

Issued Date: October 14, 2025

From: Interim Deputy Director Nelson Leese (on behalf of Interim Director Bonnie Glenn)
Office of Police Accountability 

Case Number: 2025OPA-0145

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

1. **Allegation #1:** 8.200 – Using Force, 8.200-POL-1. Using Force: When Authorized
Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
-

This Closed Case Summary (CCS) represents the opinion of the OPA Director regarding the misconduct alleged and therefore sections may be written in the first person.

Executive Summary:

SPD officers responded to a homeless shelter and arrested Community Member #1 (CM#1) for assault. An anonymous complainant alleged that CM#1 was “beat repeatedly” by unidentified officers (Named Employee #1 or NE#1).

Administrative Note:

During its intake investigation, OPA identified Witness Officer #1 (WO#1) failing to activate his body-worn video before contacting CM#1. OPA sent WO#1’s potential violation of SPD Policy 16.090-POL-2(2) (When Sworn Employees Record Activity) to his chain of command for Supervisor Action.

This case was approved for Expedited Investigation. That means OPA, with the Office of Inspector General’s (OIG) agreement, believed it could issue a recommended finding 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 23, 2025, OIG certified OPA’s investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

Summary of the Investigation:

OPA's investigation included reviewing the OPA complaint, computer-aided dispatch call report, body-worn video (BWV), use-of-force reports, and incident report. OPA tried unsuccessfully to contact the Complainant and CM#1.

On April 5, 2025, SPD officers, including WO#1, responded to a homeless shelter following a 911 call regarding a disturbance. The officers spoke with the 911 caller, who reported that CM#1, while intoxicated, had grabbed him and assaulted him. The officers then approached CM#1 in a room, where he appeared to be in crisis, lying on the floor shirtless, speaking incoherently, writhing, and unresponsive to the officers. As CM#1 lay on his side, two officers moved in, handcuffed him, helped him to his feet, and escorted him out of the room. An officer placed a spit mask over CM#1's head. CM#1 was then secured onto a stretcher and transported to the King County Jail (KCJ).

Analysis and Conclusions:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

8.200 – Using Force, 8.200-POL-1. Using Force: When Authorized

The Complainant alleged that he was “beat repeatedly” by NE#1, an unidentified officer.

Sworn employees will only use objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional force to the threat or urgency of the situation to achieve a law enforcement objective while protecting the life and safety of all people. SPD Policy 8.200(1). Reasonableness must consider that sworn employees are often forced to make split-second decisions about the amount of force necessary in a particular situation in tense, uncertain, dynamic, and rapidly evolving circumstances. *Id.* The question is whether the sworn employee's actions were objectively reasonable considering the facts and circumstances confronting them, without regard to their underlying intent or motivation. *Id.* Several factors

should be weighed when evaluating reasonableness. See *id.* Force is necessary under the totality of the circumstances when there is no reasonably effective alternative to using physical or deadly force, and the type and amount of physical or deadly force used is a reasonable and proportional response to effect the legal purpose intended or to protect against the threat posed to the sworn employee or others. SPD Policy 8.050. Proportional force must reflect the totality of circumstances of the situation, including the nature and immediacy of any threats posed to sworn employees and others. *Id.* Sworn employees must rely on training, experience, and their assessment of the situation to decide an appropriate level of force. *Id.*

This allegation is unfounded. BWV captured the entire incident, from the officers' first encounter with CM#1 to his transport to KCJ. At no point did the officers apply unauthorized force against CM#1. Rather, they applied only de minimis force while handcuffing and escorting him off the premises. CM#1 appeared to have pre-existing injuries prior to the officers' arrival. No evidence supports the claim that CM#1 was "beat repeatedly" by any officer.

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

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