


Issued Date: December 18, 2025

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

Case Number: 2025OPA-0265

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)

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 robbery call involving multiple suspects—one of whom was Community Member #1 (CM#1). The Complainant alleged that NE#1 used unauthorized force by Tasing CM#1.

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 August 9, 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, body-worn video, 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 29, 2025, SPD officers, including NE#1, responded to call regarding a robbery that involved multiple suspects, including CM#1, who reportedly robbed and assaulted a man on the ground. When the police arrived, the suspects fled. An officer radioed CM#1's description and broadcast that CM#1 might be armed and located in Cal Anderson Park, prompting NE#1 and other backing officers to head there. Numerous community members were present in the park. NE#1 located CM#1, who promptly fled. NE#1 chased after CM#1 and shouted, "Stop! Police!" CM#1 ran toward a Pride festival. NE#1 twice warned, "You're gonna get Tased!" NE#1 then drew his Taser and charged it, emitting a beeping sound. CM#1 continued fleeing and reached a soccer field. NE#1 deployed the Taser, causing CM#1 to fall. NE#1 and the backing officers then handcuffed CM#1.

Analysis and Conclusions:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

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

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 used unauthorized force by Tasing CM#1.

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.*

NE#1 used objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional force by Tasing CM#1. CM#1 was considered armed and dangerous, as he had been identified as a robbery and assault suspect. Specifically, the suspect matching CM#1's description was identified as possibly the suspect who flashed a gun at the victim. While rapidly approaching a Pride festival, CM#1 disobeyed several police commands and received three Taser warnings—two verbal and one charging sound—before being Tased. Force was objectively reasonable and necessary to prevent CM#1 from entering the

pride festival and endangering the community members there. Following the Tasing, CM#1 fell on the soft astroturf of the soccer field. NE#1 then modulated his force and handcuffed CM#1. Overall, NE#1 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)**

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).