


Issued Date: December 29, 2025

From: Director Bonnie Glenn
Office of Police Accountability



Case Number: 2025OPA-0305

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

- 2. Allegation #2: 5.001 - Standards and Duties 5.001-POL 11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication**

Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)

- **Imposed Discipline: Oral Reprimand**
-

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, on June 13, 2025, Named Employee #1 (NE#1), a parking enforcement officer (PEO), wrote him a citation. The two had a dispute over the citation and, while the Complainant attempted to leave, NE#1 attempted to put a second citation on the Complainant's vehicle. The Complainant alleged NE#1 falsely alleged the Complainant tried to hit him with his vehicle, resulting in the Complainant's arrest.

Administrative Note:

OPA interviewed the Complainant during the intake investigation for 2025OPA-0272. During his interview, the Complainant alleged NE#1's actions might have been related to a previous interaction the two had on an earlier date. OPA opened this investigation concerning the earlier interaction. Due to the related nature of the facts in both cases, the evidence in both cases

overlaps significantly. Accordingly, this DCM summarizes the factual investigation for both incidents.

This case was approved for Expedited Investigation for the allegation that NE#1 filed false assault allegation against the Complainant. That means OPA, with the Office of Inspector General's (OIG) agreement, believed it could issue recommended findings for that allegation based solely on its intake investigation.

On November 26, 2025, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

Summary of the Investigation:

OPA investigated the Complainant's allegations by reviewing the complaint, related incident report and supplements, body-worn video (BWV), private security video, email correspondence, and court packages. OPA also interviewed the Complainant and NE#1. OPA finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the following occurred.

June 13, 2025, Incident

On June 13, 2025, NE#1 was working as a PEO when he saw a vehicle parked along the street with required payment. NE#1 also observed the vehicle displayed a temporary license plate that was about nine-months' expired. These infractions were corroborated by photographic evidence. As NE#1 was ticketing the vehicle, the Complainant exited a nearby building. The two had a verbal disagreement about whether NE#1 could ticket the vehicle. The Complainant admitted the vehicle was his but believed he could not be ticketed because the vehicle was not registered to him. NE#1 issued the ticket; the Complainant ripped the ticket up and threw the ticket at NE#1.

The Complainant got into the vehicle's driver seat, and NE#1 moved to the passenger/street-side to write the Complainant a second ticket to place on the vehicle. The Complainant drove away.

NE#1 used his radio to request police assistance for an assault. NE#1 reported the Complainant attempted to hit him with his vehicle as he drove away.

Police Officer #1 (PO#1) responded to investigate. BWV and the incident report showed PO#1 spoke with NE#1. NE#1 reported he was standing about a foot away from the vehicle on the passenger side writing the second ticket when the Complainant turned the wheel toward him and drove off. NE#1 reported the vehicle came within about an inch of his shoe and nearly hit NE#1. NE#1 also reported that the Complainant made a statement to him along the lines of, "You better call for your backup." NE#1 said he interpreted this as a threat. PO#1 interviewed a non-party witness who observed the interaction. The witness said the Complainant and NE#1 were in a heated verbal exchange, the Complainant ripped the ticket and threw it at NE#1, then she saw the Complainant put his vehicle in reverse before NE#1 moved to the passenger side of the vehicle

but turned towards NE#1 as the Complainant attempted to pull out. The witness stated, "I thought he was going to hit him," and "I'm not sure if he was trying to hit him, but it looked like it."

PO#1 also reviewed security video that depicted much of the interaction between NE#1 and the Complainant. The video showed NE#1 issue the first ticket, then later the Complainant driving his vehicle away rapidly at an angle that appeared to be where NE#1 was most likely standing. PO#1 documented her reasons for developing probable cause to arrest the Complainant for assault, compared security footage of his image to his driver's license photograph, and arrested the Complainant later that day.

June 27, 2025, Incident

Two weeks later, NE#1 cited the Complainant again, this time for illegally double parking, obstructing a bicycle lane. This infraction was corroborated by photographs. NE#1 and the Complainant dispute the motivations for this citation and the details of their verbal exchange.

OPA Interview – Complainant

The Complainant filed his original complaint about the June 27 incident. He said he parked his car to let his nephew out when NE#1 approached and asked, "tell me why I shouldn't write you a ticket?" The Complainant said NE#1 wrote him a ticket, and the Complainant told NE#1 he would challenge the ticket in court. The Complainant alleged NE#1 responded, "You can suck my dick in court."

When OPA asked if anything led to this interaction, the Complainant described the June 13 incident. The Complainant said NE#1 wrote him multiple tickets that day and made false statements leading to the Complainant being wrongfully arrested. The Complainant admitted the two had a verbal argument and that the Complainant tore up the first ticket, but he denied trying to hit NE#1 with his vehicle.

OPA Interview – Witness Supervisor #1

OPA interviewed Witness Supervisor #1 (WS#1) as an expert witness about PEO training and procedures. WS#1 is the primary training manager for PEOS and has more than twenty years of experience.

In reviewing the case materials and security video footage of the June 13 incident, WS#1 noted several potential departures from training. WS#1 described that PEOs are training to mitigate risks whenever possible. WS#1 specifically questioned why NE#1 stepped into the street to issue the Complainant a second ticket while the Complainant was backing up. WS#1 stated a "driveaway citation" could have been issued, especially after the Complainant ripped up the first citation. WS#1 also noted that PEOs are trained not to "stack" tickets and not issue multiple tickets for multiple violations. Instead, PEOs are trained to issue one citation at a time.

WS#1 described PEOs receiving de-escalation training. WS#1 stated that PEOs are trained to leave the scene if a community member is escalating. WS#1 elaborated, "I'm really disappointed in the fact that this PEO chose to walk into the street and hang a citation while the vehicle is moving or even started. That's a safety issue all the way around."

OPA Interview – Named Employee #1

NE#1 stated he has worked for SPD for about a year and a half. He described the June 13 incident, saying he saw the Complainant's Tesla in a pay-to-park area and noted the vehicle had not paid and had improper plates. NE#1 described the verbal disagreement with the Complainant. NE#1 said he wrote the first ticket, put it on the vehicle, then moved to the rear to take photographs. NE#1 said the Complainant ripped up the citation and tossed it at him before getting into the vehicle. NE#1 said the vehicle's driver door remained cracked open. NE#1 said he did not want to risk putting another ticket on the driver-side windshield, so he walked around to the passenger side. NE#1 said:

As soon as I lifted the windshield wiper up to put it down (the citation), he reversed and went back about eight feet. I kept pace with the vehicle, hung a citation, and then he turned his tires and, I believe, attempted to hit me.

NE#1 said he told the Complainant, "I should call backup to our location, because you tried to hit me with your car." He said the Complainant responded, "Call your fucking backup."

OPA asked NE#1 why he felt he needed to write a second ticket. He responded he was always advised to document everything, and he already decided to write two tickets. He said he did not think a "Driveaway" citation was a "viable option" because he the driver's side door was open, he saw the Complainant was on his phone, he had already printed the ticket, and he thought putting the ticket on the passenger side was the safest course of action. After speaking with his union representative, NE#1 stated to OPA:

So, after speaking to my union rep, and clarifying questions, I can kind of see where it's going. Objectively, in hindsight, was it necessary for me to write the second citation, or at least hanging it on the windshield? Probably not. But, at the time, I was set on doing it, I decided, and I was wanting to follow through.

NE#1 acknowledge he could also have documented the Complainant's behavior in a memorandum as opposed to a second citation. NE#1 denied having received de-escalation training.

Concerning the June 27 incident, NE#1 stated he saw a vehicle that was double parked. He observed the vehicle was a Tesla but did not realize it was the Complainant's vehicle until he got closer, saw the vehicle's distinctive hood, and saw the Complainant. NE#1 recalled that, after

seeing the Complainant, NE#1 said, "Oh, it's you." NE#1 said he asked the Complainant to move his vehicle and the Complainant refused. Then, NE#1 described:

As I started taking the pictures, he keeps bragging, for some reason, about the car being untraceable or not in my system. I don't, I don't really reply to him, because I want, I want to say as little as possible, because I don't want to hurt the assault case, because I want that to go through. And he said he'd never see me in court. He then called me the F-Slur.

He dared me to call for backup. So, I did call for backup, and I made sure to say it loud enough for him to hear. Then after about a minute or so, he left, and I canceled the backup.

OPA asked why he continued writing the ticket on June 27 after realizing it was the Complainant. NE#1 said:

Because I wanted, because I wanted to document the interaction to avoid a he-said-she-said. If he wanted to make, if he wanted to complain, if he wanted to make a complaint, or if he wanted to make a complaint about me. I issued the citation. I took as many pictures as I could to show the vehicle was indeed in violation, and I wasn't just writing it for no reason or just harassing him for no reason.

Had I recognized the vehicle immediately off the bat, I wouldn't have been, I wouldn't have engaged. I would have left the block entirely.

NE#1 denied telling the Complainant to "suck his dick in court." NE#1 said that, when the Complainant said he would fight the citation in court, NE#1 responded, "We will see." NE#1 admitted the was not necessary and could have potentially escalated the situation.

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 escalated by issuing him multiple tickets on June 13, 2025. 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.*

OPA recommends this allegation be sustained. In doing so, OPA makes no finding as to whether the Complainant assaulted NE#1, attempted to hit NE#1 with his vehicle, whether NE#1

reasonably perceived the Complainant tried to hit him with his vehicle, or whether there was probable cause for the Complainant's arrest. To the extent these issues are relevant to this case, they are discussed in Allegation #2.

Here, NE#1's act of writing a second ticket for the Complainant escalated a tense situation. After NE#1 wrote the Complainant the first ticket, the Complainant argued—without any basis in law—his belief that his vehicle was somehow exempt from parking citations either because it was not registered to him or was not traceably because the Complainant was illegally driving with an extremely expired temporary tag. The Complainant also ripped up the lawfully issued citation and threw it at NE#1. At this point, NE#1 should have extracted himself from the situation: he already issued a lawful citation and any further attempt at enforcing these low-level offenses was more likely to lead to needless escalation.

Instead, NE#1 stepped out into the street at a time video showed the Complainant had already begun backing up. NE#1 stepped around the Complainant's vehicle and, by his own admission, tried to "keep pace" with the vehicle long enough to "hang" the second citation. Based on the totality of the circumstances, this was needlessly escalatory, unsafe for NE#1, and unnecessary—as the ticket could have been issued as a "driveaway."

Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2

5.001 - Standards and Duties 5.001-POL 11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 filed false allegations against him, resulting in his arrest. SPD Policy 5.001-POL-11 requires Department employees to be truthful and complete in all communications.

This allegation is unfounded. Private security video and an independent witness statement corroborated NE#1's assault allegations against the Complainant. Moreover, PO#1 independently investigated the allegations, reviewed the security video, and spoke with the witness and determined there was probable cause to arrest the Complainant. Even if NE#1 escalated the situation under SPD policy by writing and attempting to "hang" a second citation on the vehicle, the Complainant still had an obligation to drive with due care. On review of the evidence, it was objectively reasonable for NE#1 to perceive the Complainant was attempting to hit him with his vehicle or, at the very least, put him in a reasonable apprehension of being hit.

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

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