

Issued Date: October 7, 2025

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



Case Number: 2025OPA-0165

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

1. **Allegation #1:** 5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-14. Retaliation is Prohibited

Finding: Allegation Removed

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) responded to Community Member #1's (CM#1) apartment but declined to detain her under the Involuntary Treatment Act. The Complainant voiced dissatisfaction regarding NE#1's inaction to a sergeant. The following day, NE#1 sought to detain CM#1 under the ITA but ultimately arrested her for assaulting an officer. The Complainant—CM#1's brother—alleged NE#1 arrested CM#1 in retaliation for his complaint against NE#1.

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 4, 2025, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

The Complainant's OPA complaint alleged multiple named employees, including NE#1, committed multiple violations of SPD policy. These allegations underwent a full investigation in 2025OPA-0164. On review of these two files, OPA observed the retaliation allegation against NE#1 was

approved for expedited investigation in this matter and underwent full investigation in 2025OPA-0164. All allegations in 2025OPA-0164 were not sustained. Accordingly, OPA is removing the only allegation in this matter, and alleged violation of SPD Policy 5.001-POL-14 against NE#1.

Summary of the Investigation:

OPA's investigation included reviewing the OPA complaint, computer-aided dispatch call report, body-worn video, incident, supplement, and behavioral crisis reports, and interview statements from the Complainant. Based on these records, a preponderance of the evidence showed the following:

On April 29, 2025, SPD officers made two visits to CM#1's apartment following reports of suicidal threats. During the second visit, NE#1 declined to execute an ITA detainment due to CM#1 threatening to commit suicide if he had entered her apartment. On April 30, 2025, NE#1 returned to CM#1's apartment and decided to detain CM#1 under the ITA. Seattle Fire Department (SFD) personnel were also on scene with a gurney. Although CM#1 was initially inside her apartment, she was persuaded to exit. CM#1 sat on a bench outside her apartment building when NE#1, other officers, and SFD personnel approached her. CM#1 attempted to leave, but when an officer blocked her path, she kicked the officer's groin. The officers then placed CM#1 onto the gurney, where she was restrained. NE#1 ultimately decided to arrest CM#1 for third-degree assault instead of detaining her under the ITA.

Analysis and Conclusions:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-14. Retaliation is Prohibited

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 arrested CM#1 in retaliation for the Complainant's complaint against NE#1.

SPD employees are prohibited from retaliating. SPD Policy 5.001-POL-14. SPD employees are specifically prohibited from retaliating against a person who engages in activities, including but not limited to opposing any practice reasonably believed to be unlawful or in violation of SPD policy, or who otherwise engages in lawful behavior. Id. Retaliatory acts are defined broadly under SPD policy and include discouragement, intimidation, coercion, or adverse action against any person. Id.

This allegation is unfounded. Assaulting a law enforcement officer constitutes an arrestable offense. BWV captured NE#1 expressing his intent to simply detain CM#1 under the ITA. However, BWV then showed CM#1 kicking at an officer's groin while attempting to leave, giving NE#1 probable cause to arrest CM#1 for third-degree assault. Overall, there was insufficient

evidence to suggest that NE#1's decision to arrest CM#1 was based on considerations other than the assault. Accordingly, this allegation is unfounded.

As discussed above in the administrative note, OPA classified this allegation twice: once in this matter and again in 2025OPA-0164. Accordingly, OPA is removing the allegation in this case.

Recommended Finding: **Allegation Removed**