




CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: MARCH 18, 2025

FROM: INTERIM DIRECTOR BONNIE GLENN
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY 

CASE NUMBER: 2024OPA-0381

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication	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 and impounded his vehicle for being parked in a location for over 72 hours. The Complainant alleged that NE#1 wrote a dishonest citation.

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 October 31, 2024, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

OPA investigated the complaint by reviewing the citation. OPA also interviewed the Complainant.

A citation indicated that the Complainant's vehicle was parked in one location for over 72 hours in violation of Seattle Municipal Code 11.72.440 (prohibiting a vehicle from being parked on "any street or other municipal property for a period of time longer than seventy-two (72) hours, unless an official posted sign provides a shorter period of time, or unless otherwise provided by law"). The citation included photographs of the Complainant's vehicle and a private note stating, "CHALKED AND TAGGED ON 8/16/24 AT 0821 HRS. UPON RETURN: CHALK INTACT/ TAG GONE." Moreover, a public note stated that the vehicle had been impounded due to its extended parking duration. NE#1 signed the citation under penalty of perjury on August 20, 2024.



The Complainant believed that NE#1 falsified the citation, citing photographs depicting the vehicle in different locations. He claimed that he did not violate the 72-hour rule, as he had driven his vehicle within that period.¹

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 wrote a dishonest citation.

Department employees must be truthful and complete in all communications. SPD Policy 5.001-POL-11.

The citation lacked any indication of dishonesty. The photographs the Complainant referenced depicted different parts of his vehicle. One photograph depicted the front driver's side tire, while another depicted the rear driver's side tire. There was no evidence disputing NE#1's statement that he had chalked the Complainant's vehicle on August 16, 2024, and observed the chalk remaining intact upon his return on August 20, 2024.

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

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

¹ The Complainant stated he drove his vehicle around for forty-five minutes, then parked again near where he received the warning notice.