When it learned this was potentially not the case, OPA immediately sought clarification. OPA was formally notified

by MPD that no such investigation had taken place, or was being considered, on May 29, 2025, and OPA restarted its administrative investigation the same day.

On October 10, 2025, the Office of Inspector General (OIG) certified this case as timely but declined to certify this case as thorough or objective. OIG based its decision to decline to certify as thorough because, during his OPA interview, NE#1 stated he was unaware of his obligation as a mandatory reporter of sexual assault. OIG expressed concerns about a lack of follow-up questions concerning how he was unaware of this obligation, that OPA did not obtain NE#1's training records on this subject, and that OPA did not follow up on "indicators in the BWV of the Marysville officer that the NE was aware of the need to report and his conflict about that need." OIG based its decision not to certify this case as objective because OIG assessed OPA's questions as leading. Separately, OIG felt OPA should not have "altered or excluded" questions during its interview following objections raised by NE#1's SPOG representative.

OPA sought information from SPD's Education and Training Section (ETS) concerning any training NE#1 might have received concerning his statutory obligation to report child abuse. See RCW 26.44.030. An ETS representative informed OPA there was no such specific training. OPA also reviewed SPD Policy 15.220 – Child Welfare. OPA noted the policy did not instruct officers that they are mandatory reporters. OPA resubmitted the case to OIG. On October 24, 2025, OIG maintained its partial certification, noting that OPA did not contact "Legal or BLEA and no notation of other courses in Cornerstone which may address sworn personnel's reporting obligation[.]"

Thereafter, OPA sought training records from the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission (CJTC) concerning the training offered at the Basic Law Enforcement Academy (BLEA) from 2014, when NE#1 attended BLEA. OPA supplemented their investigation with these records and resubmitted the case to OIG. On November 6, 2015, OIG certified OPA's investigation as timely and thorough, but OIG maintained the case could not be certified as objective.

OPA recognizes it could have sought ETS records earlier or more forcefully clarified the potential anomaly in NE#1's statement that he was unaware of his statutorily mandated reporting obligation. However, OPA respectfully disagrees with OIG's determination that this investigation was an unobjective investigation. OPA took these allegations with the gravest seriousness, referring them for criminal investigation and diligently pursuing its administrative investigation. OPA also recognizes the traumatic and highly personal nature of this entire incident for his Daughter, other family members and NE#1. OPA was also cognizant of its role—investigating administrative misconduct allegations—and how this could potentially impact related criminal proceedings. OPA targeted its interview with NE#1 to seek relevant information, protect the privacy of family members who were uninvolved or minors, and provide NE#1 with a fair opportunity to provide his account. Ultimately, OPA believes it conducted a fair, objective, and legally sufficient investigation.

## **Summary of the Investigation:**

OPA investigated this allegation by reviewing the initial complaint documents, the MPD initial case incident report, MPD body-worn video (BWV), and emails and correspondence. OPA also interviewed NE#1.

## *Marysville Police Department Investigation*

On June 5, 2023, MPD received a report from the Washington State Department of Children, Youth & Families (DCYF). The DCYF paperwork indicated it received a phone report on June 5, 2023, at 12:28 PM, from a medical provider who was a mandatory reporter. The DCYF report documented that Daughter—a minor—disclosed to the medical provider that Son sexually abused her over a number of years. Son and Daughter have NE#1 as a parent-in common. Son is about eight years older than Daughter. The reported abuse began when Son was a minor but reportedly continued until Daughter was about fifteen years old and Son was about twenty-three years old. The medical provider noted that Daughter stated, “her parents know and her brother is in therapy.”

MPD opened a criminal investigation. MPD Officer #1 investigated and spoke with Daughter on June 8, 2023. Daughter reported the abuse to MPD Officer #1 and asked MPD Officer #1 to return after NE#1 could be present. MPD Officer #1 agreed. MPD Officer #1 and MPD Officer #2 responded later and spoke with NE#1 and Daughter. Their conversation was recorded on BWV and documented in MPD Officer #1’s report. NE#1 told MPD Officer #1 that in “October of 2022,” Daughter first informed him and his wife of the sexual abuse. BWV, recorded on June 8, 2023, depicted the following:

NE#1 stated he only knew what Daughter told him, her mother, and her medical provider. NE#1 stated Daughter told him “back in October,” and the abuse started when Daughter was about nine and continued until she was about fifteen. NE#1 noted that Son moved out years prior after he turned eighteen. NE#1 stated, “So, but I had no idea. What I, cause I’m, you know, was kind of at a conflict right. Cause this is my kids. And she was telling us that. I mentioned something like, ‘well, this has to be reported.’” NE#1 noted that, in response to his mentioning the need to report the abuse, Daughter, “fucking lost it,” describing Daughter falling on the floor, crying, and saying Son could not “get in trouble.”

NE#1 noted Daughter’s mental health challenges and crises, stating, “And the last thing that I wanted to do was contribute to that. So, I left that entirely in her hands, if she wanted to go to the authorities, what not. But I wanted her to divulge that to her counselor.” NE#1 noted that this seemed like a “lightbulb” for underlying reasons for certain mental health conditions. NE#1 reiterated that “this came to light in October.” MPD Officer #2 clarified, “The confrontation, that was eight months ago, October?” NE#1 confirmed that it was in October.

NE#1 also stated that he had not informed Son’s mother—NE#1’s ex-wife—about the sexual abuse. NE#1 stated that he did not want to alienate Son from all family contact. NE#1 confirmed that Son’s mother currently had a minor daughter with a different father. NE#1 stated that he confronted Son about the allegations, Son confirmed Daughter’s allegations but denied he abused anyone else. NE#1 stated he believed Son’s denials that anyone else was involved, specifically because Son admitted all of Daughter’s allegations. NE#1 stated, “this is something I struggle with, right? I mean, my career, and now this, I’m faced with my kids, right, this is very conflicting for me, I mean, I’m in a tight spot, right? It was hard. So, alls I wanted was for my daughter to get

better and to cut that communication with him. Umm. And it took a long time for her to ever talk to her counselors about [unintelligible], she did not want to say his name.”

NE#1 reiterated that Daughter, “made it very clear to us, if anything happens to him...it’s not going to be good. It’s, it’s been such a battle just trying to get her better.” NE#1 stated, “I’m just trying to do the best by her. Getting her help and keeping her safe is what I need to do.” NE#1 opined that he thought Daughter’s principle concern was whether Son would get in trouble.

Daughter also spoke to MPD officers on BWV on June 8, 2023. She articulated that she did not even want to report the abuse, that it “slipped out” when speaking to a medical professional, which led to the CPS report. Daughter reiterated that she did not want anything to happen to Son.

#### *OPA Interview – Named Employee #1*

OPA interviewed NE#1 on September 9, 2025. NE#1 stated he has worked for SPD for over twelve years and has no prior law enforcement experience.

NE#1 said he was employed as a law enforcement officer when he learned about the abuse but was not on duty at the time. He confirmed the reported nature of the abuse and that it began when Daughter was about nine years old and continued for about six years.

NE#1 denied knowing that, as a sworn law enforcement officer, he had a duty to report the allegations. NE#1 acknowledged telling Daughter that the sexual abuse had to be reported. He noted he was unclear on the timeline, but that the day she first told him about the abuse was the day he told her it needed to be reported. NE#1’s recollection for how he phrased it was, “I said out loud to my wife that I don’t know what department to call, either Everett or Marysville. And my daughter lost all composure, control, and fell down on the floor, and started screaming and crying, ‘Dad don’t call the police.’” NE#1 described his reasons for being concerned about Daughter’s welfare. NE#1 stated that, when Daughter regained her composure, he told her, “We’ve got to tell your counselor. We’ve got to tell your counselor now.” NE#1 described telling Daughter that medical providers “would call law enforcement.” NE#1 stated he knew that, “Doctors and counselors and school counselors had a duty to report that if, in their official capacity, that they’d heard that.”

NE#1 stated he did not call MPD to report the alleged abuse. He noted, “We talked to the counselor that she had been talking to, her counselor. It was either that, it was either that night or the next day. I don’t remember exactly when.” NE#1 confirmed that June 8, 2023, was the first time he spoke with MPD about the sex abuse allegations. NE#1 recalled when they talked to the counselor, “she did tell us, she told all three of us that she was a mandatory reporter, that she would be reporting that to CPS. And CPS would probably be calling the local law enforcement agency.” NE#1 could not remember if this conversation took place in October, stating, “I don’t remember the...I don’t remember the specific date. I’m not sure what I’m even...why I had said October. I didn’t know that those were dates that I needed to remember.”

NE#1 and his Guild Representative argued that NE#1 met the requirements of RCW 26.44.030 because NE#1 reported the sexual abuse to the counselor, who was a mandatory reporter, with the intent that this would be reported to law enforcement.

### *BLEA Training Materials*

OPA received training materials from CJTC dating from NE#1's time at BLEA. Included was a PowerPoint presentation, "Facilitator Guide," and 337-page "Criminal Law Student Resource Guide." The PowerPoint showed a learning objective as "List who qualifies as a Mandatory Reporter," and a later slide had the question, "When can/should we call CPS?" The Facilitator Guide lists the mandatory reporters as a main topic of the session, as well as a reference encouraging students to utilize a mandatory reporter website. The Student Resource Guide listed law enforcement as mandatory reports.

---

## **Analysis and Conclusions:**

### **Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1**

#### ***5.001 – Standards and Duties POL-2. Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy, and Department Policy***

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 violated RCW 26.44.030 by failing to report his Daughter's abuse allegations to either the proper law enforcement agency or to the Department of Children, Youth, and Families.

SPD Policy 5.001-POL-2 requires that employees adhere to laws, City policy, and Department policy. RCW 26.44.030 requires that "any . . . law enforcement officer . . . has reasonable cause to believe that a child has suffered abuse or neglect, he or she shall report such incident, or cause a report to be made, to the proper law enforcement agency or to the department[.]" RCW 26.44.030(1)(a). The report must be made "at the first opportunity" but not later than forty-eight hours after the mandatory reporter has "reasonable cause" about the abuse, and the report "must include the identity of the accused if known." RCW 26.44.030(1)(g). "Abuse or neglect" includes sexual abuse; the "department" means the Washington State Department of Children and Families. RCW 26.44.020. "Reasonable cause" means a person "witnesses or receives a credible written or oral report alleging abuse, including sexual contact, or neglect of a child." RCW 26.44.030(1)(b)(iii). Failure to report as required is a gross misdemeanor. RCW 26.44.080.

OPA finds by “more than a preponderance of the evidence,” see SPOG CBA 3.1, that NE#1 failed to report Daughter’s allegations in compliance with state law and, so, violated SPD Policy 5.001-POL-2. NE#1—a law enforcement officer—had reasonable cause to believe his minor child had suffered abuse after she reported it to him around October 2022. Even if he told Daughter to report it to her counselor that same day—which is not clear from the evidence—OPA finds that this was either not reported to the Counselor, or not reported in sufficient detail, until June 5, 2023, the date the DCYF paperwork indicates the medical provider timely fulfilled their statutory reporting obligation. As NE#1 appeared to tell the MPD officers, it took Daughter “a long time” to report the incident to her counselors because she did not want to say Son’s name and she was extremely concerned Son would get in trouble. When pressed, NE#1 stated he could not recall the date that Daughter actually reported the incident to her medical provider, who immediately stated they would report it to law enforcement.

OPA recognizes there does not appear to be any carve out or safe harbor in the law for parents who are also law enforcement officers. OPA also recognizes that NE#1 was put into an extremely challenging situation where he—very understandably—felt compelled to balance the needs of his children with the mandates of Washington State law and his professional obligations. OPA recognizes the weight of NE#1’s predicament. But the law’s restrictive nature also appears designed to remove this kind of discretion from NE#1 and prevent exactly the sort of delay that occurred here: Son’s alleged child abuse went unreported to the appropriate law enforcement agency for about eight months, during which time Son presumably continued to have access to at least one other minor—his mother’s minor daughter. Even taking NE#1 at his word that he was unaware he was a mandatory reporter, his present lack of knowledge of the specifics of this criminal law is not exculpatory.

But also, at the very least, NE#1’s statements on BWV and to OPA show, (i) he was aware there was a law requiring some categories of people to report sex abuse, (ii) his immediate reaction on hearing the allegations was that it needed to be reported to law enforcement, (iii) his immediate reaction was to debate which jurisdiction was the appropriate one to report to, and (iv) he spoke about how his career put him in a difficult position. At the very least, NE#1 was sufficiently on notice of the law that he should have made some effort to ascertain what his obligations were.

Separately, the BLEA records corroborate that NE#1 received training on this topic while at the academy. Even recognizing this training occurred over a decade prior to this incident, this would further corroborate that NE#1 was on notice of the mandatory reporting laws, even if he forgot certain details over the intervening years.

Ultimately, NE#1 decided to leave the decision about reporting this allegation of lengthy child sex abuse by his adult son to the discretion of his minor daughter. Washington State law required that he—an adult law enforcement officer—affirmatively report this to MPD, DCYF, or cause it to be reported. NE#1 did not, and this allegation should be Sustained.

Separately, OPA observed that SPD Policy 15.220 – Child Welfare does not reference sworn employees’ status as mandatory reporters. Instead, SPD Policy references sworn employees’ obligations, “when a child is taken into custody on the report of [child abuse.]” Although this does not change OPA’s finding that NE#1 was on notice of his obligation, OPA issues a separate Management Action Recommendation for SPD to make this obligation explicit in policy.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**

### **Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2**

#### ***5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL 10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional.***

It was alleged that NE#1’s failure to report allegations of child abuse undermined public trust in NE#1.

SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10 requires that SPD employees “strive to be professional.” The policy further instructs that “employees may not engage in behavior that undermines public trust in the Department, the officer, or other officers” whether on or off duty. SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10.

OPA’s finding, by more than a preponderance of the evidence, that NE#1 failed to conform to the law in this case would be sufficient, on its own, to sustain a separate allegation that NE#1’s conduct was undermining to public trust. But even if OPA were unable to meet the elevated standard articulated in SPOG CBA 3.1 or show each element of RCW 26.44.030—which it can—the evidence is substantial that NE#1 engaged in conduct that diminishes public trust. Confronted with felony allegations that the law takes so seriously it requires broad categories of people through risk of separate criminal penalty to report, NE#1—an adult, sworn law enforcement officer—opted to leave the decision of whether to report to his minor child. NE#1 also opted not to inform Son’s mother of the allegations, despite knowing she had another minor daughter. NE#1 based this decision on his trust that Son was honest when he told him no other children were involved. But he also had additional information: according to NE#1, Son confessed to Daughter’s allegations. Not reporting Son’s admitted criminal activity was not appropriate in this situation.

Also, even if OPA accepted that NE#1 fulfilled his legal obligations by telling Daughter to report her allegations to her mental health provider—which it does not—the fact that NE#1 would have known no law enforcement action was taken over the intervening eight-month period should have prompted him to do more.

NE#1 was confronted with an immeasurably difficult situation, learning that his son was alleged to have sexually abused his minor daughter. OPA recognizes NE#1’s deep concern for his daughter, his family, and for the entire situation. OPA acknowledges the professional predicament the law and SPD policy placed NE#1 in under these difficult circumstances. But OPA also cannot say NE#1 complied with the law or policy, or that his noncompliance was not willful in review of the

totality of the circumstances, based on the evidence provided. Even if well meaning, NE#1 appeared to have considered the implications of the law, policy, and undermined public trust by failing to report.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**