

Issued Date: November 24, 2025

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

Case Number: 2025OPA-0236

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

1. **Allegation #1:** 8.200 – Using Force, 8.200-POL-1. Using Force: When Authorized
Finding: Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper (Expedited)
-

Named Employee #2

1. **Allegation #1:** 8.200 – Using Force, 8.200-POL-1. Using Force: When Authorized
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 domestic violence (DV) call involving the Complainant and his partner, Community Member #1 (CM#1). The Complainant alleged that the named employees used unauthorized force when they forcibly removed CM#1 from the apartment.

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 July 21, 2025, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

Summary of the Investigation:

OPA investigated this incident by reviewing the OPA complaint, computer-aided dispatch (CAD) call report, body-worn video (BWV), and incident, supplement, and use-of-force reports. 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 June 12, 2025, the named employees and backing officers responded to the Complainant's and CM#1's apartment following a 911 call concerning DV disturbance involving a knife. As they approached the apartment, CM#1 could be heard shouting. The officers announced their presence and asked CM#1 to open the door, or they would force entry. CM#1 initially refused but eventually opened the door slightly, showing only her face. CM#1 disobeyed commands to exit the apartment, prompting the officers to grab CM#1's arms. In response, CM#1 shouted, "You let go of me" and attempted to pull away. However, the officers pulled CM#1 out of the apartment, prompting CM#1 to kick NE#1 in the groin.



The image above was taken from a backing officer's BWV. It shows CM#1 (center) kicking NE#1 (right) in the groin.

CM#1 fell, pulling NE#1 with her and causing him to land on top of her. NE#1 restrained CM#1 against the ground by pressing against her left shoulder. Both NE#1 and NE#2 positioned CM#1's arms behind her back, after which NE#1 handcuffed her. CM#1 expressed pain throughout the arrest. NE#1 informed CM#1 that she was under arrest for assaulting an officer.

Analysis and Conclusions:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

8.200 – Using Force, 8.200-POL-1. Using Force: When Authorized

The Complainant alleged that the named employees used unauthorized force when they forcibly removed CM#1 from the apartment.

Sworn employees will only use objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional force to the threat or urgency of the situation to achieve a law enforcement objective while protecting the life and safety of all people. SPD Policy 8.200-POL-1. Reasonableness must consider that sworn employees are often forced to make split-second decisions about the amount of force necessary in a particular situation in tense, uncertain, dynamic, and rapidly evolving circumstances. *Id.* The question is whether the sworn employee's actions were objectively reasonable considering the facts and circumstances confronting them, without regard to their underlying intent or motivation. *Id.* Several factors should be weighed when evaluating reasonableness. *See id.* Force is necessary under the totality of the circumstances when there is no reasonably effective alternative to using physical or deadly force, and the type and amount of physical or deadly force used is a reasonable and proportional response to effect the legal purpose intended or to protect against the threat posed to the sworn employee or others. SPD Policy 8.050 (effective September 1, 2024). Proportional force must reflect the totality of circumstances of the situation, including the nature and immediacy of any threats posed to sworn employees and others. *Id.* Sworn employees must rely on training, experience, and their assessment of the situation to decide an appropriate level of force. *Id.*

Due to the DV nature of the call, the reported involvement of a knife, and the active disturbance upon the arrival of police, the named employees had lawful exigency to enter the apartment. CM#1 initially disobeyed orders to open the door and subsequently disobeyed orders to exit the apartment. When NE#1 and the backing officers used *de minimis* force² to pull CM#1 out of the apartment, she chose to kick NE#1 in the groin. This act caused NE#1 to unintentionally fall on top of CM#1, likely leading to injuries to her right shoulder and face. Nevertheless, OPA finds that NE#1's use of type I force³, even if it had been intentional, was objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional due to CM#1's noncompliance and assaultive conduct. Once NE#1 was on top of CM#1, the named employees used *de minimis* force to restrain CM#1 against the ground, position her arms behind her back, and handcuff her. The named employees then modulated their force after CM#1 was handcuffed. Overall, the named employees used lawful and proper force under the circumstances.

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

8.200 – Using Force, 8.200-POL-1. Using Force: When Authorized

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)**

Footnote 1. The OPA Director may designate a civilian OPA Deputy Director to “perform such duties and have such powers as the OPA Director may prescribe and delegate.” Seattle Ordinance 125315, Council Bill 118969, subchapter I, section 3.29.100(B).

Footnote 2. *De minimis* force is an action meant to separate, guide, and/or control without using control techniques that are intended to, or are reasonably likely to, cause pain or injury. Examples include, but are not limited to, using hands or equipment to stop, push back, separate, or escort, and using compliance holds without using sufficient force to cause pain. SPD Policy 8.050 (effective September 1, 2024).

Footnote 3. Type I is force that causes pain or injury not requiring anything greater than basic first aid. SPD Policy 8.050 (effective September 1, 2024). Type I force includes, among other things, a controlled takedown resulting in a complaint of pain or causing injury, or abrasions not requiring stitches. SPD Policy 8.400-POL-1.