



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: JUNE 8, 2025

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

CASE NUMBER: 2025OPA-0024

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) responded to a dispute at an apartment involving an antiharassment protection order violation. The Complainant alleged that NE#1 was biased against her based on her disability status.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

In a memo dated February 27, 2025, the Office of Inspector General (OIG) certified this case a thorough, timely, and objective Expedited Investigation. That means OPA, with OIG's agreement, believed it could issue a recommended finding based solely on its intake investigation without interviewing the named employee.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

OPA investigated the complaint by reviewing the computer-aided dispatch (CAD) call report, body-worn video (BWV), and incident report. OPA was unable to reach the Complainant for an interview.

On July 10, 2023, CAD call remarks noted a reporting party requesting to report a court order violation. BWV captured NE#1 arriving at an apartment and speaking with Community Member #1 (CM#1), the property manager. CM#1 showed NE#1 an antiharassment protection order prohibiting the Complainant from contacting him. CM#1 claimed the Complainant violated the order. NE#1 noted the order had not been served. NE#1 then spoke with the Complainant, an apartment resident who claimed that CM#1 harassed her. NE#1 advised the Complainant to avoid CM#1, as he had no obligation to avoid her. NE#1 advised the Complainant to notify the court about the difficulty of complying, given that she resided in CM#1's building. NE#1 gave the Complainant a copy of the order.



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 was biased against her based on her disability status.

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 explained to the Complainant the conditions of the antiharassment protection order, which was issued by a court, not NE#1. He also advised the Complainant to notify the court about the challenges of compliance due to her living situation. NE#1's interaction with the Complainant did not indicate any form of bias.

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

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