


**Issued Date:** January 15, 2026

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

**Case Number:** 2025OPA-0316

---

**Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings**

**Named Employee #1**

1. **Allegation #1:** 6.220 – Voluntary Contacts, Terry Stops, and Detentions, 6.220-POL-2  
Conducting a Terry Stop, 1. Terry Stops are Seizures Based Upon Reasonable Suspicion  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper (Expedited)
  2. **Allegation #2:** 8.100 – De-Escalation, 8.100-POL-1. When Safe, Feasible, and Without  
Compromising Law Enforcement Priorities, Sworn Employees Will Use De-Escalation  
Tactics to Reduce the Need for Force  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper (Expedited)
  3. **Allegation #3:** 8.200 – Using Force, 8.200-POL-1. Using Force: When Authorized  
**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:**

Named Employee #1 (NE#1) responded to a fight disturbance and arrested Community Member #1 (CM#1). The Complainant alleged that NE#1 lacked reasonable suspicion to detain CM#1, failed to de-escalate, and used unauthorized force against CM#1 during the arrest.

**Administrative Note:**

The Complainant alleged two other instances of misconduct by NE#1, including aiming his firearm at CM#1 and dishonesty. OPA did not find any evidence to suggest potential misconduct in these instances. Accordingly, OPA processed these allegations 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 recommended findings based solely on its intake investigation without interviewing the named employee. As such, OPA did not interview the named employee in this case.

On September 12, 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, SPD media video, and incident report. Based on these records, a preponderance of the evidence showed the following:

On August 6, 2025, NE#1 responded to a fight disturbance call near an intersection. The assault suspect's description—a wearing a black puffy jacket with a yellow hoodie—was broadcast. CM#1 was on the sidewalk wearing a black jacket with a yellow hoodie underneath. NE#1 instructed CM#1 to "come here," but CM#1 did not comply and attempted to flee. NE#1 drew his firearm, maintained it in the low-ready position, and approached CM#1. NE#1 then grabbed CM#1, turned him around, and attempted to handcuff him. However, CM#1 resisted arrest and attempted to escape, prompting NE#1 to restrain CM#1 against the wall. Two backing officers assisted NE#1 with handcuffing CM#1, who was then transported to the King County Jail for assault and obstruction.

### **Analysis and Conclusions:**

#### **Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1**

#### **6.220 – Voluntary Contacts, Terry Stops, and Detentions, 6.220-POL-2 Conducting a Terry Stop, 1. Terry Stops are Seizures Based Upon Reasonable Suspicion**

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 lacked reasonable suspicion to detain CM#1.

*Terry* stops are seizures of an individual and, as such, must be based on reasonable suspicion to be lawful. SPD Policy 6.220-POL-2(1). A *Terry* stop is a brief, minimally intrusive seizure of a subject based on reasonable articulable suspicion to investigate possible criminal activity. SPD Policy 6.220-POL-1. Reasonable suspicion means specific, objective, articulable facts, which, taken together with rational inferences, would create a well-founded suspicion that there is a substantial possibility that a subject has engaged, is engaging, or is about to engage in criminal conduct. *Id.* The reasonableness of a *Terry* stop is based on the totality of the circumstances, the officer's training and experience, and what the officer knew before the stop. *Id.* While information learned during the stop can lead to additional reasonable suspicion or probable cause that a crime has occurred, it cannot justify the original stop. *Id.*

A suspect was captured on video assaulting a community member. After the assault suspect's physical description was broadcast, NE#1 arrived at the scene and observed CM#1, who matched the physical description. NE#1 had reasonable suspicion to detain CM#1.

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

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

**Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2**

**8.100 – De-Escalation, 8.100-POL-1. When Safe, Feasible, and Without Compromising Law Enforcement Priorities, Sworn Employees Will Use De-Escalation Tactics to Reduce the Need for Force**

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 failed to de-escalate.

When safe, feasible, and without compromising law enforcement priorities, sworn employees will use de-escalation tactics to reduce the need for force. SPD Policy 8.100-POL-1. Team approaches to de-escalation are encouraged and will consider sworn employee training and skill level, the number of sworn employees, and whether any sworn employee has successfully established rapport with the subject. *Id.* The totality of the circumstances should guide de-escalation options purposed for voluntary compliance through communication, time, distance, and shielding. *Id.*

NE#1 de-escalated to the extent feasible. Upon encountering CM#1, NE#1 promptly issued verbal commands by ordering CM#1 to “come here.” However, CM#1 disobeyed those commands and attempted to flee. At this moment, using additional de-escalation tactics, such as communication, time, or distance, were unfeasible and would have compromised enforcement priorities. NE#1 was authorized to use force to prevent CM#1 from escaping and to execute an arrest.

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

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

**Named Employee #1 – Allegation #3**

**8.200 – Using Force, 8.200-POL-1. Using Force: When Authorized**

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 used unauthorized force against CM#1 during the arrest.

Sworn employees will only use objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional force to the threat or urgency of the situation to achieve a law enforcement objective while protecting the life and safety of all people. SPD Policy 8.200-POL-1. Reasonableness must consider that sworn

employees are often forced to make split-second decisions about the amount of force necessary in a particular situation in tense, uncertain, dynamic, and rapidly evolving circumstances. *Id.* The question is whether the sworn employee's actions were objectively reasonable considering the facts and circumstances confronting them, without regard to their underlying intent or motivation. *Id.* Several factors should be weighed when evaluating reasonableness. *See id.* Force is necessary under the totality of the circumstances when there is no reasonably effective alternative to using physical or deadly force, and the type and amount of physical or deadly force used is a reasonable and proportional response to effect the legal purpose intended or to protect against the threat posed to the sworn employee or others. SPD Policy 8.050 (effective September 1, 2024). Proportional force must reflect the totality of circumstances of the situation, including the nature and immediacy of any threats posed to sworn employees and others. *Id.* Sworn employees must rely on training, experience, and their assessment of the situation to decide an appropriate level of force. *Id.*

NE#1 did not use unauthorized force as alleged. In fact, NE#1 did not use any reportable force throughout his encounter with CM#1. To the extent that NE#1 used *de minimis* force<sup>3</sup> by grabbing CM#1 and restraining him against the wall, such force was objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional under the circumstances. CM#1 was an assault suspect who attempted to escape during a lawful arrest, authorizing NE#1 to use force to prevent his escape. The level of resistance CM#1 presented necessitated support from two backing officers to handcuff CM#1. CM#1 did not express any pain during the arrest. NE#1 also modulated his force after securing CM#1 in handcuffs. Overall, NE#1's use of *de minimis* force against CM#1 was lawful and proper.

Accordingly, 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).

**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).

**Footnote 3.** *De minimis* force is an action meant to separate, guide, and/or control without using control techniques that are intended to, or are reasonably likely to, cause pain or injury. SPD Policy 8.050 (effective September 1, 2024). Examples include, but are not limited to, using hands or equipment to stop, push back, separate, or escort, and using compliance holds without using sufficient force to cause pain. *Id.*