

---

**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-0161

---

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

**Named Employee #1**

1. **Allegation #1:** 5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication

**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 Complainant—then an SPD sergeant—alleged Named Employee #1 (NE#1) dishonestly wrote in a court declaration that Witness Employee #1 (WE#1)—SPD's equal employment opportunity (EEO) manager—expressed concerns about the Complainant potentially retaliating against NE#1's family.

**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 6, 2025, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

## **Summary of the Investigation:**

OPA's investigation included reviewing the OPA complaint, NE#1's declaration, and EEO transcripts.

On April 30, 2025, the Complainant alleged that the following statement from NE#1's court declaration was dishonest:

*The EEO Investigator showed concern regarding the possibility that [the Complainant] might retaliate against [NE#1's] family.*

The Complainant told OPA that she asked WE#1 whether WE#1 conveyed to NE#1 concerns about the potential for the Complainant to retaliate against NE#1's family. WE#1 replied, "The only mention I would have given [NE#1] about retaliation would have been typical admonishments, either in written documentations or in emails or via interviews." Based on WE#1's response, the Complainant alleged that NE#1's statement in his declaration was dishonest.

During NE#1's EEO interview, WE#1 asked NE#1 the following:

*And the last thing I don't think we've really touched on, and I do want you to address, as comfortable as you are, how were you hurt coming after your personal life, reaching out to your wife, doing things like that?*

---

## **Analysis and Conclusions:**

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

#### **5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication**

The Complainant alleged that a statement in NE#1's declaration was dishonest.

Department employees must be truthful and complete in all communications. SPD Policy 5.001-POL-11.

The transcript of NE#1's EEO interview showed WE#1 asking how NE#1's personal life, including "reaching out to [his] wife," was "hurt" by the Complainant's actions. Although WE#1's question did not explicitly indicate her "concern" for NE#1, such sentiment could be reasonably inferred. After all, WE#1 asked NE#1 how the Complainant's actions personally affected NE#1 and his wife. Thus, NE#1's statement did not indicate dishonesty.

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

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