



## CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: FEBRUARY 10, 2025

FROM: INTERIM DIRECTOR BONNIE GLENN  
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

CASE NUMBER: 2024OPA-0337

### Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

#### Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	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:

Named Employee #1 (NE#1) cited the Complainant for exceeding the 15-minute parking limit in a load-and-unload zone. The Complainant alleged that NE#1 was biased based on her and her fiancée's physical disability.

### 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 a recommended finding based solely on its intake investigation without interviewing the named employee. As such, OPA did not interview the named employee in this case.

On September 13, 2024, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

### SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

OPA investigated the OPA complaint by reviewing the computer-aided dispatch (CAD) call report and parking infraction. OPA also interviewed the Complainant via email.

On August 16, 2024, CAD call remarks requested a check on two unoccupied vehicles that had been parked in a 15-minute load-and-unload zone for several hours. NE#1 responded to the call and cited the Complainant. The parking infraction indicated that NE#1 chalked the Complainant's tire at 11:24 AM and subsequently issued the infraction at 11:47 AM for violating Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) 11.72.215.<sup>1</sup> The infraction included photographs of the Complainant's vehicle and the adjacent 15-minute load-and-unload sign and yellow-painted sidewalk. According to the infraction, the Complainant requested the citation be withdrawn, but NE#1 explained the reasons for its issuance and discussed the option to mitigate or contest it.

<sup>1</sup> SMC 11.72.215 states, "No person shall stop, stand, or park a vehicle in a load and unload zone, for any purpose or length of time other than for the expeditious pickup and loading or unloading and delivery of persons or property, and then in no case shall the stop for such purposes exceed thirty (30) minutes."



---

The Complainant later informed OPA that her vehicle was in fact parked in the load-and-unload zone beyond the 15-minute time limit but alleged that NE#1 exhibited bias by citing her, given that both she and her fiancée were disabled.

**ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

**Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1**

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

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 exhibited bias against her and her fiancée based on disability.

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 treatment based on disability status. *See id.* Officers are forbidden from making decisions or taking actions influenced by bias and expressing prejudice or derogatory comments concerning discernible personal characteristics. *See* SPD Policy 5.140-POL-2.

This allegation is unfounded. NE#1 lawfully cited the Complainant for exceeding the 15-minute parking limit, which she admitted. Although she asserted that she and her fiancée were disabled, there was no indication that NE#1 knew about their disability. Even if NE#1 had known, there was no evidence to suggest that NE#1 mistreated the Complainant or her fiancée based on their disability. Moreover, SMC 11.72.215 did not exempt disabled individuals from the 15-minute parking limit. Overall, OPA found no evidence supporting the Complainant's claim of disability-based on bias.

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

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