




CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: AUGUST 4, 2025

FROM: INTERIM DIRECTOR BONNIE GLENN
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY 

CASE NUMBER: 2025OPA-0070

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 - Inconclusive
# 2	5.140 – Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing	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 went to the headquarters of the Seattle Police Department (SPD) to seek information about an incident. The Complainant alleged that Named Employee #1 (NE#1), an administrative specialist, was unprofessional by being rude and aggressive. The Complainant also alleged that NE#1 exhibited racial bias toward her.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

On July 17, 2025, the Office of Inspector General certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

On March 4, 2025, the Complainant submitted an OPA complaint. The Complainant wrote that she went to SPD headquarters on December 30, 2024, to request a police report but encountered NE#1, whom she claimed was unprofessional, rude, and aggressive when NE#1 declined to conduct a record search for her. The Complainant alleged that NE#1's behavior exhibited racial bias.

OPA investigated the complaint by interviewing the Complainant, two witness employees (WE#1 and WE#2), and NE#1. SPD's Video Unit notified OPA that the security footage of SPD's lobby—where the purported encounter occurred—had been purged for all footage prior to February 7, 2025. OPA received the Complaint on March 4, 2025, and requested video footage on March 10, 2025.

On March 21, 2025, OPA interviewed the Complainant. She clarified that her visit to SPD was to obtain an incident number associated with a dispute with her neighbor. She expressed concerns about the possibility of the dispute



leading to a criminal record for herself. She alleged that during her encounter with NE#1, she perceived NE#1 as rude, aggressive, unprofessional, and racially biased. She said another SPD employee witnessed the encounter.¹

On June 23, 2025, OPA interviewed WE#1. WE#1 could not recall this specific encounter but was unsurprised about NE#1's alleged behavior, given NE#1's history of customer service and professionalism issues. WE#1 described NE#1 as having a rude and unempathetic tone. However, WE#1 denied the allegation that NE#1 was racially biased.

On June 24, 2025, OPA interviewed WE#2. WE#2 corroborated WE#1's statements. WE#2 explained that administrative specialists are expected to always maintain professionalism. WE#2 said administrative specialists typically do not receive many complaints, except for NE#1, who has received many complaints. WE#2 said NE#1 has undergone training aimed at making meaningful efforts to assist community members, even in instances where she was unable to provide immediate help. WE#2 mentioned multiple training and counseling sessions with NE#1, who typically responded positively to them but tended to revert to her prior behavior over time. WE#2 emphasized that NE#1 is a hard worker, capable, and generally maintains a positive relationship with her colleagues and the public.

On June 24, 2025, OPA interviewed NE#1. NE#1 said in situations where a person is rude or confrontational, she believes she could refuse service to that person, as she would not permit anyone to address her in that manner. NE#1 said if someone treated her unfairly, she would let that person know. NE#1 acknowledged receiving training and feedback on her customer service skills. As for the alleged incident involving the Complainant, NE#1 said she could not recall the specifics but ultimately denied being rude, unprofessional, or racially biased toward the Complainant.

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 was unprofessional by being rude and aggressive.

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 is evidence supporting the claim that NE#1 was unprofessional, while there is also evidence diminishing this claim. On one hand, the Complainant alleged that NE#1 was unprofessional—a claim that was bolstered by statements from the witness employees. Both witness employees told OPA that NE#1 had a history of customer service and professionalism issues. In fact, WE#2 indicated that NE#1 had received the most customer service-related complaints against her. These concerns were serious enough to warrant further training and counseling. However, despite NE#1's participation in these sessions, WE#2 noted that NE#1 tended to revert to her prior behavior over time. Thus, it would not be unreasonable to conclude that NE#1 acted unprofessionally toward the Complainant as alleged, considering

¹ OPA identified the likely employee as WE#1.



NE#1's purported propensity for unprofessional conduct. On the other hand, WE#1 was identified as a witness to the encounter, yet she had no recollection of it. NE#1 also denied being unprofessional toward the Complainant. Finally, while propensity evidence could suggest that NE#1 may have repeated past behavior, it did not definitively indicate that NE#1 behaved in accordance with that propensity on the incident date. In other words, just because NE#1 had prior professionalism issues did not automatically mean that she was unprofessional toward the Complainant on the incident date by a preponderance of the evidence.² Overall, the weight of the evidence did not decisively favor one side or the other. Therefore, OPA finds that the evidence is inconclusive.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Inconclusive**

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2

5.140 – Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 exhibited racial bias toward her.

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 race. *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.

Although WE#1 and WE#2 recognized the Complainant's persistent issues with customer service and professionalism, they adamantly rejected any suggestion that she exhibited racial bias toward anyone. Their assessment was consistent with the evidence OPA gathered during this investigation. Overall, OPA found no evidence supporting the Complainant's interpretation of race-based mistreatment.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

² Under the preponderance of the evidence standard, if the greater weight of the evidence—more than 50 percent—supports the allegation, the recommended finding will be sustained. *See* OPA Internal Operations and Training Manual section 7.1.