


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-0297

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)

Named Employee #2

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:

The Complainant contacted the named employees (NE#1 and NE#2) at the East Precinct to report that her children were missing. The Complainant alleged that the named employees showed favoritism toward Community Member #1 (CM#1), the children's father, while being biased against her based on her gender, disability status, and housing status.

Administrative Note:

The Complainant also alleged that the named employees were unprofessional by being dismissive and patronizing. During its intake investigation, OPA found no comment that could be construed as unprofessional. Accordingly, OPA processed this allegation as a Contact Log.²

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

On June 18, 2025, the Complainant visited the East Precinct and reported to NE#1 that her children were missing. Separately, NE#2 called CM#1. CM#1 reported that the children were with him in Arizona, as a court had awarded him full custody. He corroborated his account with court documents. He believed the Complainant was harassing him and making false statements to the police. NE#2 later contacted the Complainant and informed her that when her children were taken from their school, the school had been given court documents authorizing their removal.

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 the named employees showed favoritism toward CM#1 while being 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. Although the Complainant reported that her children had been missing, she was aware that a court awarded CM#1 full custody of their children. NE#2 confirmed this information by contacting CM#1 and reviewing court documents. The children were lawfully residing with CM#1, not missing. The named employees' inaction stemmed from a court order, not bias against the Complainant.

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

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

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #1

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

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1, OPA recommends that this allegation be 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).