


**Issued Date:** December 20, 2025

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

**Case Number:** 2025OPA-0296

---

### **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) investigated a 911 call from the Complainant regarding her children, whom she claimed had been missing for several days. The Complainant alleged that NE#1 was biased against her based on her gender, disability status, and housing status.

#### **Administrative Note:**

The Complainant also alleged that NE#1 should not have prepared an incident report indicating that she committed false reporting when he did not speak with her. NE#1 reviewed a related incident report and contacted Community Member #1 (CM#1), the children's father, for verification. Under Seattle Municipal Code 12A.16.040, false reporting includes statements made to a 911 emergency operator. Accordingly, OPA processed this allegation as a Contact Log.<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 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, incident report, court records, and interview statements from the Complainant. Based on these records, a preponderance of the evidence showed the following:

On June 17, 2025, the Complainant called 911 to report that her children had been missing for several days. When NE#1 was assigned this call, he reviewed a prior incident report involving the Complainant and CM#1. NE#1 then called CM#1, who reported that he lived in Arizona with the children, having been awarded full custody. CM#1 also reported that the Complainant had been harassing him, making false statements to the police, and trying to have him arrested by claiming a protection order violation. Due to the Complainant's likely mental health crisis, providing false statements, and claims of anxiety around the police, NE#1 decided against contacting her.

---

**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 was biased 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 reviewed a prior incident report, contacted CM#1, and reasonably decided not to contact the Complainant. From the prior report, NE#1 learned that the Complainant knew a court had awarded full custody to CM#1, yet she continued to contact SPD about her missing children. NE#1's investigation into the circumstances of their situation informed his decision-making process, not bias against the Complainant.

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 complaint may be classified as a Contact Log if, among other things, it “does not involve a potential policy violation by an SPD employee.” See OPA Internal Operations and Training Manual section 5.4(B)(i).