



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: MAY 19, 2025

FROM: INTERIM DEPUTY DIRECTOR NELSON R. LEESE (ON BEHALF OF INTERIM DIRECTOR BONNIE GLENN)
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

CASE NUMBER: 2024OPA-0449

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	5.001 - Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL 10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional	Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
# 2	5.140 - Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2 Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing	Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)

Named Employee #2

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	5.001 - Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL 10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional	Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
# 2	5.140 - Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2 Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing	Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

On November 27, 2024, SPD officers, including Named Employee #1 (NE#1) and Named Employee #2 (NE#2), responded to a call about an alleged dog attack on the Complainant. The officers spoke with the Complainant and the other involved party, Community Member #1 (CM#1). Afterwards, officers determined the matter was civil and that no injury occurred. The Complainant alleged the named employees were unprofessional and engaged in bias-based policing by accusing her of being "mentally ill," mocking her, and making inaccurate statements.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

This case was approved for Expedited Investigation. That means OPA, with the Office of Inspector General's (OIG) agreement, believed it could issue recommended findings based solely on its intake investigation without interviewing the named employees. As such, OPA did not interview the named employees in this case.

On January 9, 2025, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

OPA reviewed all relevant documentation and body-worn video (BWV) for this incident. BWV showed officers, including NE#1 and NE#2, respond to the incident and interact with both the Complainant and CM#1. The Complainant



alleged CM#1's dog attacked her and stated she had a dog phobia. The Complainant showed NE#1 her putative injuries. Context from BWV appeared to show that the Complainant had no injuries. In her complaint, the Complainant referred to officers needing "microscopic" eyes to rule out any "small injuries inside." The Complainant also provided OPA photographs of her arms and legs from the date of the incident; however, no injuries were evident from these photographs. Officers informed the Complainant the issue was a civil matter and advised her to contact the building's leasing office. They further assisted her by asking CM#1 for her dog's vaccination records, which confirmed the dog had been properly vaccinated. Although NE#2 discussed mental health issues and the commonplace presence of dogs living in apartment buildings in the U.S. with the Complainant, he appeared to do so from a place of empathy or education rather than bias or unprofessionalism.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 — Allegation #1

5.001 — Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL 10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional

The Complainant alleged the officers were unprofessional.

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.

BWV did not show either named employee accusing the Complainant of being mentally ill, mocking her, or making inaccurate statements. To the extent anything mental health was discussed, the context showed it was done from a place of empathy and education. BWV did not show either officer behave in an unprofessional or biased manner.

Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited)**

Named Employee #1 — Allegation #2

5.140 — Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2 Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing

The Complainant alleged that the named employees were biased against her by accusing her of being "mentally ill," mocking her, and making inaccurate statements.

SPD policy prohibits biased policing, which it defines as "the different treatment of any person by officers motivated by any characteristic of protected classes under state, federal, and local laws as well other discernible personal characteristics of an individual." SPD Policy 5.140-POL. This includes different treatment due to any mental illness of the subject. *See id.* Officers are forbidden from both, (i) making decisions or taking actions influenced by bias, and (ii) expressing any prejudice or derogatory comments concerning personal characteristics. *See* SPD Policy 5.140-POL-2.

For the reasons set forth above at Named Employee #1, Allegation #1, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited)**



Named Employee #2 — Allegation #1

5.001 — Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL 10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional

For the reasons set forth above at Named Employee #1, Allegation #1, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited)**

Named Employee #2 — Allegation #2

5.140 — Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2 Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing

For the reasons set forth above at Named Employee #1, Allegation #1, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited)**