



Issued Date: November 21, 2025

From: Director Bonnie Glenn
Office of Police Accountability

Case Number: 2025OPA-0201

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

1. **Allegation #1: 8.200 – Using Force, 8.200-POL-1. Using Force: When Authorized**
Finding: Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper (Expedited)
-

Named Employee #2

1. **Allegation #1: 8.200 – Using Force, 8.200-POL-1. Using Force: When Authorized**
Finding: Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper
-

Named Employee #3

1. **Allegation #1: 8.200 – Using Force, 8.200-POL-1. Using Force: When Authorized**
Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
 2. **Allegation #2: 13.050 – Policing by Mountain Bike, 13.050-POL-2 Operations, 3. Sworn Employees are Responsible for the Safe Operation of Their Bicycle**
Finding: Sustained
 - **Imposed Discipline: Written Reprimand**
-

Named Employee #4

1. **Allegation #1: 5.140 – Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing**
Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
-

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:

On May 24, 2025, SPD officers arrested Counter Protester #1 (CP#1)—the Complainant’s transgender son—during the Mayday USA protest. The Complainant alleged that Named Employee #1 (NE#1), Named Employee #2 (NE#2), and Named Employee #3 (NE#3) used unauthorized force against CP#1, and that Named Employee #4 (NE#4) made biased remarks regarding CP#1’s transgender identity during transport. OPA also investigated whether NE#3 operated his police bicycle unsafely by colliding with Counter Protester #2 (CP#2), resulting in CP#2’s fall.

Administrative Note:

During its intake investigation, OPA identified NE#3 purportedly making unprofessional remarks to CP#1. OPA sent NE#3’s potential violation of SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10 (Employees Will Strive to be Professional) to his chain of command for Supervisor Action.¹

The allegations against NE#1 and NE#4, along with the force allegation against NE#3, were 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 NE#1 and NE#4. As such, OPA did not interview NE#1 or NE#4 in this case. OPA did ask NE#3 about the force allegation during his interview. On July 28, 2025, OIG certified OPA’s expedited investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

The remaining allegations underwent a full investigation. On October 3, 2025, OIG certified OPA’s full investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

Summary of the Investigation:

OPA investigated this incident by reviewing the OPA complaint, computer-aided dispatch call report, body-worn video (BWV), privately recorded video, incident and supplement reports, and interview statements from the Complainant, NE#2, and NE#3.

A. OPA Complaint and Complainant Interview

On May 27, 2025, the Complainant submitted an OPA complaint alleging unauthorized force and biased remarks. Specifically, the Complainant alleged that NE#2 headbutted CP#1 with a bicycle helmet, that NE#3 aimed an oleoresin capsicum (OC) canister at CP#1’s face, and that NE#1 threw CP#1 to the ground. The Complainant also alleged that NE#4 made biased remarks regarding CP#1’s transgender identity during transport.

¹ A Supervisor Action generally involves a minor policy violation or performance issue the employee’s supervisor addresses through training, communication, or coaching. See OPA Internal Operations and Training Manual section 5.4(B)(ii).

On June 16, 2025, OPA interviewed the Complainant. His statements were consistent with his OPA complaint.

B. Body-Worn Video (BWV)

On May 24, 2025, BWV captured the following:

Named Employee #3

NE#3's BWV captured NE#3 riding his police bicycle into a crowd of counter protesters supporting the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer plus (+), community. BWV did not capture audio due to a standard one-minute buffering period. NE#3 quickly approached CP#2, who was walking forward and had his back facing NE#3.



The image above was taken from NE#3's BWV. The orange arrow points to CP#2.

NE#3's right handlebar struck CP#2.



The image above was taken from NE#3's BMW. CP#2 is on the right. NE#3 also nearly struck the counter protester on the left.

The impact caused CP#2 to lunge forward. CP#2 braced his fall using his arms.



The image above was taken from NE#3's BMW.

CP#2 landed, rolled onto his right side, and pointed at NE#3. NE#3 continued pedaling away.

Named Employee #2

NE#2's BMW captured NE#2 conducting crowd control by pushing his police bicycle toward counter protesters while ordering them to move back. NE#2 assisted in establishing a perimeter around officers who were arresting multiple counter protesters. NE#2 encountered CP#1 and commanded, "You need to get back." CP#1 stood his ground and replied, "Fuck you." NE#2 then pushed CP#1 with the bicycle, propelling CP#1 backward several steps.



The above image was taken from NE#2's BWV.

NE#2 shouted, "Get back!" CP#1 replied, "Fuck you! Shut the fuck up!" NE#2 advanced toward CP#1 and pushed him with the bicycle again, propelling CP#1 backward several steps.



The above image was taken from NE#2's BWV.

Another counter protester approached NE#2 and asked, "What the fuck is your problem? You are being intentionally provocative and violent!" NE#2 stepped back several paces and again commanded, "Get back!" CP#1 advanced toward NE#2 and shouted, "Get the fuck away from me." NE#2 pushed CP#1 with the bicycle for the third time, propelling CP#1 backward several steps.



The above image was taken from NE#2's BWV.

CP#1 told NE#2, "Fuck you" and then walked away.

Named Employee #1 and Named Employee #3

NE#1's and NE#3's BWV captured NE#1, NE#3, and other officers within the crowd of counter protesters. Officers arrested several counter protesters, maintained them in a seated position, and formed a perimeter around them. Officers devised a plan to relocate the arrestees for transport. NE#1, a lieutenant, told CP#1, "I can't help but notice you keep moving closer when I told you to stay back. Take another step forward, or I'll have you arrested for obstruction." In response, CP#1 swore at NE#1. NE#1 momentarily stepped away but soon returned, grabbed a police bicycle, moved it toward the counter protesters, and instructed them to move back. CP#1 stood his ground, prompting NE#1 and another officer to move CP#1 backward. However, CP#1 resisted and shouted, "Fuck off!" NE#3 quickly approached and aimed an OC canister at CP#1 without spraying it and withdrew it. NE#1 grabbed CP#1, pulled him into the perimeter, released him, and stated, "You can be arrested, too, then." NE#3 handcuffed CP#1 and then escorted him away.

Named Employee #4

NE#4's BWV captured NE#4 and a backing officer transporting CP#1 to the West Precinct, where CP#1 was searched and placed in a holding cell. NE#4 made no biased comments, or any comments that could conceivably be construed as biased, regarding CP#1's transgender identity.

C. OPA Interviews

Named Employee #2

On August 21, 2025, OPA interviewed NE#2. NE#2 said he performed a trained tactic aimed at establishing a safety zone for the officers executing the arrests and pushing back counter protesters who refused to move back. NE#2 described those officers as vulnerable, as they were kneeling with their backs facing the counter protesters. NE#2 believed one or two officers formed

the security perimeter. NE#2 said bicycle pushes are a trained tactic that do not involve swinging. NE#2 said he pushed CP#1 with the bicycle due to CP#1's repeated defiance to multiple commands to step back. NE#2 said he modulated his force after achieving his intended result. NE#2 denied headbutting CP#1.

Named Employee #3

On September 2, 2025, OPA interviewed NE#3. NE#3 said he was part of the bicycle team responsible for executing arrests or forming a perimeter around officers who were executing arrests. NE#3 said the team was moving in to execute an arrest when the crowd became congested. NE#3 said the team continually issued verbal instructions to the counter protesters, urging them to move aside, because they were inattentive to the officers on bicycles. NE#3 recalled unintentionally bumping into several counter protesters, either by brushing against their shoulders or grazing them with his handlebars, as it was challenging to avoid them entirely. NE#3 maintained that he was unaware of knocking CP#2 over until he reviewed his BWV, which is the reason he did not check on CP#2.

Analysis and Conclusions:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

8.200 – Using Force, 8.200-POL-1. Using Force: When Authorized

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 threw CP#1 to the ground.

Sworn employees will only use objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional force to the threat or urgency of the situation to achieve a law enforcement objective while protecting the life and safety of all people. SPD Policy 8.200(1). Reasonableness must consider that sworn employees are often forced to make split-second decisions about the amount of force necessary in a particular situation in tense, uncertain, dynamic, and rapidly evolving circumstances. *Id.* The question is whether the sworn employee's actions were objectively reasonable considering the facts and circumstances confronting them, without regard to their underlying intent or motivation. *Id.* Several factors should be weighed when evaluating reasonableness. *See id.* Force is necessary under the totality of the circumstances when there is no reasonably effective alternative to using physical or deadly force, and the type and amount of physical or deadly force used is a reasonable and proportional response to effect the legal purpose intended or to protect against the threat posed to the sworn employee or others. SPD Policy 8.050 (effective September 1, 2024). Proportional force must reflect the totality of circumstances of the situation, including the nature and immediacy of any threats posed to sworn employees and others. *Id.* Sworn employees must rely on training, experience, and their assessment of the situation to decide an appropriate level of force. *Id.*

BWV did not show NE#1 throwing CP#1 to the ground as alleged. Rather, it showed NE#1 grabbing CP#1, moving him into the perimeter, and releasing him—all of which occurred quickly.

Before NE#1 released CP#1, CP#1 was already lowered to the ground, mitigating any injury or pain he might have experienced upon being released. Based on the evidence, NE#1's actions would have constituted, at most, *de minimis force*.² To the extent that NE#1 used *de minimis* force to pull CP#1 into the perimeter, based on the evidence provided and in review of the totality of the circumstances, such force was objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional. CP#1 disobeyed NE#1's command, giving NE#1 probable cause to arrest CP#1 for obstruction.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper (Expedited).

Recommended Finding: Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper (Expedited)

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #1

8.200 – Using Force, 8.200-POL-1. Using Force: When Authorized

The Complainant alleged that NE#2 headbutted CP#1 with a bicycle helmet.

BWV did not show NE#2 headbutting CP#1 with a bicycle helmet as alleged. Rather, it showed NE#2 pushing CP#1 with the bicycle on three occasions to ensure perimeter security, causing CP#1 to move backward. Here, based on the evidence provided, there was no corroborating evidence that NE#2 headbutted CP#1. Nearby counter protesters expressed concern about NE#2's use of his bicycle to push CP#1 away, not NE#2's alleged headbutting. To the extent that NE#1 used force to push CP#1 away with the bicycle, such force was objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional. CP#1 repeatedly disobeyed NE#2's command to step back, opting instead to remain in her position and swear at NE#2. NE#2 had legitimate law enforcement objectives to establish a perimeter around vulnerable officers who were executing arrests. Several counter protesters had already been arrested for assault or obstruction, raising concerns about further assaults or obstruction. CP#1 either refused to step back or continued advancing toward NE#2, justifying NE#2's additional pushes with the bicycle. The pushes constituted low-level force that appeared *de minimis* in nature, but even if they caused pain or injury, they would not require anything greater than basic first aid.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper.

Recommended Finding: Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper

² *De minimis* force is an action meant to separate, guide, and/or control without using control techniques that are intended to, or are reasonably likely to, cause pain or injury. Examples include, but are not limited to, using hands or equipment to stop, push back, separate, or escort, and using compliance holds without using sufficient force to cause pain. SPD Policy 8.050 (effective September 1, 2024).

Named Employee #3 – Allegation #1

8.200 – Using Force, 8.200-POL-1. Using Force: When Authorized

The Complainant alleged that NE#3 aimed an OC canister at CP#1's face.

BWV captured NE#3 aiming an OC canister at CP#1's face. However, NE#3 did not spray OC at CP#1. Thus, NE#3's act did not constitute reportable or unauthorized force.

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

Recommended Finding: Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited)

Named Employee #3 – Allegation #2

13.050 – Policing by Mountain Bike, 13.050-POL-2 Operations, 3. Sworn Employees are Responsible for the Safe Operation of Their Bicycle

NE#3 allegedly operated his police bicycle unsafely by colliding with CP#2, resulting in CP#2's fall.

Sworn employees are responsible for safely operating their bicycle. SPD Policy 13.050-POL-2(3). Sworn employees will follow all applicable rules of the road, except when necessary to effect a law enforcement purpose, such as crowd management or emergency response. *Id.* Sworn employees will ride with due regard for people's safety under all circumstances. *Id.*

OPA sustains this allegation. NE#3 operated his police bicycle without due regard for people's safety, even by his own admission. NE#3 admitted to unintentionally bumping into several counter protesters, either by brushing against their shoulders or grazing them with his handlebars. In this instance, NE#3 struck CP#2 with such force that it propelled CP#2 forward, requiring CP#2 to brace his fall using his arms. OPA found highly questionable NE#3's claim of being unaware of knocking CP#2 over, as the force of the impact momentarily halted NE#3 before he could resume pedaling. Even if OPA were to accept NE#3's claim as sincere, this would still be concerning. If true, it would call into question NE#3's ability to recognize instances where he had struck someone. Moreover, the speed at which NE#3 navigated through the narrow space between the counter protester and CP#2 showed disregard for their safety. A congested crowd—a factor NE#3 cited as a reason for being unable to avoid bumping into people—should have prompted him to reduce speed, exercise caution, and perform safe maneuvers. NE#3 failed to do any of these. Overall, a preponderance of the evidence showed NE#3's disregard for people's safety "under all circumstances" while operating his police bicycle in a crowded setting.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: Sustained

Named Employee #4 – Allegation #1

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

The Complainant alleged that NE#4 made biased remarks regarding CP#1's transgender identity during transport.

Biased policing means the different treatment of any person by officers motivated by any characteristic of protected classes under state, federal, and local laws, as well as other discernible personal characteristics of an individual. SPD Policy 5.140-POL. It includes different treatment based on gender identity. See *id.* Officers are forbidden from making decisions or taking actions influenced by bias and expressing prejudice or derogatory comments concerning discernible personal characteristics. See SPD Policy 5.140-POL-2.

This allegation is unfounded. BWV captured CP#1's transport to the West Precinct, where CP#1 was placed in a holding cell. At no point did NE#4 make a biased comment, or any comment that could conceivably be construed as biased, regarding CP#1's transgender identity.

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

Recommended Finding: Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited)