


**Issued Date:** February 18, 2026

**From:** Director Bonnie Glenn  
Office of Police Accountability



**Case Number:2025OPA-0300**

---

## **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:** Sustained

- **Imposed Discipline: Resigned prior to discipline**
- 

**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 Named Employee #1 (NE#1)—a former SPD officer—was unprofessional by flying into a rage, screaming and yelling, and swearing at him and his coworker (Community Member #1 or CM#1) for about a minute.

### **Administrative Note:**

On January 14, 2026, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

NE#1 separated from SPD before the conclusion of this investigation. Accordingly, no contractual 180-day timeline applies to this case.

### **Summary of the Investigation:**

The Complainant filed a web-based complaint with OPA. In it, the Complainant detailed how he and CM#1 work for a record label and were in Seattle for a large concert event at Lumen Field. The

Complainant wrote he was driving a rental car, while CM#1 sat in the passenger seat, when he got lost looking for the correct loading dock. The Complainant wrote he and CM#1 were on the phone with the tour manager, Community Member #2 (CM#2), when he signaled to change lanes and turn around. The Complainant wrote NE#1 approached while screaming. The Complainant described trying to explain the situation to NE#1, but NE#1 interrupted, "You're with the tour, I don't care who you are with. You and your fancy car think you can come down here and do whatever you want." The Complainant described NE#1 as screaming uncontrollably, such that CM#2—who was still on the phone—asked if NE#1 was joking. The Complainant wrote NE#1 "berated" him and CM#1 for the next thirty seconds to a minute with "rage filled screaming." The Complainant described the experience as terrifying and traumatic. Afterwards, the Complainant described trying to make a turn to avoid a toll highway, at which NE#1 returned and made an "exaggerated point" to inform them he was now turning on his body-worn video (BWV). The Complainant then described NE#1 going through the process of issuing him a citation by mail.

The Complainant provided detailed contact information for himself, CM#1, and CM#2. He noted there would likely not be BWV from the first encounter. The Complainant also described that he has previous law enforcement experience with a large-city department, and that CM#1's brother is an officer in another large-city department. The Complainant noted the extreme concern he and CM#1 felt by NE#1's "unhinged" behavior.

OPA investigated by reviewing the complaint, computer-aided dispatch (CAD) call report, and BWV. OPA also interviewed the Complainant and CM#2.

OPA learned NE#1 generated a CAD call report for the traffic stop and ran the information for the Complainant's vehicle. However, OPA was unable to locate any record of a citation for the Complainant in either the SPD or Seattle Municipal Court systems.

OPA conducted a review of BWV but was unable to locate BWV from the alleged first encounter between NE#1 and the Complainant. OPA located BWV from the alleged second encounter. BWV showed this traffic stop proceeded as described by the Complainant. CM#1 is visible in the passenger seat appearing to be speaking with CM#2 on the vehicle's speaker phone. NE#1's demeanor on the BWV was measured, but NE#1 made several curt comments. For example, while beginning the traffic stop, NE#1 stated, "You turned right from the straight lane directly after I said you couldn't turn right." The Complainant explained he was in the middle of the crosswalk, to which NE#1 responded, "Yeah, you were." The Complainant continued, "I guess the problem was I was going to have to get on the highway. I'm not from here." NE#1 quickly replied, "You don't have to get on the highway here. All you have to do is follow the rules and you didn't."

OPA interviewed the Complainant, who provided a consistent statement with his detailed written complaint.

OPA interviewed CM#2. CM#2 noted he was on the phone with the Complainant and CM#1 trying to guide them to the event. CM#2 said he heard a person yelling at the Complainant in a way that caused CM#2 to ask if the Complainant was being pranked. The Complainant informed CM#2 that the person yelling was a police officer. CM#2 said he heard the police officer use excessive profane language and say the Complainant was entitled. He described the police officer as saying, "You can't fucking go this way! Pull over! Pull over!" CM#2 drove a golf cart to the corner where he said he interacted with other nice, calm uniformed officers. CM#2 stated he tried to tell NE#1 that the Complainant and CM#1 were with him. CM#2 said NE#1 began cursing at him as well.

OPA attempted to contact CM#1, but she did not return OPA's voicemail.

OPA also attempted to contact NE#1 after he separated from the department to offer him an opportunity for a voluntary interview. NE#1 did not respond.

---

## **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 unprofessional.

SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10 requires that SPD employees “strive to be professional.” The policy further instructs that “employees may not engage in behavior that undermines public trust in the Department, the officer, or other officers” whether on or off duty. SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10. Additionally, the policy instructs Department employees to “avoid unnecessary escalation of events even if those events do not end in reportable uses of force.” *Id.* Furthermore, the policy states: “Any time employees represent the Department or identify themselves as police officers or Department employees, they will not use profanity directed as an insult or any language that is derogatory, contemptuous, or disrespectful toward any person.” *Id.*

OPA finds that, more likely than not, NE#1 behaved in a manner that undermined public trust in himself and the Department. OPA also finds that NE#1 escalated an event and was disrespectful towards the Complainant, CM#1, and CM#2.

OPA acknowledges there is no BWV or other video that captured this exchange. Importantly, NE#1 was not required by policy to record the first exchange, which was presumably predicated on simple traffic direction during a busy event. See SPD Policy 16.090-POL-2(2) (When Sworn Employees Record Activity). But BWV is not required to prove an allegation by a preponderance of the evidence. OPA interviewed two credible witnesses who detailed NE#1's “unhinged,” “rage-filled,” “berating,” that left the Complainant and CM#1 terrified. The Complainant—who self-identified as a having briefly been a police officer—wrote: “It’s incomprehensible . . . that someone in this state of mind is allowed a firearm, let alone in a position of authority as a Seattle Police Officer.” Additionally, BWV from the second encounter corroborated at least the fact that there had been a first, unrecorded encounter (“You turned right from the straight lane directly after I said you couldn’t turn right.”). Finally, OPA has no contradicting account or evidence from NE#1.

Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**