

Issued Date: July 17, 2026

From: Deputy Director Nelson R. Leese (on behalf of Director Bonnie J. Glenn)
Office of Police Accountability 

Case Number:2025OPA-0413

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

1. **Allegation #1: 5.001 - Standards and Duties POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional**

Finding: Sustained

2. **Allegation #2: 5.100 – Operations Bureau Individual Responsibilities, I. Patrol Officers A. Responsibilities, 2. Monitor and take appropriate action regarding criminal activity in assigned area**

Finding: Sustained

- **Proposed Discipline: One Hundred Eighty Hours (20 Days) to Two Hundred Seventy Hours (30 Days) Suspension**
 - **Imposed Discipline: Two Hundred Seventy Hours (30 Days) Suspension and Re-Training**
-

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:

Named Employee #1 (NE#1) visited a veterinary clinic on multiple occasions. The Complainant, a clinic employee, alleged that NE#1 was unprofessional toward clinic staff by touching them, making inappropriate comments and sounds, and mimicking a cat. OPA also investigated whether NE#1 neglected his patrol duties by spending an excessive amount of time at the clinic.

Administrative Note:

On March 3, 2026, the Office of Inspector General (OIG) certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

As discussed below, after the initial certification, OPA determined it would reinterview NE#1. OPA reinterviewed NE#1 on April 10, 2026. On April 15, 2026, OIG recertified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

Summary of the Investigation:

OPA investigated the incident by reviewing the OPA complaint, computer-aided dispatch (CAD) call reports, incident and supplement reports, global positioning system (GPS) data, business security video, staffing sheets, text messages, and email correspondence. OPA also interviewed the Complainant, four community members (CM#1 through CM#4), and NE#1.

A. OPA Complaint and Complainant Interview

On October 24, 2025, the Complainant contacted OPA to submit a complaint against NE#1. The Complainant alleged that NE#1 inappropriately touched clinic staff, made inappropriate comments and sounds, and caused discomfort among the staff. The Complainant elaborated during her OPA interview, described below.

On November 7, 2025, OPA interviewed the Complainant. The Complainant said that in June 2025, NE#1 investigated bullet casings found in the clinic's parking lot and offered to check on the staff periodically to ensure their wellbeing. The Complainant said CM#2 reported that NE#1 was getting too friendly with staff by hugging CM#2 and rubbing against CM#1 as if he were a cat while meowing. The Complainant said CM#2 reported that on October 15, NE#1 walked past the customer service desk, asked about CM#2's wellbeing, pulled her into a hug—pressing her bust against his body—and commented, "You know I love you." The Complainant said CM#2 reported that, on October 16, NE#1 entered CM#2's office, which was in a non-public area, poked her while saying, "Poke, poke, poke," and departed after she gave him a stern look. The Complainant said CM#2 reported that, on October 17, although CM#2 was not at the clinic, she received text messages from CM#4 indicating that NE#1 had visited and caused discomfort among the staff. Finally, the Complainant said CM#2 reported that, on October 20, a community service officer told CM#2 that NE#1 had been known for being "huggy" and advised her to report the matter to his supervisor. The Complainant said she did not want NE#1 to return to the clinic anymore.

B. Interviews of the Community Members and Named Employee #1

On November 18, 2025, OPA interviewed CM#1 through CM#4—all of whom were clinic employees. They reported the following.

Community Member #1

CM#1 said NE#1's presence was well-received initially, as he expressed his love for cats and animals. However, CM#1 said NE#1's presence eventually became uncomfortable—a feeling that staff found difficult to communicate to NE#1 since he was a police officer. CM#1 described NE#1's

visits as sporadic and lasting between twenty minutes to an hour. CM#1 said that in September 2025, NE#1 entered through the clinic's cat entrance and mimicked a cat by purring, meowing, and hissing, causing CM#4 to inform NE#1 that there were no available appointments for him. CM#1 said NE#1 responded by hissing at CM#4. CM#1 said NE#1 later approached her in the lobby while mimicking a cat, held her arm while rubbing his head against it for about fifteen seconds, and purred. CM#1 said she froze in discomfort and found NE#1's act triggering due to a prior traumatic experience. CM#1 said she did not initially report NE#1's act because she reassured herself that it was not a big deal.

CM#1 also described the amount of time NE#1 spent at the clinic, noting that the one day before she reported his behavior he came to the clinic three times. CM#1 recalled NE#1 making comments before leaving about how he needed to go, "look busy." CM#1 also described NE#1's presence of as being awkward and causing customers to notice his presence. She characterized his presence as appearing to be a "hang out excuse."

Community Member #2

CM#2 said that on October 15, she was behind the welcome desk and near a doorway when, aware of her own body language, she turned sideways toward NE#1 and told him, "Alright, see ya." CM#2 said NE#1 approached—"pinning" her—then grabbed her with both arms, pressed his chest against hers, causing them to be about two to three inches apart face-to-face, and commented, "You know I love you." CM#2 described her bust as touching NE#1's uniform shirt. CM#2 said she leaned back, felt "shell shocked" and "overwhelmed," and freed herself. CM#2 said staff expressed their discomfort with each other and met to discuss the matter, during which CM#1 reported the prior incident when NE#1 meowed and rubbed against her as if he were a cat. In describing another incident, CM#2 said she was in her office and instructed her colleagues not to allow NE#1 entry because she did not want to engage him. CM#2 said NE#1 still entered her office while her back faced the door, so she told him that she had no time for him. CM#2 said NE#1 approached, poked her shoulder, and commented, "Poke, poke, poke." CM#2 said that although NE#1 was not given unfettered access to the clinic, he could have been given access to the office.

CM#2 also described the frequency of NE#1's visits as initially intermittent, then becoming more frequent to multiple times per week. CM#2 stated she had the feeling he was coming for "chit chat." CM#2 estimated that on days NE#1 was at the clinic, he would stay "easy, between twenty and forty-five minutes." CM#2 stated NE#1 was always in uniform when he came to the clinic. CM#2 stated CM#4 described NE#1 as having come into the office three times in one day. CM#2 shared screenshots of text messages that corroborated this conversation and included a photograph of NE#1 sitting in the clinic while looking at his cell phone. CM#4 texted, "[NE#1] came back and is just chillen here." CM#2 stated she did not have any security cameras inside the office that captured this behavior, but that she has since installed cameras.

Community Member #3

CM#3 stated she observed the October 15 encounter between NE#1 and CM#2 in the doorway. Specifically, CM#3 said she saw NE#1 pulling in CM#2, hugging her, and telling CM#2 that he loves her. She stated, "So that was just, very uncomfortable." CM#3 described the progression of events, including that CM#2 initially appeared happy to see NE#1, but as NE#1 approached CM#2 this changed. CM#3 stated CM#2 appeared, "very visibly uncomfortable," causing CM#2 to lean back. CM#3 described discussing the incident with CM#2 noting the incident was "super weird" and "crossed a major line."

CM#3 stated NE#1's visits were initially "pretty normal," but she stated he started staying for "an hour or so."

Community Member #4

CM#4 stated she observed both the "rubbing" encounter between NE#1 and CM#1, and also the "poking" encounter between NE#1 and CM#2. CM#4 stated she spoke with CM#1 after the rubbing incident, and that CM#1 stated it made her very uncomfortable. Concerning the "poking" encounter, CM#4 stated NE#1 opened the office door to enter. CM#4 also corroborated the conversations that occurred following NE#1's encounters with staff and their feelings of discomfort.

Named Employee #1

On January 20, 2026, OPA interviewed NE#1. NE#1 confirmed that he had offered to check on clinic staff due to safety concerns after staff found bullet casings in their parking lot. NE#1 believed he visited about twice a week, usually around 5:45 PM. NE#1 said he would visit during his shift if time permitted. NE#1 characterized these visits as business checks since the clinic was in an area known for prostitution and territorial disputes among pimps. NE#1 said these business checks were a regular part of his duties. NE#1 said the staff did not express opinions about the frequency of his visits. NE#1 said he lost his cat in January 2025, so he would pet the dogs and cats at the clinic if staff permitted it.

NE#1 denied having any recollection of rubbing his head against CM#1's arm, purring, and mimicking a cat in September 2025. NE#1 denied having any recollection of hugging CM#2 and expressing his love for her on October 15. NE#1 denied having any recollection of entering CM#2's office, poking her shoulder, and commenting, "Poke, poke, poke" on October 16. NE#1 denied all allegations against him. NE#1 maintained that he would respond to a call if it was issued in his sector or if he was dispatched to it.

After reviewing NE#1's initial interview, OPA determined it needed additional clarification from NE#1. OPA reinterviewed NE#1 on April 10, 2026. Specifically, OPA sought clarification on the divergence between NE#1's recollection of events and those of the four Community Members. In his second interview, NE#1 continued to deny the allegations, but explained in part that his characterization of what occurred differed. Importantly, NE#1 admitted that he and CM#2 had hugged on at most three occasions, but he described CM#2 as having initiated the hugs. NE#1 denied telling CM#2 that he loved her. NE#1 also admitted having entered CM#2's office but said he only did so when he was invited and denied the allegation that he "poked" her. Finally, NE#1 categorically denied the allegation that he rubbed his head on CM#1's arm while mimicking a cat.

OPA asked NE#1 for his opinion about the differences in recollection between himself and the four Community Members. NE#1 stated his belief that the Community Members were providing false information to OPA. NE#1 did not have any explanations or theories as to their potential motive for doing so.

C. Staffing Sheets, CAD Records, and GPS Data

According to staffing sheets, NE#1 had been assigned to patrol a sector that encompassed the clinic since June 26. However, since October 15, NE#1 has been reassigned to a different sector.

According to NE#1's CAD records, NE#1 did not log to the premises while at the clinic, meaning he was available for dispatch to service calls.

According to GPS data, on October 15, NE#1 was at the clinic from 4:52 PM to 4:57 PM. NE#1 was not logged to a call during this period. At 4:58 PM, NE#1 logged to a shooting call.

According to GPS data, on October 16, NE#1 was at the clinic from 9:34 AM to 10:00 AM. NE#1 was not logged to a call during this period.

According to GPS data, on October 17, NE#1 was at the clinic from 3:11 PM to 3:21 PM. NE#1 was not logged to a call during this period. At 3:22 PM, NE#1 was dispatched to a call and appeared to have left immediately. NE#1 returned to the clinic, staying from 4:22 PM to 5:06 PM. NE#1 was not logged to a call during this period.

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 that NE#1 was unprofessional toward clinic staff.

SPD employees must “strive to be professional.” SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10. Further, “employees may not engage in behavior that undermines public trust in the Department, the officer, or other officers,” whether on or off duty. *Id.*

OPA recommends this allegation be Sustained. Clinic staff described both a pattern of behavior and specific incidents that were remarkably unprofessional and caused them to lose trust in NE#1. NE#1 was—ostensibly—contacting the clinic staff to reassure them after they recovered evidence from a shooting incident. However, staff described NE#1 as showing up with increased frequency, staying at the clinic for lengthy amounts of time chatting or loafing, behaving in an overly friendly way, making uncomfortable comments, and making commentary that suggested to them that he was not busy, such as coming to clinic on overtime and, when leaving, saying he needed to go “look busy.” More concerning, staff described NE#1 engaging in unwanted touching with staff, rubbing on CM#1 while mimicking a cat, forcibly hugging CM#2, and entering CM#2's back office to poke her in a flirtatious way. All three of these incidents were corroborated by direct observations of either CM#3 or CM#4. Staff provided detailed accounts of the incidents in their audio-recorded interviews. Staff also provided some documentary corroboration, specifically the text messages between CM#2 and CM#4. Finally, the manner by which these issues came to light is notable. The incident with CM#1 occurred first and, although CM#1 spoke about the incident with CM#4, she did not make an official report until after she learned about the hugging incident, reported separately by CM#2.

NE#1 was not necessarily unprofessional when he mimicked a cat at the clinic, given his love for cats and animals. However, NE#1's conduct crossed the line into unprofessionalism when, in September 2025, he invaded CM#1's personal space and rubbed his head against her arm without permission. This conduct was particularly inappropriate, as CM#1 communicated to OPA that she felt alarmed by NE#1's behavior and found it triggering due to a prior traumatic experience. This conduct alone would have been sufficient to sustain this allegation. Still, NE#1's unwarranted touching persisted. On October 15, he physically embraced CM#2 without permission and

expressed his love for her. On October 16, he poked at CM#2's shoulder without permission and repeatedly stated, "Poke." NE#1's actions on these occasions were also unprofessional. On both occasions, CM#2 expressed a desire not to engage with NE#1 (stating "Alright, see ya," and telling NE#1 she did not have time for him). NE#1 did not appear to have permission to access the clinic's non-public areas and undoubtedly caused discomfort among staff with his behavior, as reflected in text messages, email correspondence, and interview statements. OPA also found it concerning that the staff felt uncertain about how to address the situation due to NE#1's position as a police officer. As an individual in a position of authority who worked in their area, NE#1 should have recognized the boundaries of acceptable behavior around community members. This is especially true when he was on duty and in uniform.

In evaluating this allegation, OPA noted that during his first, January 20, 2026, interview, NE#1 was confronted with each specific factual allegation. To each, NE#1 only responded, "I don't recall doing that." When asked to respond, in summary, to the professionalism allegation, NE#1 stated, "My response, that none of these things occurred." These incidents occurred in September and October 2025, about four months before the first interview, and concerned behavior that was reasonably memorable. OPA recognized that NE#1 may have a different perspective on these occurrences or may dispute the characterization by the clinic staff to such an extent that, in his mind, he could flatly deny the allegations. OPA ordered NE#1 to participate in a second interview to provide him an opportunity to elaborate on his previous responses. During his second interview on April 10, 2026, NE#1 continued to deny most of the allegations. Notably, NE#1 admitted he and CM#2 had hugged, but he characterized these as initiated by CM#2. NE#1 specifically denied rubbing on CM#1, telling CM#2 that he loved her, or poking CM#2.

OPA credits the multiple, specific, detailed, corroborated accounts of the four community members. Finding that these instances occurred as alleged, OPA is currently reviewing whether to open a separate case to determine if NE#1 failed to cooperate with a Department internal investigation or provided intentionally dishonest responses in his interview. See SPD Policies 5.002-POL-11 ("Employees will cooperate with Department internal investigations" including by rendering "complete, comprehensive statements," including "all material facts and circumstances surrounding the subject matter of the investigation, which are known by the employee") and 5.001-POL-11 ("Employees will be truthful and complete in all communication").

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2

5.100 – Operations Bureau Individual Responsibilities, I. Patrol Officers, A. Responsibilities, 2. Monitor and take appropriate action regarding criminal activity in assigned area

OPA investigated whether NE#1 neglected his patrol duties by spending an excessive amount of time at the clinic.

Patrol officers are responsible for monitoring and taking appropriate action regarding criminal activity in an assigned area. SPD Policy 5.100(I)(A)(2).

OPA recommends this allegation be Sustained. Patrol officers are responsible for monitoring their assigned areas for potential criminal activity. Undoubtedly, one aspect of this involves business checks, community policing, and relationship building. But NE#1's activities at the clinic evolved far from those laudable purposes and, more likely than not, were undertaken either to specifically avoid "monitoring and taking appropriate action" or were, at the very least, lengthy and frequent social visits on work time done to the exclusion of his patrol duties. Moreover, NE#1's apparent loafing was notable to clinic staff, who specifically referenced this aspect of NE#1's behavior in their interviews.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**

Footnote 1. The OPA Director may designate a civilian OPA Deputy Director to "perform such duties and have such powers as the OPA Director may prescribe and delegate." Seattle Ordinance 125315, Council Bill 118969, subchapter I, section 3.29.100(B).