



## CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: DECEMBER 2, 2024

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

CASE NUMBER: 2024OPA-0254

### **Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings**

#### **Named Employee #1**

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional	Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
# 2	5.140 – Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing	Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)

#### **Named Employee #2**

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional	Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
# 2	5.140 – Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing	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 contacted Named Employee #1 (NE#1) and Named Employee #2 (NE#2), requesting medical aid for a dog bite injury. The Complainant alleged that the named employees were unprofessional and biased against him.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:**

This case was approved for Expedited Investigation. That means 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 employees. As such, OPA did not interview the named employees in this case.

On July 16, 2024, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

### **SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:**

On June 6, 2024, Witness Supervisor #1 (WS#1), a sergeant, submitted an OPA complaint on the Complainant's behalf. WS#1 wrote that he responded to the Complainant's location, where the named employees were present. WS#1 noted that the Complainant was aggressive, intoxicated, and had a laceration on his finger. WS#1 wrote that the Complainant went to a hospital, where he alleged that the named employees were dismissive, had aggressive body language, and tried to manipulate him since he was intoxicated.



---

OPA investigated the complaint by reviewing the computer-aided dispatch (CAD) call report, behavioral crisis report, and body-worn video (BWV). OPA also interviewed the Complainant.

BWV did not capture the Complainant's initial contact with the named employees, but it was documented in NE#1's behavioral crisis report. The report stated that on June 6, 2024, at around 6:10 AM, he and NE#2 were in a patrol car when the Complainant approached and requested medical aid for his injured finger. NE#1 wrote that the Complainant was intoxicated and claimed he previously called 911 for help, which dispatch was unable to verify. NE#1 wrote that the Complainant declined an ambulance transport, a Seattle Fire Department (SFD) evaluation, and a police transport to a hospital. NE#1 wrote that he advised the Complainant to walk to the nearest hospital two blocks away, but the Complainant became agitated and accused them of refusing to respond to his 911 call. NE#1 wrote that they drove away to de-escalate the situation since the Complainant declined the services they offered. NE#1 wrote that the Complainant called 911, demanding officers and a supervisor to respond.

On June 6, 2024, at 6:15 AM, CAD call remarks noted, "[REPORTING PARTY] IS BLEEDING, REQ[UESTED] A [SERGEANT] AND MEDICS. REFUSED TO PROVIDE FUTHER. FIRE SCREENED, NOT GOING."

The named employees responded to the incident location with their BWV activated, capturing the following:

The named employees spoke with the Complainant in a parking lot. He was argumentative, demanded a supervisor, and declined a transport via ambulance because he did not want to pay for it. NE#1 radioed for SFD and offered to walk him to the hospital. The Complainant rebuked the named employees for driving away when he initially contacted them for medical aid. They countered, saying he declined the services they offered. SFD arrived, briefly evaluated the Complainant, called for the American Medical Response (AMR), and left.<sup>1</sup> Once AMR arrived, the Complainant argued with an AMR employee, who advised him to walk to the hospital because he would not be seen sooner even if AMR transported him. WS#1 arrived and spoke with the Complainant, who sought to file a complaint against the named employees for driving away when he needed medical aid for a dog bite. He said he felt intimidated when they inserted their hands into their police vest. He agreed to walk with WS#1 to the hospital to further discuss his complaint but changed his mind, saying he would ride in the AMR van. The named employees and WS#1 drove to the hospital while AMR transported the Complainant there.

WS#1 screened the incident with the named employees and then interviewed the Complainant inside the hospital. The Complainant said no one responded when he called 911. He said he approached the named employees in their patrol car and asked for help. He said they offered to call an ambulance and provided directions to a nearby hospital but remained in their patrol car and did nothing. He said they did not swear but offered to drive him to the hospital. The Complainant alleged that the named employees were unprofessional because they exhibited aggressive and intimidating body language, like inserting their hands into their police vest. He felt they were dismissive, treating him like he was a "homeless crackhead."

NE#1's behavioral crisis report was consistent with BWV observations.

On June 21, 2024, OPA interviewed the Complainant, whose statements were consistent with those captured on BWV. Additionally, the Complainant alleged that the named employees were racially biased against him. He believed

---

<sup>1</sup> NE#1's behavioral crisis report stated that the Complainant was "verbally elusive" with SFD personnel and declined their aid.



the named employees should have taken a more community-oriented approach to policing by ensuring that he receive medical aid.

**ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

**Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1**

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

The Complainant alleged that the named employees were unprofessional.

SPD employees must “strive to be professional.” SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10. Further, “employees may not engage in behavior that undermines public trust in the Department, the officer, or other officers,” whether on or off duty. *Id.*

This allegation is unfounded. The named employees exhibited patience and courtesy throughout their contact with the Complainant. They repeatedly offered to call an ambulance, walk him to the hospital two blocks away, or drive him there—offers the Complainant repeatedly declined. Instead, the Complainant was agitated, appearing to be upset over his prior contact with the named employees, who offered the same services to him. The named employees were neither aggressive nor dismissive during their contact with the Complainant.

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

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

**Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2**

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

The Complainant alleged that the named employees were biased against him.

Biased policing means “the different treatment of any person by officers motivated by any characteristic of protected classes under state, federal, and local laws as well as other discernible personal characteristics of an individual.” SPD Policy 5.140-POL. It includes different treatments based on race or homelessness. *See id.* Employees are forbidden from making decisions or taking actions influenced by bias, prejudice, or discriminatory intent. *See* SPD Policy 5.140-POL-2.

This allegation is unfounded for the same reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1. The Complainant repeatedly declined several offers of assistance. The named employees remained professional, patient, and courteous as they attempted to get treatment for the Complainant. OPA found no evidence supporting the Complainant’s interpretation of mistreatment based on race or perceived homelessness status.

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

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

**Named Employee #2 – Allegation #1**

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



For the reasons 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**

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

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

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