



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: SEPTEMBER 30, 2025

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

CASE NUMBER: 2025OPA-0135

Allegations of Misconduct & Director’s Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director’s Findings
# 1	5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-2. Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy, and Department Policy	Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
# 2	5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-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:

The Complainant and Named Employee #1 (NE#1) are unrelated adult children of an elderly couple (Mother and Father) who have passed away. The Complainant and NE#1 are currently in a legal dispute concerning the ownership of their parents’ home in California. The Complainant alleged that NE#1 unlawfully entered the home and took a computer. The Complainant also alleged that NE#1 committed tax fraud by failing to pay inheritance tax.

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 employee. As such, OPA did not interview the named employee in this case.

On May 12, 2025, OIG certified OPA’s investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

OPA’s investigation included reviewing text messages, photographs, Facebook messages, legal documents, and interview statements from the Complainant. Based on these records, OPA finds the following have occurred:

In 2021, before her death, Mother instructed the Complainant to cease contact with her and other relatives. She also conveyed her home to Father through a quitclaim deed. Following Mother’s death, the Complainant sued Father, challenging the validity of the quitclaim deed. NE#1 and the Complainant had minimal contact during this period. Following Father’s death in 2024, ownership of the home was transferred to NE#1, as NE#1 was designated as the next of kin on the deed. NE#1 returned to California to oversee Father’s estate, while the Complainant maintained the lawn. The Complainant included NE#1 and NE#1’s sister as defendants in his lawsuit. During his OPA interview, the Complainant acknowledged that NE#1 had ownership rights to the home since NE#1 was the next of kin.



ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-2. Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy, and Department Policy

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 committed tax fraud by failing to pay inheritance tax.

Employees must adhere to laws, city policy, and department policy. SPD Policy 5.001-POL-2.

As neither Washington State nor California imposes an inheritance tax, this allegation is unfounded. NE#1 was not required to pay inheritance tax in either state. Moreover, there is no indication that either a gift tax or estate tax would apply in this situation. Neither Washington State nor California imposes a gift tax. Although Washington State imposes an estate tax on large estates, California does not impose any estate tax. A Washington State estate tax would not be imposed on a home in California.

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 NE#1 unlawfully entered the home and took a computer.

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.*

The Complainant acknowledged during his OPA interview that NE#1 is technically the owner of the California home, which he is challenging in his lawsuit. Therefore, NE#1 had the legal authority to enter the home, even through forcible means, and to remove any property inside it. The dispute regarding the ownership of the home, including property inside it, constitutes a civil matter that should be adjudicated in the Complainant’s lawsuit.

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

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