



## 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-0121

### 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)

#### 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)

***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 named employees (NE#1 and NE#2) responded to a domestic violence (DV) call at the Complainant’s residence and arrested the Complainant following an investigation. The Complainant alleged that the named employees were racially biased against her.

### 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 May 8, 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 April 6, 2025, the named employees responded to an apartment following the Complainant’s 911 call in which she alleged her husband (Husband) punched her in the stomach. The named employees interviewed the parties separately, with NE#1 interviewing the Complainant and NE#2 interviewing Husband. While escalated, the Complainant retracted her claim of being punched, while Husband denied assaulting her. He reported that an



argument led the Complainant to scratch his buttocks. NE#2 observed redness on Husband's buttocks. The Complainant later claimed that although she could not recall scratching Husband's buttocks, he might have pushed her away in self-defense. The named employees conferred with one another and concluded that there was probable cause for fourth-degree DV assault. NE#1 then arrested the Complainant.

**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 racially biased against 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.

The named employees did not exhibit bias in any way throughout their investigation. Quite the opposite. The named employees conducted an objective investigation by interviewing the parties separately, comparing their accounts, assessing their credibility, and evaluating Husband's physical injury. BWV did not show the named employees showing favoritism toward Husband. In fact, Husband was initially regarded as a suspect until the collective evidence cleared him of that status. The named employees' decision to arrest the Complainant was based on the evidence they gathered, not racial bias. Furthermore, the Complainant described the named employees as "very nice" during her interview with OPA, undermining her claim of racial bias.

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)**