


Issued Date: January 13, 2026

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

Case Number: 2025OPA-0312

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)
 3. **Allegation #3:** 6.010 – Arrests, 6.010-POL-1. Sworn Employees Must Have Probable Cause That a Subject has Committed a Crime in Order to Effect an Arrest
Finding: Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper (Expedited)
-

Named Employee #2

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)
 3. **Allegation #3:** 6.010 – Arrests, 6.010-POL-1. Sworn Employees Must Have Probable Cause That a Subject has Committed a Crime in Order to Effect an Arrest
Finding: Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper (Expedited)
-

Named Employee #3

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)

3. Allegation #3: 6.010 – Arrests, 6.010-POL-1. Sworn Employees Must Have Probable Cause That a Subject has Committed a Crime in Order to Effect an Arrest

Finding: Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper (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 named employees (NE#1, NE#2, and NE#3) assisted the Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Board (LCB) during multiple inspections of a hookah lounge. The Complainant alleged that the named employees were unprofessional, racially discriminated against the hookah lounge, and unlawfully arrested Community Member #1 (CM#1), a co-owner of the hookah lounge.

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 employees. As such, OPA did not interview the named employees in this case.

On September 5, 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, and Washington State LCB narrative/evidence report. The Complainant did not respond to OPA's requests for an interview. Based on these records, a preponderance of the evidence showed the following:

From June 13 to July 10, 2025, the named employees assisted LCB during multiple inspections of a hookah lounge following multiple complaints of unlawfully selling alcohol without a liquor license. The inspections uncovered alcohol on the premises. On June 27, 2025, an LCB officer conducted an administrative inspection despite CM#1's objections, even though CM#1 had been informed that a warrant was not needed. During the inspection, CM#1 repeatedly attempted to prevent the LCB officer from conducting the inspection and was warned that he faced arrest if he continued. When the LCB officer inspected the bar, CM#1 physically attempted to prevent the LCB officer from accessing the alcohol stored there, leading to CM#1's arrest for obstruction.

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 the named employees were unprofessional.

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.*

This allegation is unfounded. The named employees were professional toward the hookah lounge co-owners while the officers assisted LCB with an administrative inspection. When the co-owners opposed the inspections, the named employees informed them that a warrant was not needed for an administrative inspection, in accordance with state law. The named employees also appropriately warned CM#1 that he faced arrest if he continually obstructed LCB’s inspection. There was no evidence of unprofessional conduct.

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 the named employees racially discriminated against the hookah lounge.

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 race. *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.

This allegation is unfounded. LCB was the lead agency responsible for the administrative inspection, while SPD merely assisted LCB. There was no evidence that SPD specifically targeted this hookah lounge or racially discriminated against the co-owners. Rather, LCB, with SPD’s assistance, conducted multiple inspections at this hookah lounge in response to multiple complaints of unlawfully selling alcohol without a liquor license. These complaints were substantiated, as alcohol was discovered during these inspections. There was no evidence of bias.

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

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

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #3

6.010 – Arrests, 6.010-POL-1. Sworn Employees Must Have Probable Cause That a Subject has Committed a Crime in Order to Effect an Arrest

The Complainant alleged that the named employees unlawfully arrested CM#1.

Sworn employees must have probable cause that a subject committed a crime before executing an arrest. SPD Policy 6.010-POL-1. Stated differently, where an arrest is not supported by probable cause, it violates law and Department policy. Probable cause exists when the facts and circumstances within a sworn employee’s knowledge sufficiently support a reasonable belief that an offense has been or is being committed. See *State v. Fricks*, 91 Wash.2d 391, 588 P.2d 1328 (1979); *State v. Gluck*, 83 Wash.2d 424, 426–27, 518 P.2d 703 (1974).

The named employees had probable cause to arrest CM#1 for obstruction. CM#1 attempted to physically prevent the LCB officer from inspecting the bar, where alcohol was located. CM#1 did so despite having received multiple prior warnings that he faced arrest if he obstructed the inspection. Thus, probable cause supported CM#1’s arrest for violating Seattle Municipal Code 12A.24.147 (refusal to permit inspection).

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper (Expedited).

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper (Expedited)**

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #1

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

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

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

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #2

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

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

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #3

6.010 – Arrests, 6.010-POL-1. Sworn Employees Must Have Probable Cause That a Subject has Committed a Crime in Order to Effect an Arrest

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #3, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper (Expedited).

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper (Expedited)**

Named Employee #3 – Allegation #1

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

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

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

Named Employee #3 – Allegation #2

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

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

Named Employee #3 – Allegation #3

6.010 – Arrests, 6.010-POL-1. Sworn Employees Must Have Probable Cause That a Subject has Committed a Crime in Order to Effect an Arrest

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #3, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper (Expedited).

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper (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).