



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: AUGUST 11, 2025

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

CASE NUMBER: 2025OPA-0077

Allegations of Misconduct & Director’s Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director’s Findings
# 1	16.090 – In-Car and Body-Worn Video, 16.090-POL-2 Sworn Employees Recording Police Activity, 2. When Sworn Employees Record Activity	Not Sustained - Training Referral
# 2	16.090 – In-Car and Body-Worn Video, 16.090-POL-1 Recording with ICV and BWV, 6. Sworn Employees Will Document the Existence of ...	Not Sustained - Training Referral

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 March 4, 2025, Named Employee #1 (NE#1) and Witness Officer #1 (WO#1) responded to a domestic disturbance call involving the Complainant and Community Member #1 (CM#1), her ex-boyfriend, at CM#1’s apartment. Upon arrival, NE#1 did not have his body-worn video (BWV) activated. OPA alleged that NE#1 failed to record police activity and failed to document the absence of video in his incident report.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

NE#1 and WO#1 allegedly exercised unreasonable discretion by requiring the Complainant to leave CM#1’s apartment. OPA sent NE#1’s and WO#1’s alleged violation of SPD Policy 5.001-POL-6 (Employees May Use Discretion) to their chain of command for an “FYI” Supervisor Action.¹

On May 16, 2025, the Office of Inspector General certified OPA’s investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

On March 5, 2025, the Complainant submitted an OPA complaint, alleging that WO#1 required her to vacate CM#1’s apartment after an argument. OPA resolved this allegation through an “FYI” Supervisor Action, as noted above. During OPA’s investigation, OPA discovered that NE#1 did not have his BWV activated upon arriving at CM#1’s apartment

¹ An “FYI” Supervisor Action generally involves a complaint deemed unfounded through the intake investigation that does not meet the criteria to be closed as a Contact Log. See OPA Internal Operations and Training Manual section 5.4(B)(ii). In these situations, OPA directs the chain of command to take no action other than informing the named employee of the complaint’s closing. *Id.*



and did not document the absence of video in his incident report. OPA's investigation included reviewing the computer-aided dispatch (CAD) call report, BWV, and incident report. OPA interviewed the Complainant and NE#1.

On March 4, 2025, at 10:54 PM, CAD call remarks noted, "EX-PARTNER INSIDE UNIT THROWING HER STUFF OUTSIDE, SHE IS NOT ON LEASE, NO [WEAPONS]." NE#1 and WO#1 arrived at CM#1's apartment, with WO#1 activating her BWV, while NE#1 did not activate his BWV. WO#1's BWV captured CM#1 stating that he wanted the Complainant to vacate his apartment, as she had previously agreed to move out. WO#1 told CM#1 that officers could not forcibly remove the Complainant from the apartment. The Complainant agreed to leave that night and would later seek a civil standby to collect her belongings on another day. NE#1 prepared an incident report following this call, but the report did not include the absence of BWV.

On May 5, 2025, OPA interviewed NE#1. He claimed he had initially activated his BWV while driving to CM#1's apartment but deactivated it before his arrival. He said he had forgotten to reactivate it upon arrival. He said he was unaware that his BWV was not activated, which was the reason he did not document the absence of BWV in his incident report. He said he activated his BWV when he departed to respond to a higher priority call. He said he did not consult a supervisor regarding the absence of BWV because he was unaware at the time that it was not activated.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

16.090 – In-Car and Body-Worn Video, 16.090-POL-2 Sworn Employees Recording Police Activity, 2. When Sworn Employees Record Activity

OPA alleged that NE#1 failed to record police activity.

When safe and practical, sworn employees will record police activity, even if the event is out of view of the camera. SPD Policy 16.090-POL-2(2). Police activity includes, among other things, dispatched calls, starting before the employee arrives on the call to ensure adequate time to turn on cameras. *Id.*

NE#1 acknowledged that he did not record on his BWV upon his arrival at CM#1's apartment but attributed this mistake to forgetfulness. OPA sees no reason to doubt NE#1's claim, particularly as this lapse seems to be unintentional. NE#1—a new, probationary officer—also has no prior OPA allegations or sustained findings related to the failure to record police activity. Given these circumstances, OPA does not consider NE#1's oversight to be willful misconduct; rather, OPA believes NE#1 could benefit from retraining and counseling on the importance of activating his BWV before responding to a call.

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

- **Required Training:** NE#1's chain of command should discuss OPA's findings with him, review SPD Policies 16.090-POL-1(6) and 16.090-POL-2(2) with him, and provide any other retraining and counseling it deems necessary. Any retraining and counseling should be documented and maintained in Blue Team.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Training Referral**



Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2

16.090 – In-Car and Body-Worn Video, 16.090-POL-1 Recording with ICV and BWV, 6. Sworn Employees Will Document the Existence of Video or Reason for Lack of Video

OPA alleged that NE#1 failed to document the absence of video in his incident report.

Sworn employees will document the existence or absence of any BWV and/or ICV video in any related paperwork. SPD Policy 16.090-POL-1(6). When sworn employees are aware that there is no recording or there was a delay in recording, they will explain why in the submitted paperwork. *Id.*

For the reasons set forth above at Allegation #1, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Training Referral.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Training Referral**