



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: APRIL 1, 2025

FROM: INTERIM DEPUTY DIRECTOR NELSON R. LEESE (ON BEHALF OF INTERIM DIRECTOR BONNIE GLENN)
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

CASE NUMBER: 2020OPA-0388

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	5.001 - Standards and Duties 10. Employees Shall Strive to be Professional	Not Sustained - Inconclusive
# 2	5.001 - Standards and Duties 15. Employees Obey any Lawful Order Issued by a Superior Officer	Not Sustained - Inconclusive

This Closed Case Summary (CCS) represents the opinion of the OPA Director regarding the misconduct alleged and therefore sections are written in the first person.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Complainant—then an acting Captain—alleged that Named Employee #1 (NE#1), a lieutenant, acted in an intimidating, insubordinate, and irrational manner during an encounter with her.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

On August 12, 2022, OPA issued an abbreviated Director's Certification Memorandum finding all allegations in this case were Not Sustained. At that time, OPA noted an expanded Director's Certification Memorandum may be completed later at the Director's discretion. OPA now finalizes its findings as follows.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Following an investigation, the Office of Inspector General (OIG) certified this case as timely and objective but not thorough. OIG's rationale appeared to be based on the failure of a witness officer to be interviewed. OPA noted that this witness was not present during the alleged altercation. OPA assessed that, because this witness was not present, his statement would not provide any additional factual evidence to progress the investigation.

OPA's analysis is that the preponderance of the evidence does not establish that any policy violations occurred or rose to the level of misconduct.

OPA reviewed the evidence in this matter, including interviews with the Complainant, three witness employees, and NE#1.



Named Employee #1 - Allegation #1

5.001 - Standards and Duties 10. Employees Shall Strive to be Professional

OPA is unable to find by a preponderance of the evidence that the evidence proves or disproves this allegation. The Complainant alleged that NE#1 came into her office on June 8, 2020, and the two had a disagreement stemming from the Complainant's directions to NE#1's direct subordinates. The Complainant alleged NE#1 became increasingly agitated, at which point she told him to "get out of my office." The Complainant alleged NE#1 told her "Fuck you" multiple times. The Complainant also alleged NE#1 told her, "people are right about you," at which point he disregarded a second order to leave. The Complainant stated she thought NE#1 might "chest bump" or shoot her, but clarified NE#1 did not gesture towards his firearm.

NE#1 denied the allegations. NE#1 admitted he and the Complainant had a disagreement, during which he spoke with "disappointment." NE#1 admitted telling the Complainant that she did not have "no clue" about "how things were." NE#1 said this caused the Complainant to scream for him to get out of her office. NE#1 denied screaming at the Complainant and said he left the Complainant's office. The Complainant stated he was told multiple individuals present outside the Complainant's office corroborated that they heard the Complainant screaming, but not him.

OPA interviewed two witness employees whose workstations were in proximity to the Complainant's office. Both stated they heard the Complainant order someone out of her office, but neither could provide further relevant information.

Ultimately, the Complainant and NE#1 provided conflicting accounts of their interaction. OPA interviewed two witnesses who provided information that did not resolve which version was more likely.

For the reasons set forth above, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Inconclusive.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained - Inconclusive**

Named Employee #1 - Allegation #2

5.001 - Standards and Duties 15. Employees Obey any Lawful Order Issued by a Superior Officer

For the reasons set forth above, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Inconclusive.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained - Inconclusive**