


**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-0365

---

### **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:** 15.180 – Primary Investigations, 15.180-POL-1. Officers Shall Conduct a Thorough and Complete Search for Evidence  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper (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)
  - 2. Allegation #2:** 15.180 – Primary Investigations, 15.180-POL-1. Officers Shall Conduct a Thorough and Complete Search for Evidence  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper (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 threat incident involving the Complainant and Community Member #1 (CM#1) at a shelter but did not develop probable cause to arrest either party. The Complainant alleged that the named employees were biased against his housing status and conducted an inadequate investigation.

## **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 without interviewing the named employees. As such, OPA did not interview the named employees in this case.

On October 17, 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, in-car video, incident report, and interview statements from the Complainant and a shelter employee. These records reflected the following:

On September 13, 2025, the named employees responded to a shelter following a 911 call regarding two individuals who were arguing and threatening to kill one another. NE#2 interviewed the Complainant, while NE#1 interviewed CM#1. The Complainant told NE#2 that he and CM#1 argued over storage space, leading CM#1 to produce a knife and threaten him with it. The Complainant described the knife as a kitchen knife but could not provide other features. The Complainant said he threatened to kill CM#1 in self-defense. Conversely, CM#1 told NE#1 that he and the Complainant argued, but he denied producing a knife. NE#2 then interviewed two community members who claimed to have witnessed the argument. They said no knife was involved and identified the Complainant as the primary aggressor. One community member said CM#1 communicated his intent to use a knife against the Complainant in self-defense. Finally, NE#2 interviewed a shelter employee who denied seeing a knife while watching security camera footage of both parties arguing. The named employees ultimately decided against arresting either party.

## **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 biased against his housing status.

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 housing status. 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 Complainant and CM#1 appeared to share the same race, gender, and housing status. Moreover, the named employees did not treat either party differently. Upon their arrival, the named employees separated the parties and interviewed them about the incident. The named employees then sought other evidence for corroboration. They did not arrest CM#1 because the evidence they gathered did not support the Complainant's allegation. Overall, there was no indication of bias impacting the named employees' investigation.

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

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

**Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2**

**15.180 – Primary Investigations, 15.180-POL-1. Officers Shall Conduct a Thorough and Complete Search for Evidence**

The Complainant alleged that the named employees conducted an inadequate investigation

In primary investigations, officers must conduct a thorough and complete search for evidence. SPD Policy 15.180-POL-1. Sworn personnel must know how to collect the most common physical evidence that might be encountered in a primary investigation. *Id.*

The named employees conducted a thorough and objective investigation by interviewing the Complainant, CM#1, two community members who witnessed the argument, and a shelter employee who watched security footage of the argument. The two community members and shelter employee corroborated CM#1's account. Although CM#1 possessed a knife, statements from three independent witnesses indicated that he did not produce it during the argument. Overall, the named employees conducted a complete search for evidence based on the information reported to them.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper (Expedited).

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper (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)**

**Named Employee #2 – Allegation #2**

**15.180 – Primary Investigations, 15.180-POL-1. Officers Shall Conduct a Thorough and Complete Search for Evidence**

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper (Expedited).

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper (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).