


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-0364

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 - Unfounded (Expedited)
 - 2. Allegation #2:** 5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication
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:

SPD officers responded to a domestic violence incident involving the Complainant and Community Member #1 (CM#1), her ex-boyfriend, at an apartment building. The Complainant alleged that an unidentified officer (Named Employee #1 or NE#1) falsely told apartment staff that the Complainant caught CM#1 with another woman and that CM#1 was her pimp.

Administrative Note:

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. As such, OPA did not interview any employees in this case.

On October 29, 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, incident report, body-worn video (BWV), in-car video, and interview statements from the Complainant and two apartment employees. These records reflected the following:

On September 20, 2025, four SPD officers responded to an apartment building following the Complainant's 911 call regarding CM#1, who she reported was breaking down her door and attempting to grab her. A no-contact order prohibiting CM#1 from contacting the Complainant was noted in the call. Upon their arrival, the officers observed damage to the Complainant's apartment; however, CM#1 was not present. The Complainant reported a disturbance between her and CM#1 when he arrived unexpectedly, but she said she was unharmed. The officers also spoke with two apartment employees about the incident.

Analysis and Conclusions:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

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

Named Employee #1 (NE#1), an unknown employee, allegedly engaged in unprofessional conduct by telling apartment staff that the Complainant caught CM#1 with another woman and that CM#1 was her pimp.

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.*

This allegation is unfounded. OPA reviewed BWV from every responding officer and found no evidence corroborating the Complainant's allegation. Interactions between the officers and the Complainant or apartment employees were professional. According to one apartment employee, another apartment employee—not an SPD officer—mentioned that the Complainant caught CM#1 with another woman. The officers' failure to follow up on this comment was not unprofessional. The alleged “pimp” comment was not captured on BWV. Overall, there was no evidence of unprofessional conduct or statements.

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-11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 made untruthful statements.

Department employees must be truthful and complete in all communications. SPD Policy 5.001-POL-11.

This allegation is unfounded for the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1. BWV did not capture any officer making statements about infidelity or CM#1 being a “pimp.” Witness interviews indicated this rumor more likely originated with a statement or misunderstanding by an apartment employee. Consequently, there was no evidence to indicate dishonesty.

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).