


Issued Date: January 4, 2026

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

Case Number: 2025OPA-0286

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:

The Complainant alleged that Named Employee #1 (NE#1) used unauthorized force by shoving her.

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 8, 2025, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

Summary of the Investigation:

OPA investigated this incident by reviewing the OPA complaint, body-worn video, in-car video, and interview statements from the Complainant. Based on these records, a preponderance of the evidence showed the following:

On July 3, 2025, NE#1 encountered the Complainant beside the East Precinct. The Complainant stood in front of a patrol vehicle at the entrance to two garages. NE#1 motioned the Complainant to move, but she refused and began shouting at NE#1. Using his hands, NE#1 guided the Complainant away from the patrol vehicle and then guided her away from the entrance to the first garage. The officer in the patrol vehicle drove through that garage. NE#1 told the Complainant to leave, but she continued shouting at NE#1, insisting that he not touch her. The Complainant stood at the entrance to the second garage, prompting NE#1 to once again guide her away. A police vehicle then entered that garage.

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 shoving her.

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 Complainant was asked to move because she blocked a patrol vehicle and then the entrance to two garages. Upon her refusal, NE#1 used, at most, *de minimis* force² to move the Complainant. Every instance of NE#1's *de minimis* push was brief and effective, enabling the officers operating the police vehicles to maneuver them on the driveway and into the East Precinct garages. Overall, NE#1's use of *de minimis* force under these circumstances was objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional.

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).

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. 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. SPD Policy 8.050 (effective September 1, 2024).