

Issued Date: November 25, 2025

From: Director Bonnie Glenn
Office of Police Accountability



Case Number: 2025OPA-0217

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...
Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded
-

Named Employee #2

1. **Allegation #1:** 5.140 - Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2 Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based...
Finding: Not Sustained - Inconclusive
-

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 an SPD officer who was directing traffic did not allow him to make a turn, used an inappropriate tone and demeanor, bit and licked his lips, and crossed his arms. The Complainant alleged this was due to bias against him as an African American or for being a motorcyclist.

Administrative Note:

On October 14, 2025, the Office of Inspector General certified this investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

Summary of the Investigation:

OPA investigated this complaint by reviewing the initial complaint documents and a traffic plan for the incident date. OPA also interviewed the Complainant and Named Employee #1 (NE#1), who was assigned to the intersection in question.

The Complainant stated that on June 1, 2025, around 4:00PM he was travelling Southbound on Occidental Avenue South from the T-Mobile Garage. He stated he was wearing a Mariners Military Support shirt and motorcycle vest with United States Army paraphernalia on it. The Complainant stated he drove Southbound in the Northbound lane of Occidental Avenue due to a traffic backup. He stated he stopped at a stop sign at the intersection of Occidental and Holgate, waiting to take a left onto Holgate. The Complainant said a male officer at the intersection was “staring” at him and mumbling something. The Complainant stated that, after another vehicle to his right continued straight, he attempted to make a left turn. The Complainant said the officer approached and told him he received “no special privileges” as a motorcycle and needed to turn the other way. The Complainant responded that he had never been told he could not turn that way. The Complainant stated the officer, who was backed up by a female officer, reiterated he did not get special privileges. The Complainant stated he continued Southbound along Occidental Avenue. He felt that this was about more than just him being on a motorcycle. He stated that his coworkers—who were travelling in a car—were also ordered not to turn left onto Holgate. He said he felt the officer’s demeanor demonstrated bias, including biting his lip, licking his lips, crossing his arms, and paying “more attention” to the Complainant. Also, he stated he would have been arrested if he had the same attitude as the officer had. The Complainant described the officer as a tall, White male, between 6’1” and 6’3”. He said the officer had black hair, a “five o’clock shadow,” a “decent size” but “not fat,” in his early to mid-thirties in age, not wearing headgear, and wearing a traffic vest. The Complainant was not 100% sure it was a police officer and expressed it could have been a Parking Enforcement Officer.

OPA reviewed a traffic plan for this time, date, and event. OPA identified that NE#1 was assigned to the Occidental/Holgate intersection, along with a female Parking Enforcement Officer.

OPA interviewed NE#1, who does not closely match the physical description provided by the Complainant. Notably, his hair color is dirty blond/brown, he has a notable mustache, and almost always wears an SPD “8-point” or baseball hat when outside. NE#1 stated he had no recollection of interacting with the Complainant. He denied engaging in bias-based policing but noted that, hypothetically, if a motorist disobeyed his traffic commands, he would stop and redirect them. NE#1’s union representative also noted that it would be accurate to inform a motorcyclist that they do not have any special privileges.

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's demeanor exhibited bias against African Americans or motorcyclists.

SPD policy prohibits biased policing, which it defines as “the different treatment of any person by officers motivated by any characteristic of protected classes under state, federal, and local laws as well other discernible personal characteristics of an individual.” SPD Policy 5.140-POL. This includes different treatment based on a subject's race or “use of a motorcycle or motorcycle-related paraphernalia.” See *id.* See also RCW 43.101.419 (concerning protections for motorcyclists and the wearing of motorcycle-related paraphernalia). Officers are forbidden from both, (i) making decisions or taking actions influenced by bias, and (ii) expressing any prejudice or derogatory comments concerning personal characteristics. See SPD Policy 5.140-POL-2.

To the extent the Complainant's allegations concerned NE#1, OPA finds that—more likely than not—they are unfounded. First, it is unclear whether the Complainant's allegations even concern NE#1. NE#1 did not remember the alleged interaction and the Complainant's physical description of the officer did not closely match that of NE#1. The Complainant acknowledged he was not 100% sure the officer was even an SPD officer. Second, the Complainant's factual predicate for believing the officer engaged in bias-based policing was both subjective and speculative. OPA finds it is more likely a police officer or parking enforcement officer simply redirected the Complainant—as well as his car driving coworkers—that they could not make a left turn onto Holgate at that time. However, inconvenient this was for the Complainant, it does not appear to indicate bias-based behavior. Finally, the Complainant's allegations on their face did not suggest the officer treated the Complainant differently from anyone else, instead he prevented everyone from turning left at the intersection.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #1

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

The Complainant alleged that NE#2—an unknown employee—exhibited bias against African Americans or motorcyclists.

To the extent the Complainant's allegations referred to some other SPD police officer or PEO—and not NE#1—OPA is unable to determine who this would be. As discussed at Named Employee #1, Allegation #1, the physical description of the officer provided by the Complainant did not match either NE#1 or the female PEO assigned to work that intersection. The Complainant was also not 100% sure the officer was, in fact, an SPD police officer. Recognizing

that it's possible the Complainant had an interaction with some other, unidentified SPD employee, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Inconclusive.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Inconclusive**