



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: SEPTEMBER 9, 2024

FROM: DEPUTY DIRECTOR BONNIE GLENN ON BEHALF OF DIRECTOR GINO BETTS, JR.
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

CASE NUMBER: 2024OPA-0111

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	5.002 - Responsibilities of Employees Concerning Alleged Policy Violations 5. Supervisors Will Investigate or Refer Allegations of Policy Violations Depending on the Severity of the Violation	Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)

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 alleged Named Employee #1 (NE#1) failed to report a serious policy violation - time theft - against Witness Employee #1 (WE#1) to OPA.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

This complaint included several allegations to include those likely to fall within SDHR's jurisdiction. Accordingly, OPA forwarded the complaint to the Seattle Department of Human Resources for EEO considerations. OPA's investigation solely covered whether NE#1 violated a serious police violation.

This case was designated as an Expedited Investigation. This means that OPA, with the Office of Inspector General's (OIG) agreement, believed it could issue recommended findings based solely on its intake investigation without interviewing the named employee. As such, OPA did not interview the named employee involved in this case. On April 12, 2024, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

OPA completed its factual investigation within the 180-day period but, did not timely file this DCM, by the August 31, 2024, deadline given time constraints. As this was certified as an expedited investigation, no potential discipline was precluded by this untimeliness.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

The Complainant filed an internal Blue Team complaint with OPA on March 4, 2024. The Complainant documented the following.

On December 2, 2023, the Complainant was working second watch during a Seattle Police Operations Center (SPOC) activation. NE#1 was also working in SPOC as the Public Information Officer (PIO) for the event. NE#1 asked the Complainant if he could speak with her privately. The Complainant stated she had spoken with NE#1 privately on a few occasions about challenges of working as a (PIO), as the Complainant served in that capacity in 2020. The



Complainant and NE#1 went to an office. NE#1 explained he wanted to talk about WE#1. The Complainant stated WE#1 had been working overtime shifts frequently, during a time when the Complainant was the watch commander.

NE#1 told the Complainant that he was having issues with WE#1's work performance and that she should be aware of it. NE#1 stated WE#1 had been burning sick time and then working overtime augmenting. NE#1 also stated that NE#1 had been documenting WE#1's deficiencies and working with EEO on improving WE#1's performance.

On December 2, 2023, following her meeting with NE#1, the Complainant reviewed WE#1's timesheets. The Complainant did not find any instances where WE#1 appeared to have burned sick time and then worked overtime. Furthermore, the few times that WE#1 had been marked as sick she did not have overtime hours documented on her timesheet. The Complainant stated she was surprised that NE#1 would come to her regarding concerns about time theft, a "major" policy violation, without referring it to OPA. The Complainant stated, because of the significance of the alleged violation, she believed SPD policy required him to report it to OPA.

On December 18, 2023, NE#1 filed a complainant with OPA for various policy violations against WE#1 to include time keeping and payroll. OPA investigated these allegations under OPA case number 2023OPA-0539.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 - Allegation #1

5.002 - Responsibilities of Employees Concerning Alleged Policy Violations 5. Supervisors Will Investigate or Refer Allegations of Policy Violations Depending on the Severity of the Violation

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 failed to forward WE#1's serious policy violation of time theft.

SPD Policy 5.002-POL-5 requires supervisors who become aware of a potential policy violation to investigate or refer the allegations depending on their severity. Minor allegations of misconduct may be investigated by a supervisor, while allegations of serious misconduct must be referred to OPA. See SPD Policy 5.002-POL-5.

NE#1 allegedly spoke with the Complainant on December 2, 2023, about WE#1 burning sick leave and then augmenting time. On December 18, 2023, NE#1 sent a complaint to OPA concerning WE#1's sick time usage for July and November of 2023. These issues were reviewed under OPA case 2023OPA-0539. Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

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