

**Issued Date:** December 15, 2025

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

**Case Number:** 2025OPA-0268

---

**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 regarding a violation of a domestic violence (DV) protection order involving the Complainant as the petitioner and Community Member #1 (CM#1) as the respondent. An Arizona court issued a parenting plan for the parties, while a Washington court issued the DV protection order. The Complainant alleged that NE#1 exhibited bias against her based on her housing status and gender.

**Administrative Note:**

During its intake investigation, OPA identified NE#1 providing some conflicting information to the Complainant and CM#1, which could be construed as undermining to public trust. OPA sent NE#1's potential violation of SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10 (Employees Will Strive to be Professional) to his chain of command for Supervisor Action.<sup>2</sup>

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 30, 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, incident report, court records, and interview statements from the Complainant. Based on these records, a preponderance of the evidence showed the following:

On May 21, 2023, NE#1 received a radio call regarding a violation of a DV protection order involving the Complainant and CM#1. Specifically, the Complainant reported that CM#1, the father of their children, contacted her. After verifying the DV protection order, NE#1 called the Complainant. She explained that an Arizona court having jurisdiction over their parenting plan granted CM#1 visitation rights for their children from May 21 to 27, 2023. She said the Arizona judge indicated that the parenting plan superseded the Washington DV protection order, allowing CM#1 to contact her during the exchange of their children at a children's hospital. NE#1 then called CM#1, who corroborated the Complainant's account regarding the Arizona judge's order. He admitted to contacting the Complainant but believed their parenting plan permitted such contact. NE#1 countered CM#1's interpretation, explaining that a civil order from another state did not supersede a DV protection order issued in Washington State. NE#1 advised CM#1 to either exchange their children through a third party or petition a King County court to modify the DV protection order to reflect the parenting plan. NE#1 admonished CM#1 to avoid contacting the Complainant.

Later, NE#1 facilitated the exchange of the parties' children at a children's hospital. NE#1 then told CM#1 that he would refer the matter to the prosecutor's office for review since CM#1 technically violated the DV protection order. However, NE#1 said he would not recommend charges since CM#1 acted in good faith by complying with the Arizona judge's order.

### **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 against her based on her housing status and gender.

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 housing status or gender. 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.

OPA found no evidence of bias. Rather, NE#1 contacted both parties and helped them navigate two seemingly conflicting court orders. NE#1 properly advised CM#1 to avoid contacting the Complainant, as well as to exchange their children through a third party or petition a King County court for a review of the Arizona parenting plan. NE#1's guidance was intended to ensure the parties' compliance with the law, rather than show bias toward either party. Although NE#1 chose not to arrest CM#1 for technically violating the DV protection order, NE#1 explained that he would refer the matter for prosecutorial review. Overall, NE#1's statements and actions did not indicate bias against the Complainant's housing status or gender.

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).

**Footnote 2.** A Supervisor Action generally involves a minor policy violation or performance issue the employee's supervisor addresses through training, communication, or coaching. See OPA Internal Operations and Training Manual section 5.4(B)(ii).