



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: JUNE 10, 2025

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

CASE NUMBER: 2025OPA-0025

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	16.130 – Providing Medical Aid, 16.130-POL-2 Sworn Employees Providing Medical Aid, 1. Recognizing the Urgency ...	Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)

Named Employee #2

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	15.180 – Primary Investigations, 15.180-POL-1. Officers Shall Conduct a Thorough and Complete Search for Evidence	Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper (Expedited)
# 2	16.130 – Providing Medical Aid, 16.130-POL-2 Sworn Employees Providing Medical Aid, 1. Recognizing the Urgency ...	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:

The named employees (NE#1 and NE#2) arrested the Complainant and Community Member #1 (CM#1) for assault. The Complainant alleged that NE#2 conducted an unthorough investigation. The Complainant also alleged that the named employees failed to provide him and CM#1 with medical treatment.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

During its intake investigation, OPA identified NE#2 failing to document CM#1's account in his incident report and failing to Mirandize the Complainant. OPA sent NE#2's potential violations of SPD Policy 15.180-POL-5 (Officers Shall Document all Primary Investigations on a Report) and SPD Policy 6.150-POL-1(1) (Sworn Employees Will Advise All Arrestees of Their Full Miranda Rights) to his chain of command for Supervisor Action.¹

On March 20, 2025, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

¹ A Supervisor Action generally involves a minor policy violation or performance issue the employee's supervisor addresses through training, communication, or coaching. See OPA Internal Operations and Training Manual section 5.4(B)(ii).



SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

OPA investigated the complaint by reviewing the computer-aided dispatch (CAD) call report, body-worn video (BWV), incident report, Seattle Law Department decline notices, and medical records. OPA also interviewed CM#1. The Complainant did not respond to OPA's requests for an interview.

On April 5, 2024, CAD call remarks noted two males physically fighting security and screaming in their faces. BWV captured the named employees responding to a street adjacent to a music venue, where security employees had subdued the Complainant and CM#1. The named employees handcuffed the Complainant and CM#1 and then secured them in separate patrol vehicles. Security employees reported that the Complainant and CM#1 initiated an assault after being denied entry due to their intoxication. After the Complainant and CM#1 reported their injuries to the named employees, Seattle Fire Department (SFD) personnel arrived and evaluated them. SFD personnel told the named employees that neither party required hospitalization. The King County Jail declined to admit the Complainant and CM#1, after which NE#1 transported them to a hospital and released them there, advising them to seek an evaluation from hospital staff.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

16.130 – Providing Medical Aid, 16.130-POL-2 Sworn Employees Providing Medical Aid, 1. Recognizing the Urgency of Providing Medical Aid and the Importance of Preserving Human Life, Sworn Employees Will Request Medical Aid, if Needed, and Render Appropriate Medical Aid Within Their Training as Soon as Reasonably Possible

The Complainant alleged that the named employees failed to provide him and CM#1 with medical treatment.

Recognizing the urgency of providing medical aid and the importance of preserving human life, sworn employees will request medical aid, if needed, and render appropriate medical aid within their training as soon as reasonably possible. SPD Policy 16.130-POL-2(1). Sworn employees assisting a sick and/or injured person will attempt to determine the nature and cause of the person's injury or illness, provide first aid, and initiate emergency medical services, as needed. *Id.* After requesting a medical aid response, sworn employees will render aid within the scope of their training unless aid is declined. *Id.* Sworn employees will provide medical aid within their training until an emergency medical technician (EMT) officer or qualified medical personnel takes over patient care. *Id.* A call for medical aid is not required for apparent injuries that can be treated by basic first aid, such as minor cuts and abrasions. *Id.*

This allegation is unfounded. The Complainant and CM#1 did not show any visible injury, but after they reported being injured, SFD personnel were called to the scene. They evaluated both the Complainant and CM#1 and determined that they did not require hospitalization. NE#1 then released the Complainant and CM#1 at a hospital after the King County Jail declined to admit them. The named employees appropriately requested medical aid under the circumstances.

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

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



Named Employee #2 – Allegation #1

15.180 – Primary Investigations, 15.180-POL-1. Officers Shall Conduct a Thorough and Complete Search for Evidence

The Complainant alleged that NE#2 conducted an unthorough investigation.

In primary investigations, officers must conduct a thorough and complete search for evidence. SPD Policy 15.180-POL-1. Sworn personnel must know how to collect the most common physical evidence that might be encountered in a primary investigation. *Id.* Only evidence impractical to collect or submit to the Evidence Unit shall be retained by the owner. *Id.* Officers shall photograph all evidence retained by the owner. *Id.*

NE#2 thoroughly investigated the incident. The Complainant and CM#1 were heavily intoxicated, preventing them from coherently explaining their account of the incident. Conversely, three security employees reported consistent accounts, identifying the Complainant and CM#1 as the instigators. One security employee also exhibited physical injuries. There were no witnesses present who corroborated the Complainant's and CM#1's claim that the security employees initiated the assault. Thus, NE#2 developed probable cause for assault.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper (Expedited).

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper (Expedited)**

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #2

16.130 – Providing Medical Aid, 16.130-POL-2 Sworn Employees Providing Medical Aid, 1. Recognizing the Urgency of Providing Medical Aid and the Importance of Preserving Human Life, Sworn Employees Will Request Medical Aid, if Needed, and Render Appropriate Medical Aid Within Their Training as Soon as Reasonably Possible

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

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