


Closed Case Summary - Part 2

Case Number: 2020OPA-0744

Issued Date: March 3, 2026

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

Case Number: 2020OPA-0744

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

- 1. Allegation #1:** 5.001 - Standards and Duties 10. Employees Shall Strive to be Professional
Finding: Not Sustained - Training Referral
 - 2. Allegation #2:** 5.140 - Bias-Free Policing 2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing
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:

Complainant and a Co-Defendant were arrested on suspicion of Robbery when they attempted to take a dog from another person on October 30, 2019. NE#2 was one of four SPD police officers responding to a dispatch call. NE#2 prepared the Arrest Report, in which the Co-Defendant's last name was spelled correctly and incorrectly in various places. During the pendency of the criminal case against the Complainant and Co-Defendant, Complainant received a copy of the Arrest Report prepared by NE#2. The case against the Complainant was dismissed. After receiving a copy of the Arrest Report, Complainant objected to the misspelling of the Co-Defendant's name and concluded that she and the Co-Defendant were falsely arrested, and that the misspellings were intentional as a part of false statements designed to harm people due to gender and race.

Administrative Note:

Another SPD police officer (Named Employee #1 or NE#1) was the subject of another part of the

complaint, but that part of the complaint did not pertain to NE#2. As NE#2 was on extended leave at the time and later separated from the department, the complaint was bifurcated regarding the issues pertaining to NE#1. OPA issued findings for NE#1 in a DCM for Part 1 of this case.

On August 3, 2022, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

NE#2 separated from SPD prior to the conclusion of this investigation. Accordingly, contractual 180-day deadline applies to him.

Summary of the Investigation:

OPA investigated this bifurcated complaint by reviewing the internal Blue Team complaint submitted on the Complainant's behalf and the arrest report. OPA attempted to interview the Complainant but was unable to do so as the Complainant was concerned with identity theft issues and was unwilling to be available for a telephone interview or to come in for an in-person interview at OPA. OPA was unable to interview NE#2 as he was out on leave during this investigation and then separated from the department. NE#2 did submit written answers to questions posed by OPA and the answers were reviewed. OPA interviewed NE#1 on the other part of the bifurcated case to ascertain that employee's awareness and understanding of the correct and incorrect spelling of Complainant Co-Defendant's name.

Analysis and Conclusions:

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #1

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

The Complainant alleged that NE#2 inappropriately misspelled her Co-Defendant's name as a deliberate effort to harass and disrespect her.

SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10 requires that SPD employees "strive to be professional." The policy further instructs that "employees may not engage in behavior that undermines public trust in the Department, the officer, or other officers" whether on or off duty. SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10. Furthermore, the policy states: "Any time employees represent the Department or identify themselves as police officers or Department employees, they will not use profanity directed as an insult or any language that is derogatory, contemptuous, or disrespectful toward any person." *Id.*

In the Arrest Report, NE#2 spelled the Co-Defendant's name as "Manhater" several times. The word "Manhater" is only slightly different than the correct spelling of the Co-Defendant's actual name. The report contained instances of the name spelled both correctly and incorrectly. NE#2, who no longer works for SPD, declined to be interviewed for the investigation but did provide a brief written response to questions has no memory of any of the allegations. NE#2 indicated that he believed the misspelling were typographical errors that the computer did not catch. He also

speculated that the change may have been a result of an “autocorrect” feature in the software he used. The misspelling here is unfortunate but, more likely than not, inadvertent. First, the word “Manhater”—considered in context—would not make much sense to use as an insult against Co-Defendant. Second, OPA did not observe any other evidence to indicate animosity towards Co-Defendant that would trigger the insult “Manhater.” Finally, the two names were close in spelling, and it is plausible that, through some typographical or automated error, the name change was made.

That said, NE#2 should have reviewed his report and caught the misspelling, especially as the word “Manhater” would generally be considered derogatory. OPA issues a training referral here. Should NE#2 return to service at SPD, his Chain of command should provide the required additional training and counseling.

- **Training Referral:** Should NE#2 return to service at SPD, NE#2’s chain of command should discuss OPA’s findings with NE#2, review SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10 with NE#2 and provide any further retraining and counseling that it deems appropriate. The retraining and counseling conducted should be documented in Blue Team.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Training Referral**

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #2

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

The Complainant alleged that NE#2 was a part of an ongoing effort to harm her as a part of harassment because of race and gender.

SPD policy prohibits biased policing, which it defines as “the different treatment of any person by officers motivated by any characteristic of protected classes under state, federal, and local laws as well other discernible personal characteristics of an individual.” SPD Policy 5.140-POL. This includes different treatment based on race and gender. See *id.* Officers are forbidden from both, (i) making decisions or taking actions influenced by bias, and (ii) expressing any prejudice or derogatory comments concerning personal characteristics. See SPD Policy 5.140-POL-2.

There is no information in the record that NE#2 was motivated by racial or gender animus or treated the Complainant differently due to her being a Hispanic female. There is no information in the investigation reports of the underlying incident report to indicate any racial or gender animus in the events leading up to and including the arrest of the Complainant and her Co-Defendant. In its written responses to questions about the Complainant’s allegations, NE#2 did not recall the details of the incident, but also denied his actions were biased because of race or gender. Efforts to follow up with the Complainant were unsuccessful as the Complainant was distrustful of direct

communications with OPA as the Complainant was struggling with concerns about identity theft and other cybersecurity abuses. For these reasons there was no further evidence of bias that was discovered.

To the extent the term “Manhater” is a term that would implicate the potential for gender-based discrimination, OPA finds that, more likely than not, this was not the case here. For the reasons articulated above at Allegation #1, OPA finds the word was most likely the result of a typographical or automated error. Also, it would not make sense to insult the Co-Defendant by referring to him as a “Manhater” considering the totality of the circumstances in this case.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**