Seattle Office of Police Accountability

Closed Case Summary

Case Number: 2026OPA-0114

Issued Date: September 7, 2026

From: Director Bonnie Glenn
Office of Police Accountability



Case Number: 2026OPA-0114

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

1. **Allegation #1:** 6.180 – Searches-General, 1. Officers May Only Make Searches Pursuant to a Search Warrant, Unless a Specific Exception Applies

   Finding: Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper

2. **Allegation #2:** 8.100 – De-Escalation, 8.100-POL-1. When Safe, Feasible, and Without Compromising Law Enforcement Priorities, Sworn Employees Will Use De-Escalation Tactics to Reduce the Need for Force

   Finding: Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper

3. **Allegation #3:** 5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional

   Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded

Named Employee #2

1. **Allegation #1:** 6.180 – Searches-General, 1. Officers May Only Make Searches Pursuant to a Search Warrant, Unless a Specific Exception Applies

   Finding: Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper

2. **Allegation #2:** 8.100 – De-Escalation, 8.100-POL-1. When Safe, Feasible, and Without Compromising Law Enforcement Priorities, Sworn Employees Will Use De-Escalation Tactics to Reduce the Need for Force

   Finding: Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper

3. **Allegation #3:** 5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional

   Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded

Named Employee #3

1. **Allegation #1:** 6.180 – Searches-General, 1. Officers May Only Make Searches Pursuant to a Search Warrant, Unless a Specific Exception Applies

   Finding: Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper

2. **Allegation #2:** 8.100 – De-Escalation, 8.100-POL-1. When Safe, Feasible, and Without Compromising Law Enforcement Priorities, Sworn Employees Will Use De-Escalation Tactics to Reduce the Need for Force

   Finding: Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper

3. **Allegation #3:** 5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional

   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:

On March 1, 2026, the named employees (NE#1, NE#2, and NE#3) were dispatched to the Complainant's apartment following reports of the Complainant using a knife for self-harm. Upon their arrival, the named employees briefly spoke with the Complainant through the door before forcibly entering and handcuffing him. The Complainant alleged that the named employees unlawfully entered his apartment and failed to de-escalate. OPA also investigated whether the named employees communicated unprofessionally with the Complainant.

Administrative Note:

On August 21, 2026, the Office of Inspector General certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

Summary of the Investigation:

OPA investigated this incident by reviewing the computer-aided dispatch (CAD) call report, body-worn video (BWV), incident report, and email correspondence from the Complainant. OPA also interviewed the named employees.

A. OPA Complaint and Email Correspondence

On March 16, 2026, the Complainant filed an OPA complaint. He wrote that he requested crisis assistance when he called 988, but SPD officers arrived at his apartment instead and forcibly entered, leading to his involuntary detainment. He raised concerns regarding the named employees' forced entry despite his calm verbal communication and their failure to de-escalate.

The Complainant declined an OPA interview but elected to email a written statement to OPA on April 3, 2026. In his statement, the Complainant stated, “My complaint is primarily about the officers’ forced entry and the level of force used against me, especially given that I was calm, communicating, and willing to speak with them through the door. From my perspective, I was seeking assistance and de-escalation, but instead I experienced a forced entry, physical injury, loss of consciousness or memory, and restraints.”

B. The Incident

On March 1, 2026, at 1:33 AM, CAD call remarks noted, “SUBJ[ECT] IS ACTIVELY HURTING THEMSELVES W[ITH] KNIFE ON THEIR ARM[.]”

BWV captured the named employees responding to the Complainant’s apartment. Upon their arrival, NE#1 knocked on the door, identified himself, and asked the Complainant to open the door. NE#3 attempted to open the door, but it was locked. NE#1 placed a sticker over the peephole. NE#1 and NE#3 repeatedly urged the Complainant to open the door, but he declined. NE#1 insisted that the Complainant needed to open the door immediately or else the officers would “kick it down.” The Complainant asked about the reason and whether they had a warrant. NE#3 announced, “We’re going to be breaching the door.” NE#1 advised the Complainant to “back up.” NE#1 then kicked the door open. As the door swung open, the Complainant appeared to be retreating from it.

The named employees entered the apartment. The Complainant sat on the floor and raised his hands in response to NE#1’s command. The named employees grabbed the Complainant and pressed him against the couch. The Complainant exclaimed, “Get the fuck off me! This is my fucking apartment!” The Complainant pressed his side against the couch as the named employees continued grabbing him. NE#3 asked whether the Complainant called the police, but he denied it. The named employees instructed the Complainant to “turn over,” but the Complainant asked, “Why?” NE#2 replied, “Turn over or it’s going to go really badly for you. I promise.” The Complainant asked why it would go badly for him. The named employees maneuvered the Complainant’s stomach against the couch and positioned his arms behind his back, after which NE#2 applied handcuffs. NE#1 and NE#2 then sat the Complainant on the couch.

NE#2 informed the Complainant that SPD received a report indicating he was “actively harming” himself. NE#1 then informed the Complainant that the officers forcibly entered for “exigency” and “community caretaking” based on their belief that he was “actively harming” himself. NE#1 said an ambulance was en route to transport the Complainant to a hospital. NE#1 also said the officers did not need a warrant to enter. NE#1 explained that he covered the peephole due to officer safety concerns. Meanwhile, NE#3 located the Complainant’s cellphone and noticed it connected to 988, a crisis hotline. The Complainant stated to officers that he has been dealing with suicidal ideation for four years.

Eventually, the Complainant was transported to a hospital.

C. OPA Interviews

1. Named Employee #1

On June 9, 2026, OPA interviewed NE#1. NE#1 said there was a 911 call concerning a suicide. NE#1 said call updates indicated that the subject was cutting himself and threatened to jump from the roof of his building. NE#1 said they determined that forced entry was necessary due to threats of self-harm and jumping. NE#1 said forcibly entering was necessary to assist the Complainant and ensure his safety. NE#1 said they did not take additional time to speak with the Complainant because he might have been actively harming himself during their conversation, so NE#1 wanted to prevent further harm. NE#1 described the de-escalation tactics employed, which included communicating with the Complainant about the actions the named employees were intending to take, instructing the Complainant to step away from the door, the presence of multiple officers on scene, and providing instructions during handcuffing. NE#1 said further de-escalation before entry was unfeasible due to community caretaking needs. NE#1 denied using any force against the Complainant.

2. Named Employee #2

On June 3, 2026, OPA interviewed NE#2. NE#2's statements were consistent with the evidence summarized above. NE#2 added that the named employees attempted to engage the Complainant at the door, but he was dismissive and did not want to continue the conversation. NE#2 also noted the risk of the Complainant bleeding out, which could complicate treatment. NE#2 believed the Complainant intended to delay intervention. NE#2 said excessive delay could endanger the Complainant's life.

3. Named Employee #3

On June 3, 2026, OPA interviewed NE#3. NE#3's statements were consistent with the evidence summarized above.

Analysis and Conclusions:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1
6.180 – Searches-General, 1. Officers May Only Make Searches Pursuant to a Search Warrant, Unless a Specific Exception Applies

The Complainant alleged that the named employees unlawfully entered his apartment.

Officers are prohibited from searching without a valid search warrant unless a specific exception applies. SPD Policy 6.180(1).

The need to protect or preserve life, avoid serious injury, or protect property in danger of damage may justify an entry that would otherwise be illegal absent an emergency. SPD Policy 6.180-POL-1. A community caretaking search does not require probable cause but must be motivated solely by the perceived need to render aid or assistance. *Id.* Officers will act under a community caretaking role in emergency action, not in their evidence-gathering role. *Id.*

An officer may conduct a warrantless community caretaking search when: (1) the officer has a subjective belief that someone likely needs assistance for health or safety concerns; (2) a reasonable person in the same situation would similarly believe there is a need for assistance; (3) there is a reasonable basis to associate the need for assistance with the place searched; (4) there is an imminent threat of substantial bodily injury to persons or substantial damage to property; and (5) a specific person or property needs immediate help for health or safety reasons. SPD Policy 6.180-POL-1(1).

There were facts and circumstances supporting the named employees' warrantless entry into the Complainant's apartment. CAD indicated that the subject was "actively hurting" himself with a knife. The named employees defended their warrantless entry based on concerns of self-harm and jumping. They articulated to OPA that the Complainant might have been actively harming himself during their conversation. Given the totality of these circumstances, the named employees subjectively believed that the Complainant required immediate assistance for health and safety concerns. This belief was objectively reasonable, considering the Complainant's unwillingness to cooperate and his dismissiveness toward the named employees. Once inside the apartment, the named employees secured the Complainant in handcuffs and explained the reason for their forced entry. Overall, a preponderance of the evidence showed that the named employees acted to protect the Complainant from further harm, justifying their warrantless entry based on community caretaking grounds.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper**

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2
8.100 – De-Escalation, 8.100-POL-1. When Safe, Feasible, and Without Compromising Law Enforcement Priorities, Sworn Employees Will Use De-Escalation Tactics to Reduce the Need for Force

The Complainant alleged that the named employees failed to de-escalate.

When safe, feasible, and without compromising law enforcement priorities, sworn employees will use de-escalation tactics to reduce the need for force. SPD Policy 8.100-POL-1. Team approaches to de-escalation are encouraged and will consider sworn employee training and skill level, the number of sworn employees, and whether any sworn employee has successfully established rapport with the subject. *Id.* The totality of the circumstances should guide de-escalation options purposed for voluntary compliance through communication, time, distance, and shielding. *Id.*

OPA finds, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the named employees de-escalated to the extent feasible. Upon arriving at the Complainant's apartment, they attempted to communicate with him by repeatedly instructing him to open the door. NE#1 and NE#3 warned the Complainant that they would force entry if he did not comply. When the Complainant did not comply, NE#1 warned

him to step back and then breached the door. The named employees then promptly handcuffed the Complainant. The named employees explained to OPA that they had little time to continue engaging with the Complainant through his door. NE#2 particularly emphasized the risk of the Complainant bleeding out, which could complicate treatment. The circumstances suggested that further delay could endanger the Complainant's life. Overall, the named employees used communication as a de-escalation tactic until both communication and time rendered further de-escalation unfeasible.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper**

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #3
5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional

The named employees allegedly communicated unprofessionally with the Complainant.

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*. Employees will avoid unnecessary escalation of events, even if those events do not end in reportable uses of force. *Id.* Employees representing the Department or identifying themselves as police officers or Department employees will not use profanity directed as an insult or any derogatory, contemptuous, or disrespectful language at anyone. *Id.*

This allegation is unfounded. The named employees did not use profanity directed as an insult or use derogatory, contemptuous, or disrespectful language toward the Complainant. Rather, their communication consisted of issuing lawful warnings and instructions. At one point, NE#2 told the Complainant, "Turn over or it's going to go really badly for you. I promise." OPA does not consider this statement to be unprofessional since the Complainant was disobeying police commands at that moment. Overall, the named employees were professional throughout their interaction with the Complainant.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #1
6.180 – Searches-General, 1. Officers May Only Make Searches Pursuant to a Search Warrant, Unless a Specific Exception Applies

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper**

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #2
8.100 – De-Escalation, 8.100-POL-1. When Safe, Feasible, and Without Compromising Law Enforcement Priorities, Sworn Employees Will Use De-Escalation Tactics to Reduce the Need for Force

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper**

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #3
5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #3, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

Named Employee #3 – Allegation #1
6.180 – Searches-General, 1. Officers May Only Make Searches Pursuant to a Search Warrant, Unless a Specific Exception Applies

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper**

Named Employee #3 – Allegation #2
8.100 – De-Escalation, 8.100-POL-1. When Safe, Feasible, and Without Compromising Law Enforcement Priorities, Sworn Employees Will Use De-Escalation Tactics to Reduce the Need for Force

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper**

Named Employee #3 – Allegation #3
5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #3, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**