


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-0330

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

- 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)
 - 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)
-

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 domestic violence (DV) call and subsequently arrested the Complainant. The Complainant alleged NE#1 unlawfully arrested her due to racial bias.

Administrative Note:

During its intake investigation, OPA identified NE#1 using potentially unprofessional language. OPA sent NE#1's potential violation of SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10 (Employees Will Strive to be Professional) to her chain of command for Supervisor Action.²

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 October 1, 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, photograph, and interview statements from the Complainant.³ These records reflected the following:

On August 20, 2025, NE#1 responded to an apartment building following a 911 call reporting DV. Screaming sounds were audible as NE#1 and her backing officer approached the Complainant's apartment. Upon the Complainant opening the door, she was uncooperative and disobeyed orders to exit the apartment, prompting NE#1 to detain her in handcuffs. NE#1 attempted to interview Community Member #1 (CM#1), the Complainant's girlfriend, but CM#1 was intoxicated, crying, and struggled to articulate what occurred. CM#1 had a slightly bloody ear and lip, along with a swollen cheek. Moreover, the investigation led NE#1 to believe that CM#1 called 911 to report the assault, after which the Complainant took the phone from CM#1. NE#1 then interviewed the Complainant, who reported that CM#1 assaulted her. However, NE#1 observed no injuries on the Complainant. The Complainant also denied assaulting CM#1. NE#1 then arrested the Complainant for DV assault.

Analysis and Conclusions:

Named Employee #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

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 unlawfully arrested her.

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).

NE#1 had probable cause to arrest the Complainant for DV assault. During the investigation, NE#1 evaluated CM#1's and the Complainant's accounts, CM#1's physical injuries, and dispatch updates regarding the 911 call. NE#1 also observed no injuries on the Complainant. The totality of this evidence indicated that the Complainant had assaulted CM#1. Thus, probable cause supported 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 #1 – Allegation #2

5.140 – Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 was racially biased against her.

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. The circumstances surrounding the DV incident guided NE#1's investigation. NE#1's objective investigation involved separating and interviewing both parties, evaluating CM#1's physical injuries, determining whether the Complainant had any injuries, and identifying the party who called 911. The Complainant's race did not impact NE#1's investigation.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded (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 Supervisor Action generally involves a minor policy violation or performance issue the employee's supervisor addresses through training, communication, or coaching. See OPA Internal Operations and Training Manual section 5.4(B)(ii).

Footnote 3. During her OPA interview, the Complainant also alleged NE#1 was “rubbing the back of my butt” while searching her, despite the Complainant stating she had already been searched. OPA reviewed BWV and observed that, prior to re-searching the Complainant's back pocket, the Complainant was observed reaching her hand into her pocket. When NE#1 re-searched that pocket, the Complainant stated, “Stop! Weird ass bitch!” OPA observed no potential misconduct during this interaction and treated this allegation as a contact log. See OPA Internal Operations and Training Manual section 5.4(B)(i).