


Issued Date: September 3, 2025

From: Director Bonnie Glenn
Office of Police Accountability



Case Number:2024OPA-0463

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

1. **Allegation #1: 4.010 – Employee Time Off, 4.010-POL 2. Employees Schedule Time Off with Their Sergeant/Supervisor**
Finding: Sustained
 2. **Allegation #2: 4.040 – Sick Leave, 4.040-POL 2. Employee Use of Sick Leave is Regulated by City Personnel Rules (Reference Personnel Rule 7.7)**
Finding: Sustained
 3. **Allegation #3: 5.001 - Standards and Duties 5.001-POL 11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication**
Finding: Not Sustained - Training Referral
 4. **Allegation #4: 5.001 - Standards and Duties POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional**
Finding: Sustained
- **Proposed Discipline: One Day (9 Hours) to Three Days (27 Hours) Suspension**
 - **Imposed Discipline: Two Days (18 Hours) Suspension**
-

This Closed Case Summary (CCS) represents the opinion of the OPA Director regarding the misconduct alleged and therefore sections may be written in the first person.

Executive Summary:

Named Employee #1 (NE#1) is a parking enforcement officer (PEO). NE#1 was assigned to work overtime at a football game on November 24, 2024 (November 24 Event). When NE#1 did not report on time, his supervisor learned he was on vacation in Hawaii. Later that day, NE#1 left a voicemail with his supervisor stating he was sick and could not work that day.

The Complainant alleged NE#1 failed to schedule time off with his supervisor, improperly used his sick leave, and was dishonest and unprofessional.

Administrative Note:

On April 16, 2025, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

Summary of the Investigation:

OPA investigated this incident by reviewing the complaint, orders for the November 24 Event, email correspondence and attachments, timesheets, and NE#1's November 24 voicemail. OPA interviewed NE#1, his sworn police officer parent (Witness Employee #1 or WE#1), and a PEO supervisor (Witness Employee #2 or WE#2).

On Thursday, November 7, 2024, the department posted orders for the November 24 Event. NE#1 was assigned to the event, with orders to appear at a 9:00 AM roll call.¹ The Main Roll Call location was listed as the "Park 90/5" facility in the SODO neighborhood of Seattle, Washington.

NE#1 said that, around November 16, 2024, he decided he wanted to go on a trip to Hawaii over the following weekend. NE#1 explained that he made efforts to get his November 24 shift covered during the week but was unsuccessful. He said he did not speak to any supervisors about getting the days off. Instead, he explained, as the week went on, he spoke to colleagues about his shift and was told to use sick time as, "that is what everybody does."

NE#1 was also scheduled to work on November 23, 2024. On November 19, 2024, NE#1 emailed his supervisor requesting to take November 23 off. His supervisor approved this the next day.² On November 23, 2024, NE#1 flew to Hawaii.

NE#1 did not report for 9:00 AM roll call on November 24, 2024. Prior to roll call, the Sergeant in charge learned that NE#1 was absent without leave. The Sergeant then spoke with WE#1— NE#1's parent, a sworn police officer who was also assigned to work the November 24 Event. The Sergeant asked WE#1 to call NE#1 to learn his estimated time of arrival. WE#1 told the Sergeant that NE#1 was in Hawaii. Around 10:22 AM (Seattle time) on November 24, NE#1 called his supervisor and left him the following voicemail:

¹ The November 24 Event was a large sporting event. Eighty-nine SPD personnel were assigned to work the event, including one lieutenant, four sergeants, fifty-two police officers, two PEO supervisors, and thirty PEOs.

² NE#1 coded that day off using an Unpaid Day of Religion/Conscience. This is a type of unpaid leave. The propriety of NE#1's use of this leave is not at issue in this case.

Hey, this is [NE#1]. I'm really sorry this is late but I was up all night very sick and I meant to wake up in time to call out but I went a little bit over. Sorry about that but I'm not gonna be able to make it in today. Thank you.

OPA interviewed WE#1, who explained he thought NE#1 had found someone else to cover his shift. WE#1 said he was not aware of NE#1 using sick time for the November 24 Event. WE#1 expressed disappointment at NE#1's decision but also noted his feeling that NE#1 has not had good attendance behavior modeled for him in NE#1's time working for the department. WE#1 noted that NE#1 made a poor decision and felt deep regret.

OPA interviewed NE#1. NE#1 explained he went on a trip to Hawaii on November 23 and 24. He said he made the decision to leave the week prior and it was not a long-planned vacation. He explained his intent and efforts to get his shift covered, noting these were unsuccessful. He described his belief that common practice was to get the shift covered or call out sick for the event. He described multiple co-workers encouraging him to use sick leave to cover the event, saying "that is what everybody does." NE#1 described intending to call out ahead of the event but said he slept late. NE#1's union representative and union attorney explained the challenges PEOs have managing their mandatory overtime with their personal lives, noting the union's efforts to correct this issue with the department.³ NE#1 closed by speaking about his career ambitions, acknowledging he made a mistake, and noting he does not believe it represents who he is.

Analysis and Conclusions:

Named Employee #1 — Allegation #1

4.010 — Employee Time Off, 4.010-POL 2. Employees Schedule Time Off with Their Sergeant/Supervisor

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 failed to request time off from his supervisor before the start of his shift.

³ OPA also conducted an informal interview with WE#2 to learn more about the "drafting" process for PEOs' mandatory overtime. WE#2 largely corroborated the challenges the union representative and attorney spoke to, noting they are working on developing a new system to alleviate this. WE#2 also spoke to the practice for requesting release from an event through the unit manager, preference for events based on prior overtime worked, shift trading, the challenge for PEOs of scheduling their personal lives, and that large events sometimes draft half of all PEOs.

SPD Policy 4.010-POL-2 requires SPD employees to schedule time off with their supervisors. The policy states that: “Employees will contact their sergeant/supervisor before their scheduled work shift to request an unscheduled absence from duty.” SPD Policy 4.010-POL-2.

It is beyond dispute that NE#1 failed to request time off on November 24 before the start of his shift. OPA notes two layers to this violation. The first is that NE#1 was aware on November 7, 2024, that he was scheduled to work on November 24. Thereafter, he arranged to be in Hawaii on that day. This was not the case of a short-notice overtime assignment disrupting pre-arranged personal plans. Quite the opposite. NE#1 scheduled an out-of-town trip knowing he was already scheduled to work on both November 23 and 24. Thereafter, he had the foresight to request November 23 off, which he received permission to do. But, perhaps believing he would not receive permission to take off November 24, he did not even request to take that day, instead trying only to find coverage. The second layer to this violation is that NE#1 did not even call out sick on November 24 until after roll call, having overslept. Even assuming it were proper for NE#1 to use sick leave on November 24—which it was not—NE#1 was still obligated to call out *before* the start of his shift. He did not.

Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**

Named Employee #1 — Allegation #2

4.040 — Sick Leave, 4.040-POL 2. Employee Use of Sick Leave is Regulated by City Personnel Rules (Reference Personnel Rule 7.7)

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 improperly used sick leave.

Employee use of sick leave is regulated by both City Personnel Rules and Collective Bargaining Agreements. SPD Policy 4.040-POL-2. Seattle Personnel Rule 7.7 governs employee use of sick leave.

It is beyond dispute that NE#1 misused sick leave. For the purpose of resolving this specific allegation, OPA is not questioning whether NE#1 was, in fact, “up all night, very sick,” as he stated in his voicemail. This is discussed below at Allegation #3. Instead, OPA notes that sick leave use is allowed only for specific purposes, the one most relevant here is:

An absence resulting from an employee’s mental or physical illness, injury, or health condition; to accommodate the employee’s need for medical diagnosis, care, treatment of a mental or physical illness, injury, or health condition, or an employee’s need for preventive medical care[.]

Seattle Personnel Rule 7.7.4(E)(1) (emphasis added).⁴ The problem is that, even assuming NE#1 was “up all night, very sick” on the morning of November 24, his absence from work that day did not result from any health condition or treatment. His absence was a foregone conclusion because he was on a preplanned vacation in Hawaii on November 24, 2024.

Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**

Named Employee #1 — Allegation #3

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

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 was dishonest when he claimed to be sick on November 24.

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

OPA did not seek any verification from NE#1 as to whether he was, in fact, “up all night, very sick” on November 24, 2024, nor did OPA seek any explanation of the nature of any illness.⁵ Accordingly, OPA declines to reach a conclusion as to the truthfulness of this specific statement.

OPA does find that NE#1’s statement to his supervisor potentially violated policy by lacking *completeness*. As discussed above at Allegation #2, NE#1’s absence from work on November 24 was not caused by any illness—instead, NE#1 failed to report to roll call for the November 24 Event because he was in Hawaii. Ultimately, OPA appreciates the candor of both NE#1 and his union representatives during his OPA interview. Despite the misguided advice NE#1 described receiving from his coworkers, he is on notice of the rules governing the use of sick leave and importance of candor and completeness in “all communications.”

Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Training Referral.

- **Required Training:** NE#1’s chain of command should discuss OPA’s findings with him, review Seattle Personnel Rule 7.7 and SPD Policies 4.010-POL-2, 4.040-POL-2, 5.001-POL-10, and 5.001-POL-11 with him, and provide any other retraining and counseling it deems necessary. This counseling and retraining must be documented in Blue Team.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Training Referral**

⁴ Based on the limited explanation provided in NE#1’s voicemail, OPA is not aware of any other provision that would have arguably permitted him to use sick leave on November 24, 2024.

⁵ See RCW 49.46.210(1)(g) (concerning verification for absences greater than three days); SMC 14.16.030(E) (same); Seattle Personnel Rule 7.7.6(B) (verification for absences of more than four days).

Named Employee #1 — Allegation #4

5.001 — Standards and Duties POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional

The Complainant alleged that NE#1's conduct violated the department's professionalism policy.

SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10 requires that SPD employees "strive to be professional." The policy further instructs that "employees may not engage in behavior that undermines public trust in the Department, the officer, or other officers" whether on or off duty. SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10.

OPA finds that, more likely than not, NE#1's behavior violated the department's professionalism policy. Overall, NE#1's lack of notice, misuse of sick time, and incomplete communication are sufficient to sustain a violation of the professionalism policy. But OPA finds NE#1 violated this policy for two other independently sufficient reasons. First, NE#1's conduct tends to undermine public trust that PEOs—officials trusted with public safety responsibilities—will prioritize their job commitments during large scale events. The City drafts public safety officials to work these events—incurring the substantial associated overtime costs—because those public safety officials are determined to be necessary to maintain safety and good order. When NE#1 failed to show up without notice, he undercut faith in that goal. Second, NE#1 owed professional responsibilities to his coworkers and supervisors, who spent time and resources determining his whereabouts when he failed to appear for roll call, and then presumably needed to cover his responsibilities for the day.

Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**