


**Issued Date:** February 9, 2026

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

**Case Number:** 2025OPA-0327

---

### **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:** 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:** 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:**

On December 13, 2024, Named Employee #2 (NE#2) responded to a harassment call involving the Complainant and Community Member #1 (CM#1), his former girlfriend, and developed probable cause against the Complainant for stalking and false reporting. On January 7, 2025, Named Employee #1 (NE#1) conducted a traffic stop on the Complainant and subsequently arrested him. The Complainant alleged that NE#1 conducted an unlawful traffic stop and that the named employees lacked probable cause for his arrest.

### **Administrative Note:**

The Complainant alleged unprofessional conduct by a sergeant. The Complainant also alleged that unknown officers attempted to manipulate witness testimony against him. OPA sought a statement from the Complainant through his attorney, who stated she would speak with the Complainant about providing a statement. OPA has not received any response. 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 employees. As such, OPA did not interview the named employees in this case.

On September 22, 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 reports, body-worn video, in-car video, incident reports, 911 audio recordings, and court records. These records reflected the following:

On December 13, 2024, NE#2 interviewed CM#1 in her apartment, where she reported harassing behavior from the Complainant. Specifically, she reported that the Complainant had been sending her unwanted and psychologically abusive texts, repeatedly calling her, and repeatedly appearing at her apartment complex unannounced and against her requests to stay away. She reported that the Complainant unlawfully entered her apartment recently. She said a no-contact order against the Complainant had been rescinded at his request. She said she was so fearful that she stopped taking her trash to the dumpster because she believed the Complainant might ambush her. CM#1's father corroborated CM#1's account, explaining that he had been taking the trash out for CM#1.

Audio recordings indicated that the Complainant repeatedly called 911 requesting a welfare check on CM#1, even after SPD confirmed the well-being of CM#1 and her children. Despite this information being communicated to the Complainant, he repeatedly called 911 requesting welfare checks. NE#2 believed the Complainant was misusing the 911 system to continually harass and monitor CM#1. Thus, NE#1 documented probable cause to arrest the Complainant for stalking (SMC 12A.09.020, which adopted the state's stalking statute, RCW 9A.46.110) and false reporting (SMC 12A.16.040).

On January 7, 2025, NE#1 conducted a traffic stop on the Complainant's vehicle, which appeared to have run a red light. When NE#1 began following the vehicle, the Complainant made several turns without signaling or fully stopping. After the Complainant pulled over, NE#1 explained the reason for the stop and gathered the Complainant's information. During the traffic stop, NE#2

informed NE#1 that there was probable cause to arrest the Complainant for stalking and false reporting. NE#1 then arrested the Complainant and Mirandized him.

### **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 conducted an unlawful traffic stop.

*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.*

NE#1 conducted a lawful traffic stop on the Complainant. Objective, in-car video showed the Complainant's vehicle appearing to run a red light. When NE#1 began following the vehicle, the Complainant also made several turns without signaling or fully stopping. Given these traffic violations, NE#1 had reasonable suspicion to lawfully detain the Complainant.

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**

##### **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 lacked probable cause for his arrest.

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 the Complainant for stalking and false reporting. CM#1 and her father reported harassing conduct from the Complainant, which included sending her unwanted and psychologically abusive texts, repeatedly calling her, and repeatedly appearing at her apartment complex unannounced and against her requests to stay away. CM#1 felt so fearful that she avoided taking her trash out to the dumpster. These facts constituted probable cause for stalking. Moreover, multiple 911 calls from the Complainant separately supported probable cause for false reporting. Despite being informed about the well-being of CM#1 and her children, the Complainant continually called 911 for unwarranted welfare checks. Thus, the named employees had probable cause for two separate crimes, justifying the Complainant’s arrest.

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**

**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 #2, 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, “there is insufficient information to proceed with further inquiry.” See OPA Internal Operations and Training Manual section 5.4(B)(i).