



## CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: APRIL 17, 2025

FROM: INTERIM DIRECTOR BONNIE GLENN  
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

CASE NUMBER: 2024OPA-0431

### Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

#### Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-2. Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy, and Department Policy	Not Sustained - Unfounded
# 2	5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional	Not Sustained - Unfounded

*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) is an SPD personnel specialist who is authorized to access background records as part of her duties. The Complainant alleged that NE#1 disclosed having accessed an officer's background record after he requested a date from her and disclosed a medical issue concerning the officer. The Complainant also alleged that NE#1 referred to the Seattle Police Department (SPD) and its employees as a "joke."

### ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

On April 10, 2025, the Office of Inspector General certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

### SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

On November 4, 2024, OPA received a complaint from the Complainant, alleging that NE#1 accessed an officer's background record after he requested a date from her and disclosed an embarrassing medical issue about him.

OPA investigated the complaint by interviewing the Complainant, Witness Employee #1 (WE#1), NE#1, Community Member #1 (CM#1), and Community Member #2 (CM#2). OPA also reviewed texts and social media posts supplied by CM#1.

On November 7, 2024, OPA interviewed the Complainant. She said her daughter (CM#1) gave birth on April 5, 2024. She said CM#1's mother-in-law is NE#1. She recounted an incident in the waiting area where NE#1 described SPD and its employees as a joke. She said NE#1 claimed to have accessed the background record of an officer who had asked her out and revealed a private medical issue concerning the officer.

On November 19 and 25, 2024, OPA interviewed WE#1, a human resources (HR) administrator. WE#1 believed the information about the officer's medical issue likely originated from background investigation hiring documents. She



said SPD switched to eSOPH, an electronic management system, two years ago and that before this change, background investigation documents were maintained as paper copies in a file room. WE#1 said NE#1 has access to eSOPH and the file room and noted that all HR personnel have access to the file room as well. She said no security camera is in that room and no log tracks entries and exits. She said NE#1 routinely needs to review the background record of newly sworn employees, making it challenging to ascertain which specific information was accessed. She could not recall any HR investigation requiring an officer to disclose the specific medical issue.

On February 26, 2025, OPA interviewed NE#1. NE#1 said her primary role is to support the background investigation unit. She said she assists background detectives by maintaining case files, forwarding records requests, and summarizing background investigations when SPD opts not to move forward with a candidate. She said her daily tasks often involve handling confidential and sensitive information. She said there are valid reasons for accessing a person's background record, even after a background investigation has concluded, particularly when another agency requires the record for vetting purposes. She said her activity is recorded when she accesses eSOPH, while there is no access log or security video in the file room, which is accessible to all background unit personnel using the same code.

NE#1 said her son's (CM#2) mother-in-law is the Complainant. She said the Complainant had been estranged from CM#1 and CM#2. She said she had minimal interaction with the Complainant but indicated that their most recent encounter took place at the hospital on April 5, 2024. She said the Complainant argued with CM#1 after CM#1 gave birth. NE#1 denied disclosing confidential information obtained through her position in the background investigation unit. She said the Complainant was aware of her access to confidential information via CM#1 and CM#2 but maintained that she did not disclose any such information to either CM#1 or CM#2.

On March 20, 2025, OPA interviewed CM#1 and CM#2 together. They acknowledged ongoing family tensions that arose from the incident at the hospital on April 5, 2024. CM#1 said she had been avoiding the Complainant's calls, prompting the Complainant to use a tactic involving her husband to call CM#1. CM#1 said the Complainant told her about NE#1's alleged improper access to an officer's background record. CM#1 denied any knowledge of NE#1's employment, while CM#2 confirmed his awareness, stating that he had visited NE#1 at her workplace several times. CM#1 and CM#2 maintained that NE#1 did not disclose any confidential information.

On April 1, 2025, CM#1 told OPA that she believed the Complainant's allegations were "made in bad faith." She also believed the Complainant was trying to ruin NE#1's reputation. She provided OPA with screenshots of texts and social media posts. The first screenshot displayed a text exchange between the Complainant and what appeared to be another child of NE#1. During this conversation, the Complainant expressed confusion about NE#1's dislike for all her children except for CM#2 and accused NE#1 of gossiping about them. The Complainant also stated, "[NE#1] has stuck her nose into [CM#1's] and my business and flat out lied, now [CM#1] and I have no relationship. Needless to say I would not piss on your mother if she were on fire." A second screenshot displayed the Complainant's social media post describing NE#1 as a liar and troublemaker.

A third screenshot displayed the Complainant's social media post thanking NE#1 for ruining CM#1's and CM#2's lives by financially assisting their relocation to another state. A fourth screenshot displayed the Complainant's comment characterizing NE#1 as "crazy jealous" and CM#2 as "immature." The Complainant also stated that NE#1 and CM#2 had "brainwashed" CM#1. A fifth screenshot displayed the Complainant's social media post describing NE#1 as a liar and accusing NE#1 of destroying the Complainant's relationship with CM#1. A sixth screenshot, showing July 22, 2024, displayed the Complainant's social media post requesting the "nastiest" divorce attorney regardless of cost because she could not "put up with it anymore," while also thanking NE#1's family. A seventh screenshot, showing July 23,



2024, displayed CM#1 texting NE#1, warning NE#1 that she suspected the Complainant would attempt to contact NE#1's employer. NE#1 replied, "Wow crazy pants" and described the Complainant as "clearly unwell."

**ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

**Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1**

***5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-2. Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy, and Department Policy***

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 disclosed having accessed an officer's background record after he requested a date from her and disclosed a medical issue concerning the officer.

Employees must adhere to laws, city policy, and department policy. SPD Policy 5.001-POL-2. City employees are prohibited from disclosing or using any confidential information gained by reason of his or her official position for other than a city purpose. Seattle Municipal Code 4.16.070(D)(1).

Aside from NE#1's denial, OPA was unable to uncover any evidence supporting or dispelling the Complainant's allegation. The relevant background record—if it exists—might be in either eSOPH or the file room. However, without adequate search parameters, including the officer's name or the timeframe of the alleged unauthorized access to the background record, OPA could not determine which specific record—if it exists—was accessed or the circumstances surrounding that access. Further complicating the investigation were NE#1's routine and authorized access to background records as part of her duties, the absence of security cameras in the file room, the absence of a log tracking entries and exits from the file room, and WE#1's inability to recall any HR investigation requiring an officer to disclose the specific medical issue. Although CM#1 and CM#2 denied hearing NE#1 disclose confidential information, they were not present during the alleged interaction between the Complainant and NE#1.

Although the available evidence does not appear to support one account over the other, the Complainant's social media posts—supplied by the Complainant's own daughter, rather than NE#1's son—characterized NE#1 as a liar or troublemaker and blamed NE#1 for the decline in her relationship with CM#1. OPA finds this evidence brings into question the Complainant's credibility and raises doubts about her reasons for filing the OPA complaint. Considering the totality of the circumstances—including the lack of corroboration into NE#1's alleged unauthorized access to the officer's background record, the lack of corroboration into NE#1's alleged disclosure of the officer's medical issue, and the questionable motives behind the Complainant's complaint. OPA finds the evidence does not support the Complainant's allegation by a preponderance of the evidence.<sup>1</sup>

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

<sup>1</sup> Under the preponderance of the evidence standard, if the greater weight of the evidence—more than 50 percent—supports the allegation, the recommended finding will be sustained. See OPA Internal Operations and Training Manual section 7.1.



---

**Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2**

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

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 referred to SPD and its employees as a “joke.”

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.* Employees will avoid unnecessary escalation of events, even if those events do not end in reportable uses of force. *Id.* 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 anyone. *Id.* Lastly, 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 the truth. *Id.*

NE#1 denied this allegation. Considering the totality of the circumstances, OPA finds a lack of evidence supporting this allegation. Here, there was a lack of corroboration into NE#1’s alleged characterization of SPD and its employees as a “joke,” along with evidence provided that called into question the Complainant’s motives. OPA finds the evidence does not support the Complainant’s allegation by a preponderance of the evidence.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**