



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: AUGUST 18, 2025

FROM: INTERIM DIRECTOR BONNIE GLENN
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

CASE NUMBER: 2025OPA-0086

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	8.100 – De-Escalation, 8.100-POL-1. When Safe, Feasible, and Without Compromising Law Enforcement Priorities, Sworn Employees Will Use De-Escalation Tactics to Reduce the Need for Force	Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper
# 2	8.300 – Use of Force Tools, 8.300-POL-3 Taser 10, 5. Tasers Should Not Be Used on A Person Who Is Fleeing the Scene, Absent Other Factors	Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper

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:

Named Employee #1 (NE#1) responded to a stolen vehicle call, during which Community Member #1 (CM#1) was identified as the driver of the stolen vehicle. NE#1 Tased CM#1 twice on two separate occasions when CM#1 attempted to flee, causing CM#1 to fall both times. OPA alleged that NE#1 failed to de-escalate and deployed his Taser at a fleeing person absent justifying factors.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

On August 8, 2025, the Office of Inspector General certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

OPA's investigation included reviewing the computer-aided dispatch (CAD) call report, body-worn video (BWV), incident report, and Force Investigation Team (FIT) records. OPA did not interview NE#1 because OPA was present for NE#1's interview with FIT and believed an additional interview would have been duplicative.

A. Force Investigation Team (FIT) Callout

On March 14, 2025, OPA responded to a FIT callout and learned about the following incident. NE#1 went to recover a stolen vehicle and encountered CM#1, who was identified as the stolen vehicle driver. After NE#1 requested backup, he contacted CM#1 alone, drew his Taser, and told CM#1 that he was being detained; however, CM#1 fled. NE#1 deployed his Taser at CM#1, causing CM#1 to fall. CM#1 disobeyed NE#1's order to stay on the ground and fled again. NE#1 redeployed his Taser at CM#1, causing CM#1 to fall again. CM#1 sustained a broken nose, requiring a FIT callout.



B. Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) Call Report

On March 14, 2025, at 2:26 PM, CAD call remarks noted, “[REPORTING PARTY] TRACKING STOLEN VEH[ICLE] TO THIS LOCATION, APPEARS TO BE MOVING, UNK[NOWN] OCCUPANTS, UNK[NOWN] WEAPONS, [REPORTING PARTY] CAN HONK THE HORN OF HER VEH[ICLE] AND TRACK IT VIA HER [GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM].”

C. Body-Worn Video (BWV)

BWV captured the following:

As NE#1 drove to the location, a witness approached and described the stolen vehicle suspect to NE#1. After requesting backup, NE#1 parked his patrol vehicle, exited, and began walking along a sidewalk in a residential area. CM#1 walked past NE#1, who then followed CM#1. NE#1 radioed that he had located the stolen vehicle suspect and requested backup to “step it up.” Several community members were present. NE#1 followed CM#1 to a four-way intersection, where CM#1 stopped and waited to cross the street. NE#1 then drew his Taser, aimed it at CM#1, and ordered CM#1 to get on the ground, to which CM#1 asked for the reason. NE#1 repeated his order and told CM#1 that he was being detained for possessing a stolen vehicle. CM#1 disobeyed and denied the accusation, claiming NE#1 had the wrong person. NE#1 repeated his prior order while keeping his Taser aimed at CM#1, who said he refused to be detained because that was “bullshit” and “messed up.”

CM#1 then began to run away from NE#1, who promptly deployed his Taser at CM#1 and chased after him. A phone slipped from CM#1’s pocket as he crossed the street. NE#1’s Taser beeped as CM#1 reached the sidewalk and continued to run away. NE#1 deployed his Taser at CM#1 again, causing CM#1 to scream, fall forward, and roll onto his side. A set of keys slipped from CM#1’s pocket.¹ NE#1 went on top of CM#1, rolled CM#1 onto his stomach, and restrained CM#1 on the ground. While holding the Taser with his right hand, NE#1 ordered CM#1 not to remove the Taser probes and ordered CM#1 not to move, or he would be Tased again. CM#1 denied any wrongdoing and told NE#1 to release him. NE#1 radioed, “I’m not under control. Step it up.” CM#1 repeatedly demanded NE#1 to release him and accused NE#1 of assault. CM#1 used his right hand to push against the ground to shift to his side, while NE#1 maintained his grip on CM#1’s left hand behind CM#1’s back. NE#1 ordered CM#1 to place his hands behind his back, but CM#1 refused, claiming that NE#1 had captured the wrong person. Despite being ordered to stop moving, CM#1 rolled completely onto his left side and sat up. NE#1 stepped back and warned CM#1 about being Tased again. CM#1 began removing the Taser probes from his body and then stood. NE#1 commanded, “Stay where you are!” CM#1 then began to run away from NE#1, who promptly deployed his Taser again at CM#1. After taking several steps, CM#1 fell forward onto his face and screamed. Two backing officers arrived and handcuffed CM#1. Blood was present on the ground and on CM#1’s face.²

D. Force Investigation Team (FIT) Records

On March 15, 2025, FIT interviewed NE#1, with OPA present. NE#1 said he saw the stolen vehicle unoccupied as he drove into the area and was flagged down by a witness, who observed the stolen vehicle driver enter a home. NE#1 said that home was known for criminal activity, including violent crime, firearms offenses, robberies, stolen vehicles, and drug-related activities. NE#1 said he was on high alert due to this concern. NE#1 said he knew backing officers

¹ Officers later used this set of keys to access the stolen vehicle.

² Officers later learned that CM#1 had been diagnosed with a broken nose at a hospital.



were en route, so he stood near the home to monitor it, but he then saw CM#1—who matched the suspect’s description—walking past him. NE#1 said the witness pointed at CM#1, identifying him as the stolen vehicle driver, so NE#1 followed CM#1 while maintaining distance until they reached the corner of an intersection. NE#1 expressed concern that CM#1 might cross the street to either access a vehicle containing weapons or enter another home associated with criminal activity. NE#1 said he preferred not to initiate contact alone unless a specific safety concern arose. NE#1 felt the time was appropriate to detain CM#1 at the corner, considering the time that had passed and the proximity of the backing officers.

NE#1 said he tried to detain CM#1 with his Taser due to concerns about CM#1’s possible access to weapons, other community members, and escape routes, including the nearby express lanes of Interstate 5, where a “violent” encampment was located. In describing de-escalation tactics, NE#1 articulated communication, maintaining distance from CM#1, delaying contact until backing officers arrived, drawing his Taser, and providing Taser warnings. NE#1 said he deployed his Taser at CM#1 when CM#1 attempted to flee. NE#1 said he chose to deploy his Taser, which he described as the lowest level of force, to avoid having to strike CM#1 or resort to lethal force. NE#1 believed he had no other alternatives at the time.

NE#1 said he knelt on CM#1’s lower back to control his hips after CM#1 fell on the sidewalk. NE#1 described CM#1 as noncompliant and argumentative. NE#1 said he lost control over CM#1, who actively resisted and managed to stand. NE#1 believed CM#1 was preparing to fight, so NE#1 stepped back and issued commands; however, CM#1 chose to flee again. NE#1 said he intended to deploy his Taser at CM#1 before he could gain momentum. NE#1 said CM#1 took several steps before the Taser became effective, causing CM#1 to fall. NE#1 noted that CM#1 fell in front of a home associated with criminal activity. NE#1 believed the first fall did not cause injury but thought the second fall did.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

8.100 – De-Escalation, 8.100-POL-1. When Safe, Feasible, and Without Compromising Law Enforcement Priorities, Sworn Employees Will Use De-Escalation Tactics to Reduce the Need for Force

OPA alleged that NE#1 failed to de-escalate before applying force.

When safe, feasible, and without compromising law enforcement priorities, sworn employees will use de-escalation tactics to reduce the need for force. SPD Policy 8.100-POL-1. Team approaches to de-escalation are encouraged and will consider sworn employee training and skill level, the number of sworn employees, and whether any sworn employee has successfully established rapport with the subject. *Id.* The totality of the circumstances should guide de-escalation options, with the goal of attaining voluntary compliance through communication, time, distance, and shielding. *Id.*

OPA finds, based on a preponderance of the evidence, that NE#1 utilized de-escalation tactics to the extent feasible. NE#1 approached the residence reportedly housing the stolen vehicle suspect and stood by as backing officers were en route. However, CM#1 unexpectedly appeared and passed NE#1, who then followed CM#1 at a distance after a witness identified CM#1 as the stolen vehicle suspect. NE#1 followed CM#1 to the corner of an intersection, where NE#1 believed he must detain CM#1 due to the safety concerns NE#1 articulated during his FIT interview. At this point, NE#1’s actions reflected time and distance, but believing he could not allow CM#1 to proceed any further, NE#1 initiated contact with CM#1. After drawing his Taser and aiming it at CM#1, NE#1 repeatedly ordered CM#1 to get on



the ground, told CM#1 that he was being detained for an investigation into a stolen vehicle, and repeatedly warned him about the possibility of being Tased. At this point, NE#1's actions reflected communication. Despite these de-escalation efforts, CM#1 was noncompliant and attempted to flee, prompting NE#1 to immediately deploy his Taser to prevent CM#1's escape. Overall, the totality of these circumstances reflected NE#1 utilizing communication, time, and distance in his efforts to attain CM#1's voluntary compliance.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper**

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2

8.300 – Use of Force Tools, 8.300-POL-3 Taser 10, 6. Tasers Should Not Be Used on A Person Who Is Fleeing the Scene, Absent Other Factors

OPA alleged that NE#1 deployed his Taser at a fleeing person absent justifying factors.

Tasers should not be used on someone fleeing the scene, absent other factors. SPD Policy 8.300-POL-3(6).

OPA finds, based on a preponderance of the evidence, that there were sufficient factors supporting both Taser deployments. As a threshold matter, whether CM#1 was indeed “fleeing the scene” was debatable. In this case, NE#1 deployed his Taser immediately after CM#1 began fleeing in both instances. During these instances, CM#1 initiated an attempt at fleeing—rather than actively “fleeing” in the full sense of the term—when NE#1 deployed his Taser at CM#1. Even if CM#1's conduct could be construed as “fleeing the scene,” OPA finds that NE#1 articulated sufficient factors justifying his Taser deployments. NE#1 was alone while awaiting backup in an area where he identified specific locations—at least two homes and the “violent” encampment—as sites of criminal activity. In fact, NE#1 observed CM#1 exiting a home reportedly known for criminal activity. Subsequently, a witness identified CM#1 as the stolen vehicle suspect, giving NE#1 at least reasonable suspicion that CM#1 had committed a crime. CM#1 had walked past the stolen vehicle, and the destination where he was walking toward was unknown to NE#1. However, a second home reportedly known for criminal activity and a “violent” encampment were nearby. Considering this context, NE#1 reasonably believed that CM#1 might attempt to either access a vehicle containing weapons or enter another home associated with criminal activity. Moreover, multiple community members were nearby, requiring NE#1 to mitigate any potential threat that CM#1 posed to them. Upon contact, CM#1 was argumentative and noncompliant. These same factors persisted when CM#1 actively resisted on the ground, managed to stand, and initiated another attempt at fleeing, justifying NE#1's second Taser deployment. Overall, NE#1's Taser deployments were lawful and proper under the circumstances.

To the extent that SPD policy lacks clarity on the circumstances under which a Taser may be deployed against a fleeing subject, OPA issued a Management Action Recommendation in 2024OPA-0403. In that case, OPA recommended SPD to revise SPD Policy 8.300-POL-3(6) to clarify when a subject is “fleeing the scene” and what “other factors” should be considered when evaluating a Taser deployment against a fleeing subject. OPA understands that this matter is under review and looks forward to SPD's response.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper**