



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: JUNE 19, 2020

CASE NUMBER: 2020OPA-0271

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	8.200 – Using Force 1. When Authorized	Not Sustained (Unfounded)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Complainant alleged that after they were arrested, the Named Employee used excessive force by twisting their wrist while they were strapped to a gurney.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

This case was designated as an Expedited Investigation. This means that OPA, with the review and approval of the Office of Inspector General for Public Safety, believed that it could reach and issue recommended findings based solely on its intake investigation and without interviewing the Named Employee. As such, the Named Employee was not interviewed as part of this case.

The Complainant identifies using they/them gender pronouns, and this DCM refers to them as such.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 - Allegation #1

8.200 – Using Force 1. When Authorized

The Complainant sent OPA a letter from King County Jail (KCJ), which included allegations about the Port of Seattle Police Department and King County Jail staff. The Complainant also alleged that, after being taken into custody, the Complainant was unable to recover personal items that were held by SPD. OPA contacted the Complainant's attorney, who clarified the allegations regarding missing property were concerning a different police agency.

The Complainant's attorney additionally provided a date and incident number, and stated that on the date in question, the Complainant was subjected to excessive force by a female officer who twisted the Complainant's wrist after the Complainant had been arrested and secured on a gurney. The Complainant's attorney advised OPA that the Complainant would not provide a further statement.

OPA reviewed documentation and Body Worn Video (BWV) from the incident identified by the Complainant's attorney. OPA verified that, during that incident, three male officers and Named Employee #1 (NE#1), a female officer, interacted with the Complainant. The three male officers used force on them, and that force was reviewed and deemed consistent with policy by both OPA and the chain of command. NE#1 arrived on scene only after the use of force was over and the Complainant had already been restrained. A review of the BWV indicated that NE#1 did not ever make physical contact with the Complainant or use any physical force on the Complainant whatsoever.

For these reasons, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

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