

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-0158

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)
 2. **Allegation #2:** 5.140 – Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing
Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
-

Named Employee #2

1. **Allegation #1:** 8.200 – Using Force, 8.200-POL-1. Using Force: When Authorized
Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
 2. **Allegation #2:** 5.140 – Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2. Offices Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing
Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
-

Named Employee #3

1. **Allegation #1:** 8.200 – Using Force, 8.200-POL-1. Using Force: When Authorized
Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
 2. **Allegation #2:** 5.140 – Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing
Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
-

Named Employee #4

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

Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)

2. Allegation #2: 5.140 – Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing

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:

The named employees (NE#1 through NE#4) assisted American Medical Response (AMR) with the Complainant, who refused to be taken to a hospital. After NE#3 decided to execute a detainment under the Involuntary Treatment Act (ITA), the named employees placed the Complainant on a gurney. The Complainant alleged that the named employees applied unauthorized force and engaged in bias-based policing by detaining him based on his skin color.

Administrative Note:

During its intake investigation, OPA identified NE#1 failed to report the Complainant's allegation of unauthorized force to either a supervisor or OPA. OPA sent NE#1's potential violation of SPD Policy 5.002-POL-6 (Employees Will Report Alleged Violations) 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 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 June 10, 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 (CAD) call report, body-worn video (BWV), behavioral crisis report, and interview statements from the Complainant. Based on these records, a preponderance of the evidence showed the following:

The named employees were dispatched to assist AMR employees placing the Complainant—described as aggressive and in crisis—on a gurney. The Complainant was lying on the sidewalk when the named employees arrived. After an AMR employee reported the Complainant had fallen multiple times, NE#3 executed an ITA detainment. The Complainant repeatedly refused to board the gurney. Each named employee grabbed one of the Complainant's limbs, lifted him off the

ground, and placed him onto a gurney. AMR employees applied restraints to the Complainant as he continually screamed and demanded his release. AMR employees then transported the Complainant to a hospital.

Analysis and Conclusions:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

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

The Complainant alleged that the named employees applied unauthorized force when they placed him onto a gurney.

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.*

The allegation is unfounded. BWV captured the named employees applying, at most, de minimis force during their encounter with the Complainant. Each named employee grabbed one of the Complainant's limbs, lifted him off the ground, and placed him onto a gurney. The named employees maintained control holds while AMR employees applied restraints. The named employees did not assault the Complainant, twist his arms, or tear his ligaments as alleged. OPA did not identify any named employee applying reportable force against the Complainant during this incident.

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

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

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2

5.140 – Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing

The Complainant alleged that the named employees engaged in bias-based policing by detaining him based on his skin color.

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.

NE#3 documented the following rationale for detaining the Complainant under the ITA:

Based on what I observed and what AMR stated, I believed [the Complainant] to be a danger to himself. He posed a significant risk of injury to himself if no intervention was made. For these reasons, I involuntarily committed [the Complainant] to the hospital for a mental health evaluation under the Involuntary Treatment Act.

The physical evidence at the scene corroborated NE#3's observations. The Complainant was found lying on the sidewalk, and an AMR employee reported that the Complainant had fallen multiple times, requiring AMR's intervention to prevent a head injury. The Complainant was also escalated, appeared to be in crisis, and declined any assistance. Thus, the named employees had adequate grounds to execute an ITA detainment. There was no evidence to support the claim that they acted based on the Complainant's skin color.

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

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

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #1

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

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)**

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #2

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

Named Employee #3 – Allegation #1

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

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)**

Named Employee #3 – Allegation #2

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

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

Named Employee #4 – Allegation #1

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

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)**

Named Employee #4 – Allegation #2

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

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