



## CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: JULY 9, 2025

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

CASE NUMBER: 2025OPA-0049

### **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:**

On February 12 and 13, 2025, Named Employee #1 (NE#1), a parking enforcement officer, issued two parking infractions to the Complainant. The Complainant alleged that NE#1 unprofessionally yelled and swore at her several times and specifically targeted her with parking enforcement.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:**

On June 9, 2025, the Office of Inspector General certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

### **SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:**

On February 12, 2025, the Complainant submitted an OPA complaint. She wrote that her vehicle was towed from a 30-minute loading zone while she was unloading products for her business. She also alleged that NE#1 stopped her several times, inappropriately yelled at her, and specifically targeted her with parking enforcement, while ignoring other vehicles parked in the same area.

OPA investigated the complaint by reviewing the infraction court packages, a restricted parking zone (RPZ) permit, and NE#1's citation log. OPA also interviewed the Complainant and NE#1.

On February 12, 2025, at 12:21 PM, NE#1 issued an infraction to the Complainant for violating Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) 11.72.215.<sup>1</sup> The infraction stated, "IMPOUND. 30 MINUTE LOAD AND UNLOAD ONLY. TOW AWAY ZONE. PICTURES TAKEN." Photographs of the Complainant's vehicle showed it parked beside a yellow curb, with a 30-minute

---

<sup>1</sup> "No person shall stop, stand, or park a vehicle in a load and unload zone, for any purpose or length of time other than for the expeditious pickup and loading or unloading and delivery of persons or property, and then in no case shall the stop for such purposes exceed thirty (30) minutes." SMC 11.72.215.



loading sign ahead of it. NE#1's private note indicated that the Complainant's vehicle had remained in that location since 7:37 AM.

On February 13, 2025, at 10:28 AM, NE#1 issued an infraction to the Complainant for violating SMC 11.72.351A.<sup>2</sup> The infraction stated, "2 HR PARKING 7AM – 7PM EXCEPT BY ZONE 19 PERMIT. NO VALID ZONE 19 PERMIT VISIBLE OR VIRTUAL PERMIT ON FILE. PICTURES TAKEN." Photographs of the Complainant's vehicle showed it parked beside a sign indicating two hours of parking from 7 AM to 7 PM, except with a zone 19 permit. An RPZ permit was not visible on the dashboard of the Complainant's vehicle. NE#1's private note indicated that the Complainant's vehicle had remained in that location since 7:31 AM. During its investigation, OPA discovered that the Complainant possessed a 28-day RPZ permit, effective from February 12, 2025, to March 11, 2025. She printed this permit on February 12, 2025, at 5:03 PM. It specified, "This permit is valid only when in the vehicle and must be displayed on the vehicle dashboard when in use."

NE#1's citation log showed that on February 12, 2025, after towing the Complainant's vehicle, NE#1 cited a van at 12:38 PM for violating SMC 11.72.215. Between February 12 and 13, 2025, NE#1 cited 12 vehicles for violating SMC 11.72.215 and 32 vehicles for violating 11.72.351(A).

On February 27, 2025, OPA interviewed the Complainant. She said her initial encounter with NE#1 occurred in early fall of 2024 while she was unloading products for her business. She said NE#1 approached her and stated, "Can't fucking park there." Although she insisted that she was using the loading zone for its intended purpose, she said NE#1 replied, "I don't give a shit." She admitted to parking her vehicle in the loading zone for too long and later discovered that it had been impounded. She claimed that NE#1 yelled at her on multiple occasions, although she could not provide specific dates to OPA. She believed NE#1 targeted her for parking enforcement, as she observed other vehicles parked in loading zones for hours without receiving infractions. She said she parked her vehicle in a space designated for RPZ permits on February 13, 2025, and displayed a printout of a temporary RPZ permit on her dashboard; however, NE#1 still cited her. She said she lived one block away from her business, indicating that she would have been parked in the correct zone. She noted this infraction as further evidence of being targeted by NE#1. She said she had no interactions with NE#1 on February 12 and 13, 2025.

On May 21, 2025, OPA interviewed NE#1. He said he was familiar with the Complainant's vehicle but could not recall any specific interactions with her. He said he gives drivers a reasonable amount of time to use a loading zone before towing their vehicles; however, in the Complainant's case, she was parked unlawfully for about five hours. He said that while the system is converting to virtual permitting, drivers are still required to display the temporary RPZ permit on their dashboard for the time being. He said the Complainant did not display an RPZ permit on February 13, 2025, nor did he recall seeing a virtual permit in his system. He recalled citing her one or two additional times after being informed about this OPA complaint. He said he would continue performing his duties irrespective of the complaint and noted that her parking infractions were not unusual, as there were offenders who had received greater numbers of infractions. He denied targeting the Complainant for parking enforcement or using inappropriate language toward her. He maintained that he could not recall having any interaction with her at all.

---

<sup>2</sup> "No person shall stop, stand, or park a vehicle in violation of the posted or marked restrictions or when a permit or other authorization issued by the city is required as a condition for parking unless the following permit or placard is displayed: (1) an RPZ permit pursuant to Chapter 11.16; (2) a free-floating car sharing permit pursuant to Section 11.23.160; or (3) a disabled placard permit, license plate, or year tab pursuant to chapter 46.19 RCW." SMC 11.72.351A.



---

**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 unprofessionally yelled and swore at her several times and specifically targeted her with parking enforcement.

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.*

There was insufficient evidence to support the claim that NE#1 yelled and swore at the Complainant. She recalled NE#1 swearing at some point in 2024 (“Can’t fucking park there” and “I don’t give a shit”), but she could not articulate specific dates when other similar incidents occurred. NE#1 denied such claim and maintained that he could not recall having any interaction with her at all.

Furthermore, there was insufficient evidence to support the claim that NE#1 specifically targeted the Complainant with parking enforcement. In the February 12, 2025, incident, the Complainant’s vehicle was parked in a 30-minute loading zone for nearly five hours, justifying NE#1’s decision to tow it for violating SMC 11.72.215. The Complainant even admitted to having her vehicle parked there for an extended duration. In the February 13, 2025, incident, the Complainant’s vehicle was parked in a two-hour parking zone for nearly three hours, which would have been permitted had she displayed a zone 19 permit. Although the Complainant appeared to have possessed this permit, whether in virtual form or otherwise, the permit’s validity was established only when it was “displayed on the vehicle dashboard when in use.” Photographs of the Complainant’s vehicle did not show any permit on the dashboard. Thus, NE#1 lawfully cited the Complainant’s vehicle for violating SMC 11.72.351(A). Finally, NE#1’s citation log further undermined the Complainant’s claim. It recorded a combined 44 infractions for violations of either SMC 11.72.215 or 11.72.351(A) between February 12 and 13, 2025.

Considering these allegations together, OPA finds that, more likely than not, they did not occur as alleged. The Complainant’s allegations that NE#1 swore at and upbraided her, on unspecified dates, were filed months after the fact. NE#1 denied the allegations and no other evidence corroborated the specifics of those claims. Also, the Complainant only filed her complaint on February 12, 2025, shortly after her vehicle was lawfully towed. The next day, the Complainant filed an additional complaint indicating NE#1 ticketed her vehicle for parking in an RPZ without a permit. The Complainant specifically alleged she displayed her RPZ permit on her dashboard. Photographic evidence, which was date and time stamped, strongly indicated this was not the case. OPA has no reason to doubt the Complainant is providing her best recollection of these events, but the evidence more strongly favors NE#1’s recollection.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**