

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-0250

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #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:

Named Employee #1 (NE#1) arrested the Complainant for robbery. The Complainant, a Black woman, alleged that NE#1 would not have arrested her had she been a white woman.

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 July 23, 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, incident and supplement reports, and interview statements from the Complainant. Based on these records, a preponderance of the evidence showed the following:

On May 13, 2025, NE#1 responded to a motel following a 911 call regarding a robbery. SPD officers detained Community Member #1 (CM#1) and the Complainant and secured a gun. NE#1 interviewed CM#1, while other SPD officers interviewed the Complainant and an occupant from the adjacent room. CM#1 reported that he had solicited the Complainant for sex and brought her to his motel room, where she eventually drew a gun from her purse and demanded money. CM#1 said he reacted quickly by lunging at the Complainant, leading to a physical struggle. CM#1 said he disarmed the Complainant, who then blocked the door and refused to leave, prompting him to call 911 and photograph her using his phone. CM#1 showed NE#1 a picture depicting the Complainant blocking the doorway. The officer who interviewed the Complainant told NE#1 that she initially denied having a gun but later admitted to acquiring it from a friend. She also reported that CM#1 was dissatisfied with their sexual arrangement, so he forcibly retrieved the gun from her purse. The officer who interviewed the occupant from the adjacent unit told NE#1 that the occupant heard a male say and repeat “I need help” and “I got a gun.” NE#1 arrested the Complainant for robbery and then screened the incident with a sergeant.

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, a Black woman, alleged that NE#1 would not have arrested her had she been a white woman.

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 race. 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.

This allegation is unfounded. NE#1 conducted a thorough and unbiased investigation by interviewing CM#1, conferring with backing officers who interviewed the Complainant and the witness, evaluating CM#1’s injuries, and reviewing the picture on CM#1’s phone. CM#1’s account was credible, consistent, and corroborated by the non-party witness, who reported hearing a male shout, “I need help!” CM#1 told dispatch that the Complainant was blocking the doorway, which he corroborated by showing NE#1 that depiction on his phone. Contrarily, the Complainant’s account lacked credibility. She initially denied having a gun but later admitted to having one. She also sustained injuries that were inconsistent with her claim that CM#1 had bitten her. Ultimately, NE#1’s decision to arrest the Complainant for robbery was based on the collective evidence supporting CM#1’s account. OPA found no evidence of bias.

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

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