


**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-0346

---

### **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)

---

#### **Named Employee #2**

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)

---

**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 and NE#2) responded to a dispute involving the Complainant and Community Member #1 (CM#1), whom the Complainant accused of supporting the Chinese Community Party (CCP). The Complainant alleged that the named employees were favorably biased toward the CCP.

#### **Administrative Note:**

During its intake investigation, OPA identified the named employees failing to notify the Complainant and community members that they were being recorded. Moreover, OPA identified the named employees failing to conduct a thorough investigation. OPA sent the named employees' potential

violations of SPD Policy 16.090-POL-2(1) (Notification of Recording) and SPD Policy 15.180-POL-1 (Officers Shall Conduct a Thorough and Complete Search for Evidence) to their chain of command for Supervisor Action.<sup>2</sup> Finally, OPA identified NE#2 failing to provide his name to the Complainant upon request. OPA sent NE#2's potential violation of SPD Policy 5.001-POL-7 (Employees Engaged in Department-Related Activities Identify Themselves When Requested) to his chain of command for Supervisor Action.

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 October 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 report, body-worn video, incident report, and interview statements from the Complainant. These records reflected the following:

On September 1, 2025, the named employees responded to Westlake Plaza due to an argument between the Complainant and CM#1. The Complainant spoke into a bullhorn, accusing CM#1 of supporting the CCP. CM#1 shouted at the Complainant in response. CM#1 began walking away while telling NE#2 that the Complainant should not speak about China in such manner. When NE#2 asked the Complainant what happened, she reported that CM#1 supported the CCP and struck her phone and arm. NE#2 replied that CM#1 was permitted to express her opinions. NE#1 told NE#2 that witnesses reported seeing only a verbal disagreement, not a physical altercation. The Complainant then accused NE#2 of supporting the CCP, leading NE#2 to terminate the interaction.

### **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 the named employees were favorably biased toward the CCP.

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 political ideology. 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. OPA found no evidence indicating the named employees' preference for the CCP. Rather, the named employees responded to the scene and supported everyone's right to free speech, regardless of political ideology. NE#2 particularly emphasized that both CM#1 and the Complainant were entitled to express their opinions peacefully. The named employees did not disparage either party's opinions or show favoritism toward either party.

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

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

---

**Named Employee #2 – Allegation #1**

**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 #1, 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).