


Issued Date: December 15, 2025

From: Acting Deputy Director Nelson R. Leese (on behalf of Director Bonnie J. Glenn)
Office of Police Accountability 

Case Number: 2025OPA-0257

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:

Named Employee #1 (NE#1) responded to a call involving the Complainant possibly shooting arrows at animals in a park. NE#1 warned the Complainant they could not shoot arrows in the park. The Complainant alleged that NE#1 exhibited bias by enforcing against his use of a bow and arrow, while failing to enforce against off-leashed dogs.

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 24, 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 call report, and body-worn video. The Complainant responded to OPA by email but did not respond to OPA's requests for an interview. Based on these records, a preponderance of the evidence showed the following:

On June 24, 2025, NE#1 responded to a park following a call regarding the Complainant reportedly shooting arrows into the ground, possibly targeting animals. The Complainant was under a picnic shelter, where a bow was on a table, but no arrows were present. NE#1 asked about the bow and arrow, but the Complainant did not respond. NE#1 warned the Complainant to cease shooting arrows at the park. The Complainant packed his belongings but remained unresponsive. NE#1 reiterated his warning before disengaging. The Complainant later called 911 to complain about off-leashed dogs. This call was referred to animal control for resolution.

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 exhibited bias by enforcing against his use of a bow and arrow, while failing to enforce against off-leashed dogs.

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. 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.

OPA found no evidence of bias, even though the Complainant did not allege bias against a protected class or a discernible personal characteristic. NE#1 merely warned the Complainant against shooting arrows at a park, as doing so posed a safety risk to the public. Although the Complainant was unresponsive, NE#1 remained professional and did not say anything that suggested bias. The Complainant's concerns about off-leashed dogs were appropriately referred to animal control.

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

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