


Closed Case Summary

Case Number: 2021OPA-0456 (Abbreviated Final)

Issued Date: January 19, 2026

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

Case Number: 2021OPA-0456

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

- 1. Allegation #1:** 5.140 - Bias-Free Policing 5.140-POL 2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing
Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded
 - 2. Allegation #2:** 5.001 - Standards and Duties 5.001-POL 7. Employees Engaged in Department-Related Activities Identify Themselves When Requested
Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
 - 3. Allegation #3:** 5.001 - Standards and Duties POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional
Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
-

Named Employee #2

- 1. Allegation #1:** 5.140 - Bias-Free Policing 5.140-POL 2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing
Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
 - 2. Allegation #2:** 5.001 - Standards and Duties 5.001-POL 7. Employees Engaged in Department-Related Activities Identify Themselves When Requested
Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
 - 3. Allegation #3:** 5.001 - Standards and Duties POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional
Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
-

Named Employee #3

1. Allegation #1: 5.140 - Bias-Free Policing 5.140-POL 2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing

Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)

2. Allegation #2: 5.001 - Standards and Duties 5.001-POL 7. Employees Engaged in Department-Related Activities Identify Themselves When Requested

Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)

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

Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)

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:

The Complainant called 911 regarding an incident at her residence. The three named employees responded. The Complainant alleged that the Named Employees treated her in a way that made her feel like the “suspect,” which the Complainant alleged was because of her race and gender.

Administrative Note:

On June 2, 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.

During its intake investigation, OPA identified allegations against the three named employees for failing to properly conduct a DV investigation. See SPD Policy 15.410-POL-5. OPA returned these allegations to the chain of command to be handled via a Supervisor Action.²

This case was also designated as partial Expedited Investigation for the alleged professionalism and failure to provide identification allegations for all named employees. The alleged bias-based policing allegations for Named Employee #2 (NE#2) and Named Employee #3 (NE#3) were also expedited. This means that OPA, with the Office of Inspector General’s review and approval, believed that it could reach, and issue recommended findings based solely on its intake investigation. As such, OPA did not interview NE#2 or NE#3. The allegation of bias-based policing against Named Employee #1 (NE#1) proceeded to full investigation.

On May 24, 2022, OIG certified this investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

Summary of the Investigation:

Following an investigation that the Office of Inspector General certified as thorough, timely, and objective, 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 investigated the complaint by reviewing the OPA complaint, computer-aided dispatch (CAD) call reports, police reports, and body-worn video (BWV). OPA requested an interview with the Complainant, which she declined. OPA reviewed the Complainant's written response to questions.

Analysis and Conclusions:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

Allegation #1: 5.140 - Bias-Free Policing 5.140-POL 2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing

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 the race and gender of the Complainant. *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.

The Complainant, an African American woman, alleged that in responding to a DV call the named employees acted indifferently toward her, treated her as if she were the perpetrator, and would have been more responsive if she were White or Asian.

OPA reviewed the available evidence, including BWV for all three named employees. OPA observed no evidence to support this allegation. Instead, it appeared more likely than not that the Complainant wanted the subject arrested, and progressively revised her original allegations to trigger an arrest. These revisions were made after the officers informed the Complainant that the parties would be separated from each other and the subject would not be arrested. At no time did any named employee appear to make decisions or take actions based on the race of the Complainant or others, nor did any named employees express any prejudice or make derogatory comments concerning African Americans or other races.

The allegation concerning NE#1 proceeded to full investigation due to concerns OIG expressed regarding how NE#1 pronounced the name of one of the Complainant's children. OPA reviewed the BWV from this exchange and, although the pronunciation appeared somewhat stilted or awkward, NE#1 did not appear to express any prejudice against the Complainant or the child in doing so.

In her OPA interview, NE#1 identified as African American and “half black, half white.” NE#1 described being mis-identified as an Asian woman by the Complainant. NE#1 stated the Complainant was frustrated by not getting the subject arrested and changed her allegations regarding the subject to achieve that objective.

Based on the totality of the evidence, OPA finds that it is more likely than not that NE#1 did not engage in bias-based policing. Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2

5.001 - Standards and Duties 5.001-POL 7. Employees Engaged in Department-Related Activities Identify Themselves When Requested

SPD Policy 5.001-POL-7 requires that SPD employees engaged in department related activities “provide their name and Department serial number verbally, or in writing if requested.” (SPD Policy 5.001-POL-7.)

The Complainant alleged that the named employees did not to identify themselves. In reviewing the BWV, OPA did not observe the Complainant request the named employees’ names or badge numbers. Instead, at one point, the Complainant requested a card “for the incident” from NE#1. NE#1 then provided the case number for the incident by writing on a domestic violence pamphlet she provided to the Complainant.

Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

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

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #3

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

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. Additionally, the policy instructs Department employees to “avoid unnecessary escalation of events even if those events do not end in reportable uses of force.” *Id.* 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.* Lastly, the policy states that Department employees, while on duty or in uniform, will not publicly ridicule: “the Department or its policies, other Department employees, other law enforcement agencies, the criminal justice system or police

profession. This applies where such expression is defamatory, obscene, undermines the effectiveness of the Department, interferes with the maintenance of discipline, or is made with reckless disregard for truth.” *Id.*

The Complainant alleged the named employees treated her like a suspect and introduced the Subject’s relative to remove the Subject’s daughter from the site of the DV conflict. During the conflict, the Named Employees took steps to de-escalate the situation. As a part of this effort, especially when the Complainant and the Subject’s sister were escalating hostilities, NE#2 warned that the Complainant might be arrested if she did not back off, which effectively diffused the tension. OPA observed that all parties were spoken to and treated with respect throughout the encounter

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

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

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #1

Allegation #1: 5.140 - Bias-Free Policing 5.140-POL 2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing

For the same reasons articulated at Named Employee #1, Allegation #1, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

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

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #2

5.001 - Standards and Duties 5.001-POL 7. Employees Engaged in Department-Related Activities Identify Themselves When Requested

For the reasons articulated at Named Employee #1, Allegation #2, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

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

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #3

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

For the same reasons articulated at Named Employee #1, Allegation #3, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

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

Named Employee #3 – Allegation #1

Allegation #1: 5.140 - Bias-Free Policing 5.140-POL 2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing

For the same reasons articulated at Named Employee #1, Allegation #1, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

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

Named Employee #3 – Allegation #2

5.001 - Standards and Duties 5.001-POL 7. Employees Engaged in Department-Related Activities Identify Themselves When Requested

For the reasons articulated at Named Employee #1, Allegation #2, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

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

Named Employee #3 – Allegation #3

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

For the same reasons articulated at Named Employee #1, Allegation #3, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

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

Footnote 1. The OPA Director may designate a civilian OPA Deputy Director to “perform such duties and have such powers as the OPA Director may prescribe and delegate.” Seattle Ordinance 125315, Council Bill 118969, subchapter I, section 3.29.100(B).

Footnote 2. A Supervisor Action generally involves a minor policy violation or performance issue the employee’s supervisor addresses through training, communication, or coaching. See OPA Internal Operations and Training Manual section 5.4(B)(ii).