


**Issued Date:** January 5, 2026

**From:** Deputy Director Nelson R. Leese (on behalf of Director Bonnie J. Glenn) <sup>1</sup>  
Office of Police Accountability 

**Case Number:** 2025OPA-0280

---

**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)
- 

**Named Employee #3**

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

**Named Employee #4**

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

**Named Employee #5**

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

**Named Employee #6**

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

The named employees (NE#1 through NE#6) responded to Community Member #1 (CM#1) experiencing a mental health crisis while armed with a knife and shears. The Complainant alleged that the named employees used unauthorized force by tackling CM#1 to the ground.

**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 August 14, 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, and interview statements from the Complainant. Based on these records, a preponderance of the evidence showed the following:

On June 12, 2025, the named employees responded to a sidewalk, where CM#1 was experiencing a mental health crisis. After the officers instructed CM#1 to drop the shears and knife, CM#1 complied but shouted incoherently. The officers then approached CM#1. NE#1 and NE#3 grabbed CM#1's arms and lowered her to the ground in a seated position. NE#2—a student officer under NE#5's supervision—briefly grabbed CM#1's legs as NE#3 handcuffed CM#1. NE#4 retrieved the shears and knife. CM#1 expressed pain from an unknown "burning" sensation and continually cried. The Seattle Fire Department arrived and medically evaluated CM#1 at the scene.

**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 by tackling CM#1 to the ground.

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.*

The named employees did not tackle CM#1 to the ground as alleged. Rather, BWV showed NE#1 and NE#3 lowering CM#1 to the ground in a seated position. NE#2, under NE#5's supervision, restrained CM#1's legs. To the extent that NE#1, NE#2, and NE#3 used *de minimis* force<sup>2</sup> to arrest CM#1, such force was objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional under the circumstances. The force was objectively reasonable and necessary because CM#1 posed a threat to the public as she was experiencing a mental health crisis while armed with a knife and shears. The force used was proportional and *de minimis*, involving control holds, maneuvering CM#1 onto the ground in a manner that would not cause any pain, and positioning her arms behind her back to facilitate handcuffing. NE#1, NE#2, and NE#3 modulated their force once they secured CM#1 in handcuffs. The Seattle Fire Department was also summoned to the scene to evaluate any injuries CM#1 might have sustained. Overall, NE#1, NE#2, NE#3, and NE#5 used lawful and proper force during CM#1's arrest.

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)**

---

**Named Employee #3 – 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)**

---

**Named Employee #4 – Allegation #1**

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

NE#4 and NE#6 did not physically contact CM#1 during her arrest. As such, NE#4 and NE#6 did not use force against CM#1 at any point.

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

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

---

**Named Employee #5 – 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)**

---

**Named Employee #6 – Allegation #1**

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

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #4 – Allegation #1, 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.** *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. SPD Policy 8.050 (effective September 1, 2024). 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. *Id.*