

Issued Date: November 10, 2025

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

Case Number: 2025OPA-0180

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

- 1. Allegation #1:** 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 Complainant alleged that Named Employee #1 (NE#1), a parking enforcement officer, engaged in gender-based mistreatment by contacting her about the requirement to pay for parking, while failing to contact the male driver of the vehicle ahead of her.

Administrative Note:

The Complainant also alleged that NE#1 acted unprofessionally by issuing two infractions—one for parking too close to a fire hydrant, and the other for displaying improper tabs—despite her presence near her vehicle. OPA reviewed infraction records regarding this incident and found photographic evidence supporting both infractions. Accordingly, OPA processed this allegation as a Contact Log.¹

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

¹ A complaint may be classified as a Contact Log if, among other things, it “does not involve a potential policy violation by an SPD employee.” See OPA Internal Operations and Training Manual section 5.4(B)(i).

solely on its intake investigation without interviewing the named employee. As such, OPA did not interview the named employee in this case.

On June 17, 2025, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

Summary of the Investigation:

OPA investigated this incident by reviewing the OPA complaint, infraction records, photographs, and interview statements from the Complainant. On June 4, 2025, OPA interviewed the Complainant. Among other things, she said on May 14, 2025, she pulled over and parked in a payment-required zone. She said she was in the process of paying on her phone, with her engine still running, when NE#1 knocked on her window and told her that payment was required. She said she told NE#1 that she had just parked and was in the process of submitting payment, yet NE#1 retorted that the system showed no payment. She said NE#1 then left the area. She said NE#1 did not contact the male driver who had parked ahead of her around the same time.

Analysis and Conclusions:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

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

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 engaged in gender-based mistreatment.

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 gender. *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.

The Complainant's allegation that NE#1 engaged in bias-based policing by solely contacting her, but not the male driver ahead of her, was speculative and lacked evidentiary support. The Complainant acknowledged that her allegation was based on her personal feelings. Moreover, NE#1 took no enforcement action against the Complainant, even if NE#1 only contacted her during this incident. OPA found no evidence of gender bias.

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

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