



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: MAY 27, 2025

FROM: INTERIM DEPUTY DIRECTOR NELSON R. LEESE (ON BEHALF OF INTERIM DIRECTOR BONNIE GLENN)
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

CASE NUMBER: 2024OPA-0450

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	Sustained

Imposed Discipline

Oral Reprimand

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:

Multiple complainants alleged that Named Employee #1 (NE#1), a parking enforcement officer, was unprofessional by photographing children at a daycare center without consent and claiming child abuse.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

On April 22, 2025, the Office of Inspector General certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

On December 2 and 3, 2024, three complainants filed OPA complaints, alleging that NE#1 approached children at a daycare center, photographed them without consent, and claimed child abuse due to the children not wearing gloves while playing outdoors in cold weather.

OPA investigated the complaint by reviewing the computer-aided dispatch (CAD) call report, interview statements from Community Member #1 (CM#1) and NE#1, and photographs.

A CAD call report indicated that there were no service calls recorded for the daycare center on December 2, 2024.

On December 11, 2024, OPA interviewed CM#1, who identified herself as the director of the daycare center. She said she had two employees—Employee #1 and Employee #2—assisting her on December 2, 2024. CM#1 reported the following:

The children were playing outdoors on a patio under Employee #1's supervision. Employee #1 saw NE#1 on the street issuing citations to parked cars, so Employee #1 approached her car to ensure its proper parking. Employee #2 came out to the patio to supervise the children, some of whom became upset and cried due to Employee #1's absence.



NE#1 heard the children crying, so she entered the patio, raised her voice, and grabbed the children's hands. NE#1 expressed outrage over their red hands, claiming that their crying was due to being cold. CM#1 tried to clarify that the children were crying because Employee #1 had left, but NE#1 dismissed this explanation. NE#1 took out her cellphone and began photographing the children, an action that CM#1 explained was inappropriate. NE#1 then began photographing the children's hands. NE#1 said the 47-degree Fahrenheit temperature was too cold and caused the children's hands to redden. NE#1 insisted that the children should wear gloves. CM#1 explained that only some of the children had gloves, which they would remove and place in their mouths. NE#1 requested CM#1 to assure her that this situation would not happen again and that she would return to check on the children.

CM#1 reported that she did not have current contact information for Employee #1 and Employee #2, both of whom have resigned for reasons unrelated to this matter. CM#1 said the parents were informed about the incident and expressed no concerns about their children playing outdoors without gloves. CM#1 said none of the parents were present at the time the incident occurred.

On March 18, 2025, OPA interviewed NE#1. NE#1 said she saw multiple cars parked near the daycare center that displayed fake temporary registrations, so she began issuing citations to those cars. NE#1 said she continually heard a child crying, so she set down her equipment and approached the daycare center. NE#1 said she saw a crying boy and several other children who appeared to be unsupervised. NE#1 said she was alarmed at seeing the boy's red hands. NE#1 said she knocked on the daycare center's window and requested to speak with a manager, at which point CM#1 came out. NE#1 expressed concern about the boy's red hands and his prolonged crying, but CM#1 reassured her that everything was fine, as the children were simply playing outside. NE#1 told OPA that she disagreed with CM#1's statement, so she photographed the boy's red hands, as well as another boy's red hands, though she refrained from capturing their faces.¹ NE#1 said she advised CM#1 that the children should wear gloves while playing outdoors.

NE#1 said she did not file any report about the incident. NE#1 expressed concern that filing a report could have a negative impact on the children, their families, and the business. NE#1 believed the situation could be remedied by simply having the children wear gloves while playing outdoors.

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 NE#1 was unprofessional by photographing children at a daycare center without consent and claiming child abuse.

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.*

¹ NE#1 submitted the photographs to OPA. Two photographs depicted the hands of two distinct children. The children's faces were not visible. Their hands appeared red. A third photograph depicted a screenshot from Apple's weather application, indicating 41 degrees Fahrenheit about one hour following the incident on December 2, 2024.



The facts in this case are largely undisputed. NE#1 involved herself with the daycare center's operations upon hearing a boy cry and seeing his red hands. She communicated her concerns to CM#1 for allowing the children to play outdoors without gloves in what she considered to be cold weather. Finally, she photographed their hands, which appeared to be red. Although the evidence showed NE#1's genuine concern for the children's wellbeing, NE#1 unnecessarily escalated the situation at the daycare center, where at least three adults—CM#1, Employee #1, and Employee #2—were present to supervise the children. NE#1 could have simply voiced her concerns to them, contacted her supervisor for guidance, or called emergency services if she believed immediate action was necessary. Instead, NE#1 overstepped her authority by interfering with the daycare center's operations and photographing the children without consent, despite not capturing their faces. Furthermore, NE#1 was in uniform as a parking enforcement officer, which may have led to the perception that she had the authority to investigate the scene or take enforcement action against the center. Although NE#1 acted out of genuine concern, it was inappropriate for her to investigate this herself by entering the property and photographing the children. NE#1's actions led to needless public alarm, resulting in three different parents contacting OPA to report this incident, undermining public trust in NE#1 and the department.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**