



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: JUNE 11, 2025

FROM: INTERIM DIRECTOR BONNIE GLENN
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

CASE NUMBER: 2025OPA-0041

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	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:

The Complainant, then an SPD employee, alleged that Named Employee #1 (NE#1), SPD's human resources (HR) director, forced her to take administrative leave instead of Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) leave. The Complainant also alleged that NE#1 coerced her into signing a medical release, enabling SPD to control her and protect her ex-husband, an SPD employee.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

On June 5, 2025, the Office of Inspector General certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

A. OPA Complaint

On January 27, 2025, the Complainant submitted an OPA complaint, alleging that NE#1 had placed her on administrative leave on January 23, 2019, without any explanation while she was initially on FMLA leave. She claimed that NE#1 directed Witness Officer #1 (WO#1) to instruct her to fabricate a reason for her administrative leave by completing an activity prescription form (APF) and faking a mental breakdown so her supervisor could report the matter to SPD HR. She wrote that she was unqualified to be placed on administrative leave due to a medical issue. She claimed that she refused to "lie" for NE#1, who then removed her from FMLA leave and placed her on administrative leave. She believed this forced her to return to work only on SPD's terms, rather than those of her doctor as provided under the FMLA, and forced her to relinquish her medical records, enabling her ex-husband to continue his abuse. She claimed that if she refused to sign the APF, which would grant SPD access to her medical history, her employment would be threatened.

OPA investigated the complaint by reviewing HR records and email correspondence. OPA also interviewed the Complainant, Witness Supervisor #1 (WS#1), then the HR director for the Community Safety and Communications Center (CSCC), and NE#1.



B. Human Resources (HR) and Email Records

In a document titled, “ADMINISTRATIVE REASSIGNMENT REPORT,” NE#1’s designee and an assistant chief approved the Complainant’s administrative reassignment on January 23, 2019, due to a medical reason. The document included the following definition:

“Administrative reassignment” means paid leave status when an employee is the subject of an active official investigatory process, the employee’s absence from his or her regular work unit is deemed to be in the best business interest of the department, and there is no other work unit to which the employee can be assigned. Administrative reassignment shall not be considered discipline.

In an SPD memorandum dated January 23, 2019, the Complainant was notified that she was “administratively reassigned to home with pay until further notice.” An assistant chief signed the memorandum on the chief’s behalf. NE#1 was carbon copied.

In an SPD memorandum dated January 23, 2019, an Employment Services Unit lieutenant notified the Communications captain of the Complainant’s administrative reassignment to her home. It stated that the order needed to be given to the Complainant via her chain of command. It directed the Complainant to sign and date the order to indicate her receipt. However, it was neither signed nor dated. Moreover, it was not signed to indicate that the order had been served on the Complainant.

A document authored by NE#1 and dated January 31, 2019, stated that on January 15, 2019, the Complainant requested leave beginning on January 8, 2019, due to a serious health condition. It also stated the following:

We have reviewed your request for leave under FML and any supporting documentation that you have provided. We received your most recent information on 01/28/19 and decided:

You are provisionally granted FML for yourself from 02/06/19 through 02/19/19.

You meet the eligibility requirement for taking FML and still have unpaid FML available within a rolling 12-month period.

However, the *Certification of Health Care Provider* form is insufficient. Your health care provider has been notified of the additional information needed. Sufficient certification is necessary to support your request for FML. You will receive an update when the information has been provided.

Please provide an Activity Prescription Form (APF) to your supervisor upon your return to work.

Please note that a new *Employee Request for Family and Medical Leave* and *Certification of Health Care Provider* forms must be submitted to support the use of FML for another reason or extend your time. You must provide 30 days advance notice of the need to take FML when the need is foreseeable. When 30 days notice is not possible, you must provide notice as soon as practicable.

In a document issued by the chief’s office and dated November 13, 2019, the Complainant was placed on administrative reassignment from January 23, 2019, until November 13, 2019.

In a document titled, “RETURN FROM ADMINISTRATIVE REASSIGNMENT” and dated November 13, 2019, the Complainant was reinstated to duty. NE#1 signed and dated the form on November 13, 2019. An assistant chief also signed and dated the form on November 14, 2019.



An internal SPD email sent January 23, 2019, stated that the Complainant would undergo a “fit-for-work evaluation over the next couple of months.”

C. OPA Interviews

Complainant

OPA interviewed the Complainant via email. She said she had been approved for FMLA leave from January 11, 2019, to March 3, 2019, due to a medical incident. She said WO#1 advised her to take administrative leave—a suggestion she declined because she did not want SPD to dictate her return to work. She said WO#1 told her that she could return when her therapist deemed her ready. She said WO#1 assured her that her job was secure and that any issues could be resolved with her therapist, whom he would contact regularly with her consent. She said WO#1 explained that she was unqualified for administrative leave, so he suggested she fabricate a reason by completing the APF form, faking a mental breakdown, and reporting to a supervisor that she could no longer cope. She said she refused this suggestion and preferred to stay on FMLA leave, which angered WO#1. She said WO#1 later told her that she had been removed from FMLA leave and placed on administrative leave on January 23, 2019. She said WO#1 advised her to contact him when she was prepared to return to work so he could coordinate with NE#1. She said she received no explanation for this change in her leave status. She said WO#1 later told her that he would determine when she would be taken off administrative leave, not her. She believed WO#1 was deceptive and conspired with her ex-husband to manipulate her into taking administrative leave so SPD could control her. She claimed that NE#1 repeatedly contacted WS#1 and attempted to convince her to investigate the Complainant, which WS#1 declined to do. She said WS#1’s refusal angered NE#1. She claimed that NE#1 warned her about SPD protecting her ex-husband.

Witness Supervisor #1

On May 19, 2025, OPA interviewed WS#1, the HR director for CSCC at the time. She said she was aware of the Complainant’s FMLA leave status converting to administrative leave and instructed the Complainant to coordinate with SPD HR. She said the Complainant told her that someone—likely WO#1—had instructed her to sign a form or face termination. She said the Complainant seemed unaware of the reasons behind the change in her leave status, although she suspected that the Complainant might have known but was using ignorance as a defense. She doubted the Complainant’s claim of not being informed about the reason for the leave change, as employees typically receive documentation. She said FMLA leave was intended for the Complainant to care for her father, but after his passing, she was told that she could no longer take FMLA leave. She believed the Complainant’s account of WO#1 lacked credibility and thought the Complainant often misrepresented others’ statements. She said the Complainant frequently claimed that SPD had placed her on administrative leave to control her for her ex-husband’s benefit, which reflected her distrust in SPD. She characterized the Complainant’s account as a “conspiracy theory” and believed the Complainant required help. She did not believe NE#1 had engaged in misconduct.

Named Employee #1

On May 28, 2025, OPA interviewed NE#1. He said he had no specific recollection of the Complainant’s FMLA leave request. He said WO#1 managed issues involving administrative leave and employees being fit for duty. He said he was unable to recall any specific conversation with WO#1 about the Complainant’s situation. He acknowledged awareness about a dispute between the Complainant and her ex-husband but was unsure whether this dispute impacted her leave. He said a person could be placed on administrative leave and would need to be cleared by a psychologist before returning to work, although he was uncertain whether this occurred in the Complainant’s case. He said being placed on administrative leave was not a voluntary decision for an employee, as it was overseen by HR and ultimately ordered by the chief. He said the Complainant’s change in leave status was unusual but clarified that a



person on administrative leave could still request FMLA leave. He said a person placed on administrative leave would receive documentation. He denied ordering WO#1 to instruct the Complainant to fabricate a mental health situation that would result in her being placed on administrative leave. He said he referred an allegation from the Complainant's ex-husband to CSCC for investigation but denied encouraging CSCC to initiate frivolous investigations.

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 forced her to take administrative leave to enable SPD to control her for her ex-husband's benefit.

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.*

OPA uncovered no evidence supporting the Complainant's allegations. Multiple HR records showed that the Complainant was placed on administrative reassignment on January 23, 2019. Additionally, the records showed that SPD HR attempted to accommodate the Complainant's request for FMLA leave. Specifically, NE#1 authored a document approving the Complainant's provisional FMLA leave from February 6 through 19, 2019, but required the Complainant to submit the APF to validate her FMLA leave request. At a minimum, the Complainant was aware of the requirement to submit the APF, as she extensively discussed it in her OPA complaint and during her interview. However, there was no evidence suggesting that the APF was submitted, as the Complainant believed doing so would have relinquished her medical privacy and subjected her to SPD control. OPA found no evidence to substantiate this concern. Moreover, interview statements from WS#1 and NE#1 did not support the Complainant's allegations. WS#1 found her claims lacked credibility and believed she misrepresented WO#1's statements. WS#1 encouraged the Complainant to work with SPD HR to resolve leave-related issues but maintained that the Complainant distrusted SPD and attempted to feign ignorance. NE#1 told OPA that he could not recall any discussion with WO#1 about the Complainant's situation. NE#1 also explained the administrative leave process, the decision-making behind it, and the necessary documentation. There was no evidence indicating that NE#1 deviated from this process or failed to provide the necessary documentation in the Complainant's case. Instead, the Complainant appeared to misconstrue the process necessary for obtaining FMLA leave and declined to participate in that process.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**