

**Issued Date:** October 2, 2025

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

**Case Number:** 2025OPA-0147

---

## **Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings**

### **Named Employee #1**

1. **Allegation #1:** 5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-2. Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy, and Department Policy  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded
  2. **Allegation #2:** 5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded
- 

**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:**

The Complainant—SPD's equal employment opportunity (EEO) manager—alleged that Named Employee #1 (NE#1), while operating a motorcycle, may have fled and hid from a Washington State Patrol (WSP) trooper (Trooper #1) conducting a traffic stop after she committed a traffic violation.

### **Administrative Note:**

On September 5, 2025, the Office of Inspector General certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

NE#1 separated from SPD while this investigation was pending. A contractual 180-day timeline does not apply to NE#1.

## **Summary of the Investigation:**

OPA's investigation included reviewing the OPA complaint, EEO interview transcript, text messages, and interview statements from Witness Officer #1 (WO#1). NE#1 did not respond to OPA's multiple requests for an interview. Moreover, WSP informed OPA that it was unable to locate an incident pertaining to Trooper #1's traffic stop.

On April 23, 2025, the Complainant submitted an OPA complaint regarding a potential SPD policy violation committed by NE#1. The Complainant also provided the transcript of an EEO interview with WO#1. During that interview, WO#1 reported the following events. On September 6, 2024, NE#1 and WO#1 were riding motorcycles when NE#1 improperly changed lanes, leading Trooper #1 to activate his lights to conduct a traffic stop on NE#1. Instead of pulling over, NE#1 fled and hid behind a gas station, while WO#1 pulled over. WO#1 told Trooper #1 that NE#1 was his supervisor and did not know how to operate a motorcycle, as she was a new rider. Trooper #1 told WO#1 to be careful, as the public would expect Trooper #1 to address traffic violations.

During the EEO interview, WO#1 also discussed text messages between NE#1 and himself. The Complainant provided screenshots of those text messages to OPA. Those text messages showed the following. On September 6, 2024, NE#1 asked WO#1 whether he was facing charges. In response, WO#1 asked for NE#1's location, to which she replied that she was at a gas station. Referring to Trooper #1, NE#1 texted, "Fuck that guy ... he doesn't like motorcycles." WO#1 agreed with that sentiment, later replying, "Fuck that trooper." WO#1 expressed familiarity with Trooper #1's name, his previous employment, and his former residence. NE#1 replied with an image depicting police vehicles with their emergency lights activated.

On July 29, 2025, OPA interviewed WO#1. WO#1 said he and NE#1 were riding their motorcycles when they exited a state route and reached a red light, with NE#1 positioned ahead of him. WO#1 said when the light turned green, Trooper #1 approached from behind with his emergency lights activated. WO#1 said he could not recall the reason

for the stop but speculated that it might have been due to an improper lane change. WO#1 said he and NE#1 pulled over to the side, but only he was contacted by Trooper #1, who directed WO#1 to move into a nearby parking lot because they were obstructing traffic. WO#1 said he complied, while NE#1—who was not contacted by Trooper #1—drove away and stopped at the next gas station.

WO#1 said Trooper #1 told him to be careful and ride safely. WO#1 recalled mentioning that NE#1 was a new motorcycle rider. WO#1 was unsure whether the initial traffic stop was intended for him, NE#1, or both. WO#1 was unable to recall whether Trooper #1 asking for further information on NE#1, but he recalled telling Trooper #1 that NE#1 was his sergeant and they both worked for SPD. WO#1 said Trooper #1 did not issue a citation. WO#1 said he joined NE#1 at the gas station afterward. WO#1 was unable to recall the specifics of their conversation, but they drove home. WO#1 did not believe Trooper #1 tried to locate NE#1.

---

## **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 fled and hid from Trooper #1 conducting a traffic stop on her.

Employees must adhere to laws, city policy, and department policy. SPD Policy 5.001-POL-2. Any person requested or signaled to stop by a law enforcement officer for a traffic infraction has a duty to stop. RCW 46.61.021(1).

OPA found insufficient evidence indicating NE#1's violation of RCW 46.61.021(1). The sole evidence suggesting a potential violation originated from WO#1's account during his EEO interview. Although WO#1 initially claimed during his EEO interview that NE#1 fled and hid behind a gas station when Trooper #1 activated his lights, WO#1 later clarified his account during his OPA interview. In that interview, WO#1 maintained that NE#1 had initially pulled over but then drove away when Trooper #1 did not contact her, as Trooper #1 only engaged WO#1 and directed him to move to a nearby parking lot. Moreover, Trooper #1's decision not to document the incident, cite WO#1, or attempt to locate NE#1 suggested that Trooper #1 did not intend to conduct a traffic stop on NE#1. Due to the absence of video evidence and NE#1's account of the incident, OPA cannot find that NE#1 fled from Trooper #1 in violation of RCW 46.61.021(1).

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

### **Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2**

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

NE#1 was allegedly unprofessional in response to a traffic stop.

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. Lastly, Department employees, while on duty or in uniform, will not publicly ridicule the Department or its policies, other Department employees, other law enforcement agencies, the criminal justice system, or police profession. This applies where such expression is defamatory, obscene, undermines the effectiveness of the Department, interferes with the maintenance of discipline, or is made with reckless disregard for the truth. Id.

As discussed in Allegation #1, OPA found insufficient evidence suggesting that NE#1 engaged in behavior undermining public trust in SPD or herself, as noted above. According to WO#1, NE#1 seemingly left the scene when she believed the traffic stop was intended for WO#1, rather than herself. Also, NE#1's text—"fuck that guy"—was communicated privately to WO#1 when NE#1 was off duty.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**