

**Issued Date:** October 22, 2025

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

**Case Number:** 2025OPA-0187

---

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

**Named Employee #1**

1. **Allegation #1:** 6.220 – Voluntary Contacts, Terry Stops, and Detentions, 6.220-POL-2 Conducting a Terry Stop, 1. Terry Stops are Seizures Based Upon Reasonable Suspicion  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper (Expedited)
- 

**Named Employee #2**

1. **Allegation #1:** 6.220 – Voluntary Contacts, Terry Stops, and Detentions, 6.220-POL-2 Conducting a Terry Stop, 1. Terry Stops are Seizures Based Upon Reasonable Suspicion  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper (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 and NE#2) responded to a possible domestic violence (DV) incident involving the Complainant and Community Member #1 (CM#1), his girlfriend. The Complainant alleged that the named employees unlawfully detained him.

**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 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 13, 2025, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

### **Summary of the Investigation:**

OPA investigated the incident by reviewing the OPA complaint, computer-aided dispatch call report, body-worn video, and incident report. The Complainant did not respond to OPA's requests for an interview. Based on these records, a preponderance of the evidence showed the following:

On May 12, 2025, the named employees responded to the Complainant's apartment following a 911 caller reporting a disturbance between the Complainant and CM#1. Upon opening the door, the Complainant stepped into the hallway and spoke with NE#2, while NE#1, with the Complainant's consent, entered the apartment to speak with CM#1. During NE#1's conversation with CM#1, NE#1 returned to the hallway, where the Complainant was shouting at NE#2, prompting NE#2 to extend his arm toward the Complainant. NE#1 handcuffed the Complainant, explained that he was being detained due to his aggression, and Mirandized him. NE#1 then returned to CM#1, who reported that they had argued over her attempt to end their relationship but denied any physical altercation. NE#1 evaluated CM#1 for injuries, exited the apartment, and released the Complainant, who declined to speak with a supervisor.

---

### **Analysis and Conclusions:**

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

#### **6.220 – Voluntary Contacts, Terry Stops, and Detentions, 6.220-POL-2 Conducting a Terry Stop, 1. Terry Stops are Seizures Based Upon Reasonable Suspicion**

The Complainant alleged that the named employees unlawfully detained him.

Terry stops are seizures of an individual and, as such, must be based on reasonable suspicion to be lawful. SPD Policy 6.220-POL-2(1). A Terry stop is a brief, minimally intrusive seizure of a subject based on reasonable articulable suspicion to investigate possible criminal activity. SPD Policy 6.220-POL-1. Reasonable suspicion means specific, objective, articulable facts, which, taken together with rational inferences, would create a well-founded suspicion that there is a substantial possibility that a subject has engaged, is engaging, or is about to engage in criminal conduct. *Id.* The reasonableness of a Terry stop is based on the totality of the circumstances, the officer's training and experience, and what the officer knew before the stop. *Id.* While information learned during the stop can lead to additional reasonable suspicion or probable cause that a crime has occurred, it cannot justify the original stop. *Id.*

The named employees had reasonable suspicion to detain the Complainant. The 911 caller expressed fear of the Complainant, mentioned that he had a gun, and reported hearing banging

noises. The Complainant exhibited aggression toward NE#2, who was alone in the hallway with the Complainant and felt compelled to create distance by extending his arm. The incident location also had prior DV history. Given these circumstances, the named employees had a well-founded suspicion that the Complainant had committed DV against CM#1 or was about to assault NE#2, justifying his detainment in handcuffs. The detainment was brief, and the reasonable suspicion was dispelled once CM#1 denied any physical altercation occurring. To the extent the Complainant alleged the named employees exceeded the permissible scope of the stop because NE#1 had his firearm unholstered, this was also lawful and proper. The officers were responding to a DV call where neighbors reported fighting and screaming. Call notes indicated one party may have access to a firearm. On arrival, the officers heard loud noises inside the apartment. Merely unholstering a firearm under these circumstances did not exceed the scope of the stop.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper (Expedited).

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper (Expedited)**

#### **Named Employee #2 – Allegation #1**

#### **6.220 – Voluntary Contacts, Terry Stops, and Detentions, 6.220-POL-2 Conducting a Terry Stop, 1. Terry Stops are Seizures Based Upon Reasonable Suspicion**

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper (Expedited).

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper (Expedited)**