


Issued Date: February 10, 2026

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

Case Number: 2025OPA-0333

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

1. **Allegation #1:** 5.140 – Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing
Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
 2. **Allegation #2:** 5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional
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:

The Complainant alleged that Named Employee #1 (NE#1), a parking enforcement officer, was racially biased against her and improperly impounded her vehicle.

Administrative Note:

This case was approved for Expedited Investigation. OPA, with the Office of Inspector General's (OIG) agreement, believed it could recommend findings based solely on its intake investigation without interviewing the named employee. OPA did not interview the named employee in this case.

On September 25, 2025, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

Summary of the Investigation:

OPA investigated this incident by reviewing the OPA complaint, citation logs, citation court packages, and interview statements from the Complainant. These records reflected the following:

A citation log indicated that NE#1 issued three warnings to the Complainant on different dates (July 22, 2025; August 6, 2025; and August 19, 2025) for violating SMC 11.72.440, which generally prohibits a person from parking a vehicle on any street for more than 72 hours. Photographs taken by NE#1 showed these warnings affixed to the windshield of the Complainant's vehicle.

On August 22, 2025, NE#1 impounded the Complainant's vehicle. On this date, the warning and chalk mark from August 19, 2025, remained visible. Another citation log indicated that between January 17, 2024, and July 14, 2025, NE#1 and other officers cited or issued warnings to the Complainant for violating SMC 11.72.440, improper license display, or being in a prohibited area.

Analysis and Conclusions:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

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. Citation logs showed NE#1 and other parking enforcement officers citing or issuing warnings to the Complainant for multiple SMC violations between January 17, 2024, and July 14, 2025. The citations included photographs corroborating those SMC violations. There was no indication that NE#1 knew the Complainant's race, nor was there any evidence that race impacted NE#1's enforcement actions. NE#1 also elected to issue three warnings to the Complainant on three separate dates before ultimately impounding her vehicle. Overall, OPA found no evidence supporting the Complainant's interpretation of race-based mistreatment.

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

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

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2

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

The Complainant alleged NE#1 unprofessionally harassed her by impounding her vehicle.

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.*

NE#1 lawfully impounded the Complainant’s vehicle. On August 19, 2025, NE#1 issued a warning and marked the Complainant’s vehicle with chalk for violating SMC 11.72.440. The warning clearly stated that the vehicle was subject to impound. When NE#1 returned three days later, the warning and chalk mark remained. The Complainant admitted to failing to relocate her vehicle. NE#1 properly documented these facts, photographed the SMC violation, and lawfully impounded the Complainant’s vehicle. OPA found no evidence that NE#1 was harassing the Complainant.

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).