

**Issued Date:** February 6, 2026

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



**Case Number: 2025OPA-0116**

---

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

### **Named Employee #1**

1. **Allegation #1: 5.001 - Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL 11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication**  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded
  2. **Allegation #2: 5.001 - Standards and Duties POL-2. Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy, and Department Policy, 5.001 - Standards and Duties**  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded
  3. **Allegation #3: 5.001-POL 10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional**  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded
  4. **Allegation #4: 4.020 – Reporting and Recording Overtime/Out of Classification Pay 4.020-POL-1 Civilians, Officers, Detectives, Sergeants, and Lieutenants 4. Supervisor Responsibilities for Monitoring Overtime Use**  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded
- 

### **Named Employee #2**

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
3. **Allegation #3: 5.001 - Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL 11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication**  
**Finding:** Sustained

- **Proposed Discipline: Two Hundred Seventy Hours (30 Days) Suspension to Termination**
    - **Imposed Discipline: Resigned Prior to Discipline**
- 

### **Named Employee #3**

- 1. Allegation #1: 5.001 - Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL 11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication**  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded
  - 2. Allegation #2: 5.001 - Standards and Duties POL-2. Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy, and Department Policy, 5.001 - Standards and Duties**  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded
  - 3. Allegation #3: 5.001-POL 10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional**  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded
  - 4. Allegation #4: 4.020 – Reporting and Recording Overtime/Out of Classification Pay 4.020-POL-1 Civilians, Officers, Detectives, Sergeants, and Lieutenants 4. Supervisor Responsibilities for Monitoring Overtime Use**  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded
- 

### **Named Employee #4**

- 1. Allegation #1: 5.001 - Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL 11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication**  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded
  - 2. Allegation #2: 5.001 - Standards and Duties POL-2. Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy, and Department Policy, 5.001 - Standards and Duties**  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded
  - 3. Allegation #3: 5.001-POL 10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional**  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded
  - 4. Allegation #4: 4.020 – Reporting and Recording Overtime/Out of Classification Pay 4.020-POL-1 Civilians, Officers, Detectives, Sergeants, and Lieutenants 4. Supervisor Responsibilities for Monitoring Overtime Use**  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded
- 

**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:**

An anonymous Complainant alleged Named Employee #2 (NE#2) had been committing time theft

by regularly leaving the precinct ninety minutes to two hours before the end of his overtime shift but claiming overtime for the entire shift.

During his OPA interview, NE#2 alleged multiple sergeants—NE#1, NE#3, and NE#4—had approved or otherwise sanctioned his actions.

### **Administrative Note:**

On December 4, 2025, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

### **Summary of the Investigation:**

On April 3, 2025, an anonymous Complainant filed a web-based OPA complaint alleging NE#2 had been working consistently augmenting second watch patrol several times per week over the past one or two years. The Complainant alleged that NE#2 was submitting overtime slips with a departure time of 9:00pm despite regularly leaving between 7:00pm and 7:30pm.

#### 1. Intake Investigation

OPA opened an intake investigation into the Complainant's allegations.

OPA reviewed NE#2's timecards from January 8, 2025, through April 5, 2025. These showed NE#2 worked forty-six second watch patrol augmentation shifts during this time. All forty-six overtime entries reflected the same work hours: 2:00pm to 9:00pm.

OPA reviewed NE#2's computer-aided dispatch (CAD) logs for the forty-six overtime shifts. OPA observed that NE#2 signed off from his mobile data terminal (MDT) between 7:00pm and 7:30pm on forty-five occasions. On one occasion NE#2 signed off at 7:40pm, which was the latest sign off time of all reviewed shifts.

On April 24, 2025, OPA requested facility security video for all nine of NE#2's overtime shifts during the thirty-day security video retention period (between March 24, 2025, through April 5, 2025). OPA observed video footage of NE#2 leaving his assigned precinct between 7:11pm and 7:25pm on all nine occasions.

OPA was able to email with the anonymous Complainant through an anonymized email the Complainant submitted with their complaint. The Complainant described noticing that NE#2 "disappeared" around the time of third watch roll call and that "people often made comments about it." The Complainant stated NE#2's personally owned vehicle "disappeared around 1900," and NE#2 was "gone from CAD." The Complainant described checking randomly and "it was always the case." The Complainant noted this would not be unusual except that NE#2 was "actually recording a dishonest end time on his overtime form." When asked about who would have been

aware of NE#2's conduct, the Complainant noted that some people would have been aware he was leaving early and others would have been aware he was claiming overtime until 9:00pm, but that there was likely a disconnect where the supervisor entering NE#2's work time would not necessarily have supervised the overtime shift, and so would not know when NE#2 stopped working.

## 2. Criminal Referral

Based on the evidence obtained during the intake, OPA referred this matter for criminal investigation on April 28, 2025, and paused its administrative investigation.

SPD assigned the matter to Detective #1 to investigate. Detective #1 reviewed the OPA intake investigation and evidence. Detective #1 also reviewed SPD policy, City of Seattle timekeeping rules, SPOG CBA provisions, Washington Administrative Code provisions for work breaks, and the Revised Code of Washington. Among other things, Detective #1 noted that for each overtime shift, an officer is entitled to a fifteen-minute break every four hours and a thirty-minute "lunch" break for any overtime shift longer than three hours. Detective #1 identified NE#2 worked 105 regular and overtime shifts between January 8, 2025, and April 8, 2025, and only logged sixteen breaks during that time. Detective #1 noted that officers are not required to log their breaks and interpreted Washington Administrative Code 296-126-092 to allow the lunch and break periods to be taken at any time within the shift.<sup>1</sup>

Detective #1 interviewed NE#3 as a witness for the criminal investigation. NE#3 confirmed she is a first watch supervisor. NE#3 stated she was not aware of any employees logging off earlier than the time they coded on their overtime sheets. NE#3 noted her employees are "all adults." Detective #1 wrote that NE#3 "insinuated" that she trusts her employees to record their time accurately. NE#3 denied giving NE#2 permission to leave early from overtime. NE#3 also denied being aware NE#2 was leaving early on the second watch overtime shifts she supervised.

Detective #1 interviewed NE#2, informing them they were the subject of a criminal investigation. NE#2 agreed to speak voluntarily. NE#2 stated they had worked as a police officer for thirty-four years and characterized their overtime hours as nothing abnormal. Detective #1 summarized NE#2's remarks as, "It is the accepted practice with permission from supervisors, other officers do it as well and it's the way it's always been." NE#2 stated he had been told to take his overtime to 9:00pm but to go home at 7:00pm. NE#2 stated NE#1 and NE#4 had previously given him permission and guidance to do this. NE#2 stated he worked with no break and had been working with his understanding for a couple of years. NE#1 also stated that another officer—later identified as Witness Employee #1 (WE#1)—had told him another sergeant, Witness Employee #2 (WE#2), had told him leaving early but signing out the overtime slip at 9:00pm was "the accepted and permitted practice."

Detective #1 interviewed NE#4. NE#4 stated he was a second watch supervisor at NE#2's precinct from 2022 through January 2025. NE#4 stated he did not recall giving anyone permission

to leave an overtime shift early but mark their overtime slip for a later time. NE#4 denied being aware of any common practice of doing so.

Detective #1 interviewed NE#1, who stated he was a second watch sergeant from 2022 to 2024. NE#1 stated he was aware of officers leaving early but claiming their full overtime shift with “permission or implied permission,” but that—at most—this would be forty-five minutes early. NE#1 described period when the chain of command would strictly enforce shift end times but then would “get lenient” and officers may leave between thirty to forty-five minutes early. NE#1 said he could not recall giving anyone permission to do so.

Detective #1 interviewed WE#2, a second watch sergeant. WE#2 described his understanding that lieutenants at his precinct allowed sergeants reasonable discretion to permit officers to leave early from their shifts. For second watch, WE#2 stated that normally this would be no earlier than 7:00pm—which is when third watch would have roll call—and would only be done with a supervisor’s permission.

Detective #1 reviewed the forty-six overtime shifts NE#2 worked from January 8 though April 8, 2025, and determined NE#2 marked his overtime until 9:00pm but left between 7:08pm and 7:40pm. Detective #1 calculated that, at NE#2’s overtime rate, forty-six unworked hours would amount to about \$5,149.

Detective #1 determined she could not find probable cause that NE#2 committed time theft due to his explanation that he was acting in accordance with a long-standing practice, which NE#1 and WE#2 at least partially corroborated. Detective #1 also wrote that NE#3’s description of the supervision structure also made it possible NE#2’s behavior was never corrected. Due to this, Detective #1 wrote she did not have proof NE#2 “willfully and wrongfully intended to deprive the city of services.”

Detective #1 sent her investigation to the King County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office (KCPOA) for review. KCPOA declined to file charges, writing:

This timecard discrepancy problem at [NE#2’s] Precinct appears to be prevalent. However, it appears to be more of an administrative rather than criminal matter. We hope that [NE#2’s] Precinct chooses to change its overtime practices and recoups the money it paid [NE#2] for time that he did not work. However, our office will not be filing criminal charges against NE#2.

### 3. OPA Investigation

After KCPOA declined to file criminal charges, OPA resumed its administrative investigation. OPA interviewed NE#2 on October 28, 2025 (discussed below). Based on information from NE#2’s interview, OPA added allegations against NE#1, NE#3, and NE#4, and interviewed them about those allegations. OPA also interviewed WE#1 and WE#2.

*a. Named Employee #2*

NE#2's OPA interview was broadly consistent with his criminal interview. NE#2 stated, "Sergeants have told all of us that augment basically go home when third watch goes into roll call and take your time all the way till nine o'clock." NE#2 stated that NE#1 and NE#4 specifically talked to him "multiple times about doing this." NE#2 stated that NE#3 augments second watch as a supervisor and know he puts in an end time of 9:00pm but leaves for home between 7:15pm and 7:20pm.

NE#2 also alleged that two other supervisors had advised him to request overtime for the entire shift even after this complaint was initiated. OPA is investigating those allegations in separate cases.

NE#2 stated he last spoke to NE#4 about this practice "sometime in 2024. Maybe early 2024." NE#2 stated that, when he informed NE#3 about the criminal investigation, NE#3 responded, "You got to be kidding me," and that it was standard practice to allow augmenters to leave as a way of saying "thank you." NE#2 also stated that, after the criminal investigation became known, another officer told him that he was going to continue claiming unworked overtime. This allegation is under separate investigation.

NE#2 also stated he had third-hand information that WE#2 had told officers to leave early but put in for a full overtime shift. NE#2 identified WE#1 as having more information about this.

*b. Witness Employee #2*

WE#2's OPA interview was broadly consistent with his criminal interview. WE#2 stated officers working second watch typically end their shift, "between 8:30 and 8:45." WE#2 stated he was not aware of any supervisors giving NE#2 permission to end his shift at or before 7:30pm but claim overtime pay through 9:00pm.

OPA asked WE#2 to elaborate on his statements to Detective #1 that supervisors had discretion to allow officers augmenting their shift to leave early. WE#2 stated that he would allow officers who were worked regular shifts at another precinct to leave early to allow them to return to their assigned precinct, change out, and finish their shift at their home precinct. WE#2 said he typically allowed about 45 minutes for this and always gave officer specific permission to do so. WE#2 stated he would not approve NE#2 leaving early from his home precinct.

*c. Witness Employee #1*

WE#1 denied ever discussing augmenters leaving early but claiming a full shift with WE#2. WE#1 stated it was not a common occurrence for augmenters to be released early.

*d. Named Employee #3*

NE#3's OPA interview was broadly consistent with her criminal interview. NE#3 stated she was not aware of NE#2 claiming unworked overtime.

OPA asked NE#3 about NE#2's allegation in his interview that, after telling her about the time theft investigation, NE#3 responded, "You got to be kidding me. Standard practices. We've always done this for you guys." NE#3 denied this was a standard practice. NE#3 recalled having a conversation with NE#2 about the time theft allegation, but she recalled responding, "oh my gosh."

NE#3 said that officers are permitted to sign out from their shifts thirty minutes before the end of their shift as a "general rule." See SPD Policy 12.010-POL-2(6) (requiring officers to remain available until 30 minutes before they end their shift). NE#3 described certain unique situations where an officer may sign out of CAD earlier than thirty minutes before the end of their shift but denied those situations would reoccur regularly.

*e. Named Employee #4*

NE#4's OPA interview was broadly consistent with his criminal interview. He denied giving NE#2 permission to leave after third watch roll call but mark his overtime slip until 9:00pm. NE#4 denied being aware of a common practice of augmenters leaving early but putting in for full overtime shifts. NE#4 stated that second watch officers were generally permitted to sign off CAD at 10:30pm and that the expectation was the same for augmenters and regularly assigned officers. NE#4 stated that there are circumstances where officers augmenting a shift need to leave more than thirty minutes early, but elaborated: "But the expectations would be, there would be, their time sheet would be accurate."

*f. Named Employee #1*

NE#1's OPA interview was broadly consistent with his criminal interview. He denied giving NE#2 permission to leave early but claim a full overtime shift. NE#1 described that officers are permitted to log out of CAD thirty minutes prior to the end of shift and that, at times, he allowed them to extend that by fifteen minutes, for a maximum of forty-five minutes. NE#1 stated it was his understanding that this was the practice department-wide and that giving officers "a few minutes" was a tool sergeants had if it was not busy. NE#1 stated such an extension, "would be very specific to that day, to that moment." NE#1 denied this would be blanket, ongoing permission.

## **Analysis and Conclusions:**

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

#### ***5.001 - Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL 11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication***

It was alleged that NE#1 was dishonest by allowing or encouraging subordinated to submit inaccurate time sheets.

SPD Policy 5.001-POL-11 requires Department employees to be truthful and complete in all communications.

OPA finds by a preponderance of the evidence that this allegation is unfounded. This allegation was classified because NE#2 stated NE#1 gave him permission to leave work between 7:15pm and 7:30pm but claim overtime through 9:00pm. NE#1 has not worked at the same precinct as NE#2 since May 2024. NE#1 also denied giving NE#2 such permission, instead stating that—on specific occasions—he allows officer to log out of work fifteen minutes early. NE#1 characterized this as a unique occurrence, not ongoing permission. Moreover, this is more consistent with the statements from the Complainant, witness employees, and named employees. None of the individuals OPA interviewed corroborated NE#2's characterization of a common practice of leaving ninety minutes to two hours early but claiming the full overtime shift.

Additionally, NE#1's practice—as described—would not rise to the level of dishonesty. SPD policy permits officers to log out of CAD thirty minutes prior to their scheduled end of shift. See SPD Policy 12.010-POL-2(6) (requiring officers to remain available until 30 minutes before they end their shift). As described by those interviewed, this is to allow officers sufficient time to return to the precinct, handle any required administrative matters, change out, and depart the precinct on or before their end of shift. Cf. SPOG CBA article 5.1 (for nine-hour patrol day, employees permitted to return to assigned station “no more than fifteen (15) minutes prior to end of the assigned shift, to check out and finish shift completion tasks”). While OPA is unaware of a specific policy allowing supervisors to extend this time, the *de minimis* one-off occurrences described by NE#1 allowing an officer to take at most an extra fifteen minutes does not rise to the level of misconduct.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

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

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

For the same reasons articulated above at Named Employee #1, Allegation #1, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

**Named Employee #1 – Allegation #3**

***5.001-POL 10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional***

For the same reasons articulated above at Named Employee #1, Allegation #1, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

**Named Employee #1 – Allegation #4**

***4.020 – Reporting and Recording Overtime/Out of Classification Pay 4.020-POL-1 Civilians, Officers, Detectives, Sergeants, and Lieutenants 4. Supervisor Responsibilities for...***

It was alleged that NE#1 failed to monitor overtime use.

SPD Policy requires supervisors “ensure that all overtime is authorize in advance and that the work done on overtime is necessary to the mission of the Department.” SPD Policy 4.020-POL-1(4).

As discussed above for Named Employee #1, Allegation #1, NE#1 and NE#2 have not worked in the same precinct since May of 2024, about a year prior to OPA receiving the allegations in this case. To the extent NE#1 might have permitted NE#2 to leave early from his shift, OPA finds—for the same reason articulated for Named Employee #1, Allegation #1—that this was more likely on the occasional, limited terms described by NE#1.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

---

**Named Employee #2 – Allegation #1**

***4.010 – Employee Time Off 4.010-POL 2. Employees Schedule Time Off With Their Sergeant/Supervisor***

On review, OPA determined that this allegation under SPD Policy 4.010 applies to scheduling leave time from regular work duties, not seeking pay for unworked overtime.

Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be removed.

Recommended Finding: **Allegation Removed**

**Named Employee #2 – Allegation #2**

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

The Complainant alleged that NE#2 violated law and policy by claiming overtime hours he did not work.

SPD Policy 5.001-POL-2 requires that employees adhere to laws, City policy, and Department policy.

Considering the elevated standard of review for allegations stigmatizing to law enforcement officers, see SPOG CBA article 3.1, OPA finds there was insufficient evidence to prove NE#2 violated the law. However, OPA finds that, more likely than not, NE#2 violated City policy, Department policy, and provisions of the SPOG CBA concerning overtime.

Even though OPA finds insufficient evidence that NE#2 committed theft of services, this was a close call. Importantly, OPA does not concur with all of Detective #1's interpretations of policy or the reasonableness of assuming that NE#2 consistently worked his entire overtime shift straight through, without any bathroom, meal, rest, or intermittent breaks "equivalent to ten minutes for each four hours worked." WAC 296-126-092(5). But even if OPA made such a maximalist assumption—stacking two ten-minute breaks, a thirty-minute lunch, and allowing NE#2 to log off CAD thirty minutes prior to the end of his overtime shift—NE#1 *still* appears to have regularly received about ten to thirty minutes of unworked overtime pay per augmented shift. In both his criminal and OPA interviews, NE#2 spoke about his belief that his practice of leaving after third watch roll call was standard and allowed. OPA does not concur with Detective #1's interpretation that NE#1 and WE#2 corroborated NE#2's belief on this point. Instead, NE#1 stated in both his criminal and OPA interviews that he permits officers to leave *at most* 45 minutes early in rare circumstances. Relatedly, WE#2 elaborated at his OPA interview that he only allowed augmenters to leave significantly early *if* they were augmenting from another precinct and needed work time to return to their home precinct and change out before the end of shift. That said, NE#2 appears to have been openly leaving his second watch overtime shifts—fully changed out in civilian clothes—from the precinct front door ninety minutes to two hours before the end of second watch for at least a year. During this time, NE#2 was submitting overtime for the full shift to 9:00pm and does not appear to have been corrected by any supervisors, who are charged with monitoring overtime use. See SPD Policy 4.020-POL-1(4). Given this, NE#2 may have a colorable defense to any *criminal* allegation for theft that he did this openly and avowedly under a claim in good faith. See RCW 9A.56.020(2)(b) (creating a sufficient defense to any theft charge that the "property or service was appropriated openly and avowedly under a claim of title made in good faith, *even though the claim be untenable*") (emphasis added).

Although OPA finds insufficient evidence to conclude NE#2 violated the law, this does not end the analysis of whether NE#2 upheld the "standards and duties" set forth in SPD Policy 5.001. SPD Policy 5.001-POL-2 also requires SPD employees to adhere to City of Seattle Policy, Department policy, and applicable collective bargaining agreements. All clearly required that NE#2 only be paid overtime for hours he actually "worked." See City Personnel Rules 3.6.4 Rate of Compensation ("Hourly employees will be compensated at the rate of 1½ times their regular rate of pay for all hours and fractions of hours worked beyond the overtime threshold in a workweek for ordinary overtime.") and 9.1.9 Overtime ("Hourly employees are eligible to receive overtime compensation for all hours worked beyond the overtime threshold in a work week."); SPD Policies 4.020-POL-1(6) ("Employees are compensated for authorized overtime worked."), and 4.020-POL-1(10) ("Employees report overtime worked on the appropriate form."); SPOG CBA Article 5.4

Overtime (“Employees on the nine (9) hour day schedule shall be paid at the rate of time and one-half (1 1/2) for all hours worked in excess of nine (9) in one (1) day and for all hours worked on a scheduled furlough day.”) (emphasis added to each citation). This expectation is also common sense, especially as it concerns overtime that is compensated at 150% of regular pay. While it is certainly reasonable to presume a supervisor can allow an employee to leave an overtime shift early, it is unreasonable to assume the employee could claim—or a supervisor could authorize—unworked overtime hours.

Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**

**Named Employee #2 – Allegation #3**

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

The Complainant alleged that NE#2 violated public trust by accepting compensation for unworked overtime.

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.

It is sufficient for OPA to sustain this allegation for all the reasons articulated for Named Employee #2, Allegation #2. However, OPA also sustains this allegation based on the tendency of NE#2’s conduct to undermine public trust in the Department and NE#2. In plain terms, overtime hours are not the same as regular work hours. Overtime is compensated at 150% of regular pay and must be specifically approved as necessary and consistent with policy. While OPA deeply appreciates the personal hardships of officers who are forced to work mandatory overtime or the willingness of others to regularly volunteer to work overtime to maintain minimum safe staffing levels for their fellow officers, the compensation for this hardship is the overtime pay premium for hours *worked*. Conversely, there is no argument that it is mandatory or necessary for an officer to be paid overtime for unworked hours. Instead, NE#2’s acceptance of unworked overtime pay undermines public trust that overtime pay is being responsibly claimed and managed.

Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**

**Named Employee #2 – Allegation #4**

***5.001 - Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL 11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication***

The Complainant alleged that NE#2 submitted dishonest overtime request forms (ORFs).

SPD Policy 5.001-POL-11 requires Department employees to be truthful and complete in all communications.

OPA finds by an elevated burden of proof (more than a preponderance) that NE#1 submitted dishonest ORFs. OPA finds the evidence to be overwhelming that NE#2 submitted all forty-six ORFs reviewed in this case knowing that they were false.

However, given the seriousness of the finding for this allegation, OPA focuses on the nine dates for which it also has video corroboration of the time NE#2 left the precinct. In all nine videos, NE#2 appears fully changed out, in civilian clothes, with his personal effects packed.

- March 24: NE#2 walked out around 7:22pm. MDT signoff 7:14pm.
- March 26: NE#2 walked out around 7:19pm. MDT signoff 7:18pm.
- March 27: NE#2 walked out around 7:15pm. MDT signoff 7:17pm.
- March 29: NE#2 walked out around 7:26pm. MDT signoff 7:14pm.
- March 30: NE#2 walked out around 7:18pm. MDT signoff 7:13pm.
- March 31: NE#2 walked out around 7:18pm. MDT signoff 7:15pm.
- April 2: NE#2 walked out around 7:12pm. MDT signoff 7:10pm.
- April 3: NE#2 walked out around 7:12pm. MDT signoff 7:11pm.
- April 5: NE#2 walked out around 7:15pm. MDT signoff 7:12pm.

On all nine dates, NE#2 claimed overtime hours until 9:00pm. Even allowing that the precinct security video timestamp and the MDT timestamps might not have been perfectly synchronized, the patterns suggests that NE#2 was logging out of MDT almost immediately before exiting the building. To do this—fully changed in civilian attire—NE#2 would have functionally needed to stop logging to calls and stopped actively patrolling two hours or more before the end of his overtime shift. OPA finds based on the evidence provided that NE#2 knew he was submitting false ORFs by more than a preponderance of the evidence.

Relatedly, NE#2's explanations in both the criminal and OPA investigations reflected this awareness. NE#2's stated belief that this was standard practice might support a technical defense to a theft crime, even if "untenable." RCW 9A.56.020(2)(b). It does not excuse knowingly submitting false ORFs. This is especially the case given repeated references in SPD policy, the SPOG CBA, and City policy that employees are compensated for authorized overtime "worked." See, e.g., SPD Policies 4.020-POL-1(6) and 4.020-POL-1(10). There is no policy allowance for claiming overtime hours for unworked hours, with or without supervisory approval.

Also, none of the other officers interviewed in this case corroborated NE#2's explanation. The Complainant felt NE#2's conduct was dishonest and egregious enough to risk, in the Complainant's words, "the possibility of retaliation or social fallout" by reporting it. NE#1 stated he, at most, permitted officers to log out of CAD forty-five minutes early on rare occasions with specific permission. NE#3 stated officers would typically logout of CAD thirty minutes before shift and, rarely, somewhat before. NE#4 stated officers could sign out of CAD thirty minutes before shift end, but if they signed out earlier than that, his expectation would be that they submitted reflective timesheets. WE#2 stated he would let augmenting officers leave early when they needed to report back to their home precinct before end of shift. WE#1 stated it was not common for augmenting officers to be released early. To the extent NE#2 claimed he had previously received permission from both NE#1 and NE#4, NE#2 stated this would have occurred sometime

in early 2024. Nor could NE#2 recall exactly what was said in these conversations. Importantly, NE#2 did not identify NE#3, his immediate supervisor during early 2025, as one of the supervisors who gave him permission to claim unworked hours.

Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**

---

**Named Employee #3 – Allegation #1**

***5.001 - Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL 11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication***

For the same reasons articulated above at Named Employee #1, Allegation #1, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

**Named Employee #3 – Allegation #2**

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

For the same reasons articulated above at Named Employee #1, Allegation #1, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

**Named Employee #3 – Allegation #3**

***5.001-POL 10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional***

For the same reasons articulated above at Named Employee #1, Allegation #1, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

**Named Employee #3 – Allegation #4**

***4.020 – Reporting and Recording Overtime/Out of Classification Pay 4.020-POL-1 Civilians, Officers, Detectives, Sergeants, and Lieutenants 4. Supervisor Responsibilities for ...***

It was alleged that NE#3 failed to appropriately monitor NE#2's overtime use.

During the relevant period, NE#3 was NE#2's direct supervisor and was responsible for entering his timesheets. NE#3 denied being aware of NE#2 logging off and leaving before the end of his overtime shift. NE#3 denied giving NE#2 permission to do so or being aware NE#2 was leaving early during the second watch shifts she augmented as supervisor. In her criminal interview, NE#3 referenced her employees all being "adults" and insinuated she trusts them to submit accurate ORFs.

NE#2 did not identify NE#3 as one of the supervisors who gave him explicit permission to leave early. Instead, he stated she entered his time despite having seen him leave early. NE#2 specifically stated he has said goodbye to her as he was walking out early. NE#3 denied seeing NE#2 leaving early.

OPA appreciates that supervisors cannot always perfectly track every subordinate and, practically, must rely on some level of good faith on the part of their subordinates to submit accurate ORFs under the current overtime system.<sup>2</sup> This is especially true when the approving supervisor is not the same as the overtime shift supervisor. However, NE#3 must implement some form of supervision regarding overtime use beyond faith-alone reliance on the accuracy of submitted ORFs. This could involve a brief consultation with subordinates, making a practice of reviewing ORFs during each shift, or requiring subordinates to turn in ORFs immediately after completing overtime each overtime shift. NE#3 should be retrained on the importance of exercising supervisory responsibilities before entering her subordinate's time based on their submitted ORFs.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Training Referral.

- **Required Training:** NE#3's chain of command should discuss OPA's findings with her, review SPD Policy 4.020 with her, and provide any other retraining and counseling it deems necessary. Any retraining and counseling should be documented and maintained in Blue Team.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Training Referral**

---

**Named Employee #4 – Allegation #1**

***5.001 - Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL 11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication***

For the same reasons articulated above at Named Employee #1, Allegation #1, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

**Named Employee #4 – Allegation #2**

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

For the same reasons articulated above at Named Employee #1, Allegation #1, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

**Named Employee #4 – Allegation #3**

***5.001-POL 10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional***

For the same reasons articulated above at Named Employee #1, Allegation #1, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

**Named Employee #4 – Allegation #4**

***4.020 – Reporting and Recording Overtime/Out of Classification Pay 4.020-POL-1 Civilians, Officers, Detectives, Sergeants, and Lieutenants 4. Supervisor Responsibilities for ...***

For similar reasons articulated above at Named Employee #1, Allegation #4, OPA finds this allegation to be unfounded. Even as alleged, NE#2 only stated NE#4 gave him permission to leave early sometime in early 2024. NE#2 did not provide specifics of that conversation. NE#4 denied giving such permission, stating that, when employees left an overtime shift more than thirty minutes before end of shift, his expectation was that they submit times reflecting that change.

OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

---

Footnote 1: This was Detective #1’s interpretation of this section of the WAC. OPA notes this section of the WAC does not explicitly say that rest and meal periods can be stacked. Instead, it says that, if scheduled, they should be “as near as possible to the midpoint of the rest period,” and, if the “nature of the work” allows “intermittent rest periods,” then “scheduled rest periods are not required.” WAC 296-126-092.

Footnote 2: OPA has issued multiple Management Action Recommendations (MARs) concerning the gaps in SPD’s overtime tracking system. OPA most recently submitted a MAR on these issues on November 12, 2025, in 2025OPA-0152 / 2025COMP-0016. The systemic issues presented in that case were like those here. SPD has not yet responded to that MAR. For that reason, OPA does not believe an additional MAR is required in this case.