


Issued Date: February 16, 2026

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

Case Number: 2025OPA-0358

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

1. **Allegation #1:** 5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional

Finding: Not Sustained - Inconclusive

2. **Allegation #2:** 5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-14. Retaliation is Prohibited

Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded

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, engaged with her unprofessionally and retaliated against her following his request to move her vehicle.

Administrative Note:

On January 27, 2026, the Office of Inspector General certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

Summary of the Investigation:

OPA investigated this incident by interviewing the Complainant and NE#1.

On September 17, 2025, the Complainant contacted OPA requesting to submit a complaint against an officer, who OPA later identified as NE#1. On September 18 and 30, 2025, OPA interviewed the

Complainant, who provided the following account. On September 17, 2025, her vehicle, along with several others, was unlawfully parked on a street when NE#1 arrived in his parking enforcement vehicle. NE#1 pointed at a sign indicating her illegal parking, repeatedly asked her to move her vehicle, and asked about how long it would take her to move it. She replied that she would move it when she was done. As NE#1 began driving away, she sarcastically told NE#1 to have a nice day, prompting NE#1 to park his vehicle across the street, reapproach her, and comment, "Sarcasm isn't going to work with me." The Complainant believed that NE#1 may have addressed her as "missy," and she maintained that he improperly exerted his authority over her. She said she did not submit to his authority but instead argued with him, clapped her hands at him, and told him she hoped he was proud of himself. She said she moved her vehicle, and NE#1 ultimately did not cite her.

On September 19, 2025, OPA interviewed NE#1. He recalled noticing a vehicle parked illegally, so he parked his parking enforcement vehicle behind it, approached the Complainant, and asked, "Can you move your vehicle please?" He said he did not recall whether she replied but believed he would have remained at her window had she ignored him. He denied parking beside her and speaking through his window, as that would have blocked traffic. He said he returned to his vehicle, but because the Complainant showed no indication of moving, he reapproached her and commented, "You really do need to move your vehicle." He said he returned to his vehicle after making this comment but could not recall any further details, suggesting that she likely moved her vehicle. He claimed he acted professionally. He denied telling the Complainant, "Sarcasm isn't going to work with me" and denied addressing her as "missy." He was unable to recall anything she said to him but recalled his two statements as part of his "normal pattern." He indicated that nothing memorable occurred during this routine interaction.

Analysis and Conclusions:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

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

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 engaged with her unprofessionally.

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.*

A preponderance of the evidence did not support one account over the other. Here, the Complainant described NE#1's interaction with her as unprofessional based on his "sarcasm isn't going to work with me" remark and the possibility that he referred to her as "missy." However, NE#1 denied making these statements. He claimed that he initially asked the Complainant to move her vehicle and then

insisted on her compliance when she failed to show any intention to move. OPA found insufficient evidence to resolve the discrepancy.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Inconclusive.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Inconclusive**

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2

5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-14. Retaliation is Prohibited

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 retaliated against her following his request to move her vehicle.

SPD employees are prohibited from retaliating against a person who publicly criticizes an SPD employee. SPD Policy 5.001-POL-14. Retaliatory acts include, among other things, intimidation. *Id.*

There was insufficient evidence to support the Complainant’s allegation. The Complainant believed that NE#1 reapproached to intimidate her, whereas NE#1 claimed that he reapproached due to her noncompliance. Here, the evidence suggests that NE#1 reapproached because the Complainant did not move her vehicle as instructed. Both accounts consistently indicated that NE#1 instructed the Complainant to move her vehicle at least twice. Moreover, the Complainant admitted to parking her vehicle illegally—a violation for which NE#1 had the authority to issue a citation. If NE#1 intended to retaliate against the Complainant, he could have cited her. However, he ultimately allowed her to move her vehicle without citing her. Overall, there was insufficient evidence to indicate retaliation.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

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).