



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: APRIL 8, 2025

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

CASE NUMBER: 2021OPA-0018

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

| Allegation(s): | | Director's Findings |
|----------------|---|---------------------------|
| # 1 | 5.140 - Bias-Free Policing 2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing | Not Sustained - Unfounded |
| # 2 | 15.180 - Primary Investigations 1. Officers Shall Conduct a Thorough and Complete Search for Evidence | Not Sustained - Unfounded |
| # 3 | 5.001 - Standards and Duties 10. Employees Shall Strive to be Professional | Not Sustained - Unfounded |

Named Employee #2

| Allegation(s): | | Director's Findings |
|----------------|---|---------------------------|
| # 1 | 5.140 - Bias-Free Policing 2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing | Not Sustained - Unfounded |
| # 2 | 15.180 - Primary Investigations 1. Officers Shall Conduct a Thorough and Complete Search for Evidence | Not Sustained - Unfounded |
| # 3 | 5.001 - Standards and Duties 10. Employees Shall Strive to be Professional | Not Sustained - Unfounded |

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 named employees (NE#1 and NE#2) investigated the theft of a dog and subsequently arrested the Complainant. The Complainant alleged that the named employees exhibited racial bias, prevented him from showing proof of ownership of the dog, and mockingly misspelled his last name in a police report.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

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



ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Following an investigation that the Office of Inspector General certified as thorough, timely, and objective, OPA found that the preponderance of the evidence does not establish any policy violation occurring or rising to the level of misconduct.

OPA investigated the complaint by reviewing the computer-aided dispatch (CAD) call report, body-worn video (BWV), incident and supplement reports, and interview statements from the named employees.

Named Employee #1 - Allegation #1

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

The Complainant alleged that the named employees exhibited racial bias.

OPA found no evidence supporting the Complainant's interpretation of race-based mistreatment. NE#2's interaction with the Complainant was professional and included NE#2 voicing sympathy for the Complainant's situation regarding the ownership of the dog, de-escalating the situation, and communicating respectfully to the Complainant. Furthermore, the named employees' decision to arrest the Complainant was based on evidence gathered during their investigation, described below, rather than bias.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained - Unfounded**

Named Employee #1 - Allegation #2

15.180 - Primary Investigations 1. Officers Shall Conduct a Thorough and Complete Search for Evidence

The Complainant alleged that the named employees prevented him from showing proof of ownership of the dog.

The named employees conducted a thorough investigation by interviewing the relevant parties and an independent witness. A community member reported that the Complainant forcefully took her dog while she was walking it. She presented documentation to another officer proving ownership. An independent witness corroborated the community member's account of the theft. Although the Complainant believed the dog was gifted to him, there were no facts suggesting it belonged to him.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained - Unfounded**

Named Employee #1 - Allegation #3

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

The Complainant alleged that the named employees mockingly misspelled his last name in a police report.

Despite NE#1 misspelling the Complainant's last name in several sections of his supplement report, NE#1 considered these errors to be typographical mistakes, attributing the changes to Microsoft Word's automatic corrections.



Furthermore, the named employees' interactions with the Complainant were professional and respectful. Also, to the extent the putatively misspelled word is insulting in nature, the underlying facts of the incident would not suggest any rationale for insulting the Complainant with that specific word. Considering the similarities in the spellings of the Complainant's last name—which is either not an English-language word or an uncommon word—and the putatively misspelled word—a recognized, though insulting, English-language word—OPA finds the balance of the evidence suggests this allegation is unfounded.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained - Unfounded**

Named Employee #2 - Allegation #1

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

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained - Unfounded**

Named Employee #2 - Allegation #2

15.180 - Primary Investigations 1. Officers Shall Conduct a Thorough and Complete Search for Evidence

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained - Unfounded**

Named Employee #2 - Allegation #3

5.001 - Standards and Duties 10. Employees Shall 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**