


Issued Date: October 20, 2025

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

Case Number: 2025OPA-0156

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 (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:

Named Employee #1 (NE#1) allegedly violated a no-contact order (NCO) by requesting an insurance agent (Agent #1) convey a message to his ex-fiancée (Community Member #1 or CM#1), the petitioner of the NCO.

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 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 June 30, 2025, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

Summary of the Investigation:

OPA's investigation included reviewing the OPA complaint, Snohomish County Sheriff's Office (SCSO) case reports, email correspondence, and interview statements from Agent #1 and CM#1.

SCSO Deputy #1 documented the following in a case report. On April 23, 2025, CM#1 reported to SCSO that NE#1, the respondent to an NCO, used Agent #1 to contact her regarding the reconciliation of vehicle policies. The following day, SCSO Deputy #2 documented his conversation with Agent #1. Agent #1 said he was handling an insurance claim for NE#1. Agent #1 said NE#1 wanted Agent #1 to inform CM#1 that NE#1 wished to "reconcile" the situation. Agent #1 maintained that NE#1 did not ask for any communication beyond the insurance claim be sent to CM#1. SCSO Deputy #1 documented the following conversation with NE#1. On April 27, 2025, NE#1 reported to SCSO that he requested Agent #1 exclude CM#1 from insurance coverage. NE#1 said he told Agent #1 not to communicate any messages to CM#1 on his behalf due to his current situation and the NCO. NE#1 maintained that the phone call to Agent #1 was solely for insurance-related purposes. Based on this investigation, SCSO Deputy #1 concluded that there was no probable cause for a crime.

Agent #1 clarified in his OPA interview that "reconcile" referred to NE#1's intent to maintain the same policy and continue paying for it. Agent #1 said "reconcile" did not refer to NE#1 reconciling his relationship with CM#1. During CM#1's OPA interview, CM#1 corroborated Agent #1's interpretation of "reconcile." CM#1 confirmed that NE#1 did not contact her directly and believed NE#1 sought to remedy errors resulting from his attempt to separate the insurance policy. NE#1 emailed the following statement, in part, to an SPD lieutenant in human resources:

I made it abundantly clear I was in no way, shape or form requesting the insurance agent pass this message onto [CM#1] because it would be third party contact and violate the terms of the order. I reiterated this fact to the insurance agent several times and made it known my conversation with him was solely about insurance coverage and not a way to communicate with [CM#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

NE#1 allegedly violated an NCO by requesting Agent #1 to convey a message to CM#1.

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

This allegation is unfounded, even at the probable cause level, as SCSO concluded. Agent #1 seemed to have misinterpreted his conversation with NE#1, mistakenly believing that he was directed to convey a message to CM#1 on NE#1's behalf. The evidence showed NE#1 did not request Agent #1 convey such a message to CM#1. NE#1 firmly rejected the claim that he asked Agent #1 to contact CM#1. All involved parties—NE#1, Agent #1, and CM#1—clarified that “reconciliation” concerned vehicle insurance policies, rather than the relationship between NE#1 and CM#1. This supported NE#1's claim that he contacted Agent #1 solely for insurance-related purposes, not to use Agent #1 as an intermediary to violate the court order. Overall, there was insufficient evidence to support the allegation that NE#1 violated the NCO by contacting CM#1, either directly or indirectly.

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

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