


**Issued Date:** December 20, 2025

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

**Case Number:** 2025OPA-0295

---

### **Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings**

#### **Named Employee #1**

- 1. Allegation #1:** 5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
  - 2. Allegation #2:** 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:**

The Complainant alleged that Named Employee #1 (NE#1) was rude and dismissive when she reported that her children had been abducted. She also alleged that NE#1 showed favoritism toward Community Member #1 (CM#1), their children's father, and bias against her based on her gender, disability status, and housing status.

#### **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 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, 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 June 10, 2025, NE#1 met with the Complainant on a sidewalk. The Complainant reported that she and her children were at a school when an unknown male abducted her children. After NE#1 asked clarifying questions, the Complainant eventually revealed that the male was dressed in plain clothes, identified himself as a King County deputy sheriff, and advised her to attend a court hearing regarding her children. She said she attended the court hearing, during which a judge awarded custody of her children to CM#1. Throughout the Complainant's explanation, NE#1 paraphrased her account and asked clarifying questions. NE#1 said she would prepare an incident report but acknowledged some inconsistencies in the Complainant's account.

---

## **Analysis and Conclusions:**

### **Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1**

#### **5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional**

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 was rude and dismissive when she reported that her children had been abducted.

SPD employees must “strive to be professional.” SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10. Further, “employees may not engage in behavior that undermines public trust in the Department, the officer, or other officers,” whether on or off duty. *Id.* Employees will avoid unnecessary escalation of events, even if those events do not end in reportable uses of force. *Id.* Employees representing the Department or identifying themselves as police officers or Department employees will not use profanity directed as an insult or any derogatory, contemptuous, or disrespectful language at anyone. *Id.*

NE#1 was neither rude nor dismissive. The Complainant initially reported to NE#1 that her children had been abducted. When NE#1 continually probed the Complainant's account, she eventually learned that the King County Sheriff's Office brought the children to a court, where a judge awarded custody to CM#1. Although the Complainant was aware of the court's ruling, she did not initially disclose this information to NE#1. NE#1's clarifying questions were aimed at gaining a full understanding of the situation. Overall, NE#1 remained professional throughout her encounter with the Complainant.

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

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

**Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2**

**5.140 – Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing**

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 showed favoritism toward CM#1 and bias against her based on her gender, disability status, and housing status.

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 gender, disability status, or housing status. *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. NE#1 met with the Complainant, listened to her account, asked clarifying questions, handed her a domestic violence pamphlet, asked if she had any questions, and prepared an incident report following their encounter. NE#1 did not show favoritism toward CM#1 but instead recognized the limitations of her authority since a court had awarded custody of the children to CM#1. NE#1 expressed empathy toward the Complainant’s situation, not bias.

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).