



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: SEPTEMBER 23, 2025

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

CASE NUMBER: 2025OPA-0113

Allegations of Misconduct & Director’s Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director’s Findings
# 1	5.140 – Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing	Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
# 2	5.001 - Standards and Duties POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional	Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)

Named Employee #2

Allegation(s):		Director’s Findings
# 1	5.140 – Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing	Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
# 2	5.001 - Standards and Duties POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional	Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)

Named Employee #3

Allegation(s):		Director’s Findings
# 1	5.140 – Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing	Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
# 2	5.001 - Standards and Duties POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional	Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)

Named Employee #4

Allegation(s):		Director’s Findings
# 1	5.140 – Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing	Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
# 2	5.001 - Standards and Duties POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional	Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)

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), Named Employee #2 (NE#2), and Named Employee #4 (NE#4) responded to a disturbance at a bar involving the Complainant, an assault victim. The Complainant alleged that NE#1, NE#2, and NE#4 engaged in unprofessional conduct by unnecessarily touching her and unfairly siding with the other party in the dispute; that



Named Employee #3 (NE#3)—an acting sergeant—declined to meet with her at the North Precinct; and that the named employees were biased against mixed-raced females.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

This case was approved for Expedited Investigation. That means OPA, with the Office of Inspector General's (OIG) agreement, believed it could issue recommended findings based solely on its intake investigation without interviewing the named employees. As such, OPA did not interview the named employees in this case.

On April 29, 2025, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

OPA's investigation included reviewing the OPA complaint, computer-aided dispatch call report, body-worn video, incident report, and interview statements from the Complainant. Based on these records, OPA finds the following occurred.

On March 29, 2025, NE#1, NE#2, and NE#4 responded to a bar for a disturbance involving the Complainant, her father (Father), and a patron (Patron). The officers contacted the Complainant near the bar's bathroom, where she demanded Patron's arrest for throwing a glass of whiskey at her. She also demanded Father's arrest for trying to tackle her. NE#1 told the Complainant that officers were searching for Patron. The officers escorted the Complainant outside, where Father explained that he intervened in the dispute by trying to separate the Complainant from Patron. The Complainant then showed NE#1 a video she recorded, which showed Patron throwing a glass of whiskey at her and Father attempting to de-escalate the situation. NE#1 explained that he would document the incident but would not be arresting Father. Upset at this outcome, the Complainant left the scene. The Complainant later visited the North Precinct to discuss the incident with NE#3, but when NE#3 went out, the Complainant was no longer present.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

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

The Complainant alleged that the named employees were biased against mixed-raced females.

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 and gender. *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.

BWV showed no bias. Rather, BWV showed NE#1, NE#2, and NE#4 investigating the incident and attempting to locate Patron. Although the officers chose not to arrest Father, this decision was based on lack of probable cause for assault, rather than bias. NE#3 had no interaction with the Complainant, as she had left the North Precinct before NE#3 could contact her. Overall, OPA found no evidence supporting the Complainant's interpretation of bias based on race or gender.



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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited)**

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2

5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional

The Complainant alleged that the named employees engaged in unprofessional conduct.

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 derogatory, contemptuous, or disrespectful language toward anyone. *Id.*

BWV showed no unprofessional conduct. Rather, BWV showed NE#1, NE#2, and NE#4 being courteous to the Complainant, Father, and other witnesses. The officers utilized de-escalation when the Complainant was agitated and shouting. Although NE#4 briefly grabbed the Complainant, the contact was brief, *de minimis*,¹ and aimed at preventing the Complainant from approaching Father. The officers attempted to locate Patron but were unsuccessful, and their decision not to arrest Father was based solely on the absence of probable cause. As noted above, NE#3 had no interaction with the Complainant.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited)**

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #1

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

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited)**

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #2

5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited)**

¹ *De minimis* force is an action meant to separate, guide, and/or control without using control techniques that are intended to, or are reasonably likely to, cause pain or injury. Examples include, but are not limited to, using hands or equipment to stop, push back, separate, or escort, and using compliance holds without using sufficient force to cause pain. SPD Policy 8.050.



Named Employee #3 – Allegation #1

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

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited)**

Named Employee #3 – Allegation #2

5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited)**

Named Employee #4 – Allegation #1

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

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited)**

Named Employee #4 – Allegation #2

5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited)**