



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: SEPTEMBER 8, 2025

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

CASE NUMBER: 2025OPA-0107

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	15.410 – Domestic Violence Investigation, 15.410-TSK-1 Patrol Officer Primary Investigation of a Domestic Violence Incident	Not Sustained - Training Referral
# 2	5.100 – Operations Bureau Individual Responsibilities, I. Patrol Officers, A. Responsibilities, 2. Monitor and take appropriate action regarding criminal activity in assigned area	Allegation Removed

Named Employee #2

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	15.410 – Domestic Violence Investigation, 15.410-TSK-1 Patrol Officer Primary Investigation of a Domestic Violence Incident	Not Sustained - Training Referral
# 2	5.100 – Operations Bureau Individual Responsibilities, I. Patrol Officers, A. Responsibilities, 2. Monitor and take appropriate action regarding criminal activity in assigned area	Allegation Removed

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 #2 (NE#2) was assigned to a domestic violence (DV) call involving roommates. Named Employee #1 (NE#1), a sergeant, was contacted about NE#2's handling of the call. The Complainant alleged that the named employees mishandled the call by failing to respond to the scene and clearing it without any investigation.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

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

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

In this investigation, OPA reviewed the OPA complaint, computer-aided dispatch (CAD) call report, CAD messages, audio recordings, and interview statements from the Complainant and named employees.



A. OPA Complaint and Complainant's OPA Interview

On March 29, 2025, the Complainant submitted an OPA complaint. She wrote that on March 28, 2025, a 911 call concerning DV involving four roommates was entered for service. She wrote that an escalated party had pepper spray, an axe was in the common area, one party reportedly had a gun, and there was prior DV history among the parties. She wrote that despite these circumstances, NE#2 cancelled the call just 12 minutes later without contacting the reporting party or any other party and without responding to the scene to investigate the disturbance. She wrote that after NE#2's actions were reported to NE#1—a patrol supervisor—the call was not reopened. The Complainant expressed concern about NE#2 frequently dismissing calls in this manner.

On April 9, 2025, OPA interviewed the Complainant, who identified herself as a call taker for Community Assisted Response and Engagement. She said she had received a call from a person regarding a DV incident involving a roommate. She said this caller was different from the initial caller, who had called several hours earlier.¹ She said CM#2 felt unsafe and requested officers to respond. She said CAD notes indicated that NE#2 attempted to contact CM#1 but received no answer. She said NE#2 closed the call about 15 minutes later, which she found concerning due to the location's history of DV, with reports of firearms or other weapons being present. She said she consulted with her supervisor, who agreed with her and contacted NE#1 about these concerns.² However, she said NE#1 did not reopen the call and was unsure why it remained cleared. She believed the named employees' conduct was negligent due to the DV nature of the call, prompting her to file an OPA complaint.

B. Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) Call Report

First 911 Call

On March 28, 2025, dispatch received a 911 call from CM#1, the reporting party for the first 911 call. At 7:36 PM, CAD call remarks noted the following:

MACE-[REPORTING PARTY], AXE, POSS[IBLE] FIREARM
GUEST OF [REPORTING PARTY'S] HOUSEMATE HAS TAKEN [REPORTING PARTY'S] KEYS SO
SHE CANNOT LEAVE, NOW [REPORTING PARTY'S] HOUSEMATE AND MALE ARE ARGUING
WITH HER

Dispatch coded the call as a disturbance and DV without any assault. Additional updates to the call, among other things, included the following:

- A male in the background says the reporting party is fabricating stories (7:39 PM).
- The reporting party appears to be in crisis, high, or intoxicated (7:40 PM).
- There is a history of DV calls involving the reporting party and the suspect (7:41 PM).
- The reporting party separated herself from a roommate and her two friends (7:42 PM).

¹ OPA will refer to the initial caller as Community Member #1 (CM#1) and the second caller as Community Member #2 (CM#2).

² An audio recording captured the conversation between the dispatch supervisor and NE#1. The supervisor told NE#1 that the call had been holding for several hours, CM#2 requested contact, and NE#2 cleared the call without responding in person or contacting CM#2. The supervisor indicated that NE#2 might have overlooked the information about CM#2. NE#1 replied that he would "take care of it."



- A roommate keeps an axe behind the couch, which the reporting party is unable to see. The roommate has mentioned owning guns, but the reporting party is unsure if the roommate owns one (7:50 PM).
- A roommate and her friend have been drinking alcohol. The reporting party does not believe the male is high or intoxicated. The reporting party denies being high or intoxicated (7:50 PM).
- The reporting party is outside awaiting transportation to relocate and will provide a new location (7:54 PM).

At 11:33 PM, a CAD update indicated that NE#2 attempted to contact CM#1 but received no answer and subsequently cleared the call.

Second 911 Call

On March 28, 2025, dispatch received a 911 call from CM#2, the reporting party for the second 911 call.³ At 8:42 PM, CAD call remarks noted the following:

[REPORTING PARTY'S] ROOMMATE AND HER ROOMMATE [HAVE] BEEN HARASSING [REPORTING PARTY'S] ROOMMATE AND REFUSING TO PAY RENT. [REPORTING PARTY] SAID [OFFICERS] HAVE BEEN HERE IN THE PAST, ALL INVOLVED PARTIES ARE HERE ON SAME PROP[ERTY]. SUSP[ECT]/ROOMMATE IS MAK[ING] FALSE ACCUSATIONS ABOUT [REPORTING PARTY]. NO [WEAPONS]. NO HIGH/INTOX[ICATION].

Dispatch coded the call as a disturbance and DV without any assault. Additional updates to the call, among other things, included the following:

- Nothing physical occurred now (8:45 PM).
- This call is possibly related to the first 911 call (8:46 PM).
- The suspect has been locking herself in various areas of the home. The reporting party said the suspect has been falsely claiming that he is threatening her life (8:47 PM).

At 8:48 PM, a CAD update indicated that the call was cleared.

C. OPA Interviews

Named Employee #2

On May 14, 2025, OPA interviewed NE#2. NE#2 said the initial 911 call was placed at around 7:30 PM, and he was assigned to the call about four hours later. NE#2 determined that the call concerned an argument between roommates, rather than a crime, especially since the call taker noted that CM#1 was likely high or intoxicated. NE#2 believed a call to CM#1 was appropriate, given the delay in the call and no crime being articulated. NE#2 said he cleared the call after receiving no answer from CM#1. NE#2 said he did not respond in person because he felt the call was adequate. NE#2 denied calling CM#2 and maintained that he was unaware of CM#2 or any pertinent information

³ An audio recording captured the conversation between CM#2 and the call taker. CM#2 said he was following up on his "non-emergency" call about a "mentally unwell" resident, requested an officer's presence, and asked whether he should barricade himself in his room. The call taker replied that officers would respond when available.



concerning him. NE#2 denied being contacted by anyone else regarding this call. NE#2 recalled a possible conversation with NE#1 about this call, although he could not recall what they discussed.

Named Employee #1

On May 25, 2025, OPA interviewed NE#1, who identified himself as a patrol supervisor. NE#1 recalled the dispatch supervisor requesting the two 911 calls be combined. NE#1 was unable to recall whether he spoke with NE#2 about this incident or whether he counseled NE#2. NE#1 said he did not instruct NE#2 to reopen the call or respond to the scene. NE#1 believed NE#2's phone call after a four-hour delay was a reasonable response, considering the parties having been separated and no claims of violence. NE#1 felt an in-person response was unnecessary, given the time delay and dispute over rent. NE#1 said he did not respond to the scene, as there were no requests for a supervisory presence. When NE#1 told the dispatch supervisor that he would "take care of it," he meant that he would review the call and determine whether his intervention was necessary or whether an officer needed to respond to the scene. NE#1 noted that he was neither assigned to this call nor the investigating officer for it. NE#1 believed this call, which he characterized as a general disturbance, did not warrant any further response.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

15.410 – Domestic Violence Investigation, 15.410-TSK-1 Patrol Officer Primary Investigation of a Domestic Violence Incident

The Complainant alleged that the named employees mishandled a DV call by failing to respond to the scene and clearing it without any investigation.

When an officer conducts a DV investigation, the officer will, among other things, respond to the scene. SPD Policy 15.410-TSK-1(1). Upon arrival, an officer is required to undertake specific investigatory actions. See SPD Policy 15.410-TSK-1(1) through (16) (requiring officers to, among other things, assist injured persons, coordinate the suspect's arrest, and prepare a DV supplement).

OPA recognizes that NE#1, a patrol supervisor, was neither assigned to this call nor the investigating officer for it. NE#1 also did not clear the call. As such, NE#1 technically had no obligation to conduct a DV investigation.

Nevertheless, NE#1 might have mishandled the DV call once he became aware of the two 911 calls. The evidence was inconclusive as to whether NE#1 ever discussed the calls with NE#2. Regardless of whether a conversation occurred, NE#1 said he did not instruct NE#2 to reopen the call or respond to the scene. For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #2 – Allegation #1, OPA believes an in-person response was warranted under the circumstances. NE#1 defended NE#2's actions, believing that a phone call to CM#1 was adequate due to a four-hour delay, the parties being separated, a dispute over rent, and no claims of violence. While a general disturbance alone might not warrant a further response based on the factors NE#1 cited, this disturbance must be considered in context. Here, two 911 calls—from different callers—originated from the same location, which had a history of DV, and appeared to potentially involve DV. Once NE#1 became aware of these 911 calls, he should have instructed NE#2 to respond to the scene. Under the circumstances, OPA does not find willful misconduct but believes NE#1 could benefit from retraining and counseling on how he could better direct his subordinates' responses to DV calls, recognizing the Department's priority in this area. See SPD Policy 15.410-POL.



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 15.410 and 5.100(III) 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

5.100 – Operations Bureau Individual Responsibilities, 1. Patrol Officers, A. Responsibilities, 2. Monitor and take appropriate action regarding criminal activity in assigned area

OPA finds that this allegation was adequately addressed in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1.

Accordingly, OPA is removing this allegation.

Recommended Finding: **Allegation Removed**

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #1

15.410 – Domestic Violence Investigation, 15.410-TSK-1 Patrol Officer Primary Investigation of a Domestic Violence Incident

The Complainant alleged that the named employees mishandled a DV call by failing to respond to the scene and clearing it without any investigation.

Even if OPA were to assume that NE#2 was unaware of the second 911 call, NE#2 should have responded to the location in person based solely on the first 911 call. CM#1 reported that an argument occurred at a location where weapons—an axe and possibly a firearm—were present. The disturbance was serious enough that CM#1 felt compelled to distance herself from the other parties and then leave the residence entirely. This call appeared DV in nature, especially since it involved multiple roommates residing in the same household, and the location had a history of DV. Although NE#2 called CM#1 after being assigned the call, policy required him to respond to the scene in person. Given the particular emphasis the Department places on DV response, the circumstances of the call warranted an officer's presence at the location to establish whether a crime had occurred, even if an assault was not explicitly reported to dispatch. Although NE#2 cited the delay of the call, CM#1's inability to articulate a crime, and the likelihood that CM#1 was high or intoxicated as reasons for not needing to respond to the scene, the policy still required NE#2 to respond presence. Ultimately, NE#2's decision not to respond to the scene was partially mitigated by the significant delay of the call being dispatched to him and his attempt to contact CM#1. Under the totality of these circumstances, OPA does not find NE#2 committed willful misconduct but believes NE#2 could benefit from retraining and counseling in responding to DV-related calls.

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

- **Required Training:** NE#2's chain of command should discuss OPA's findings with him, review SPD Policies 15.410 and 5.100(I) 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 #2 – Allegation #2

5.100 – Operations Bureau Individual Responsibilities, 1. Patrol Officers, A. Responsibilities, 2. Monitor and take appropriate action regarding criminal activity in assigned area

OPA finds that this allegation was adequately addressed in Named Employee #2 – Allegation #1.

Accordingly, OPA is removing this allegation.

Recommended Finding: **Allegation Removed**