


Issued Date: March 3, 2026

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

Case Number: 2025OPA-0366

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)

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:

Community Member #1 (CM#1) entered the East Precinct to file a report about being stalked. CM#1 initially spoke with Witness Officer #1 (WO#1) but then spoke with Named Employee #1 (NE#1), a sergeant at the time. CM#1 alleged that NE#1 would have acted on his report had he been a white woman.

Administrative Note:

During its intake investigation, OPA identified WO#1 allegedly acted unprofessionally toward CM#1. OPA sent WO#1's potential violation of SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10 (Employees Will Strive to be Professional) to her chain of command for Supervisor Action.²

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

On November 5, 2025, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

Summary of the Investigation:

OPA investigated this incident by reviewing the OPA complaint, body-worn video, East Precinct security video, incident report, and email correspondence from CM#1. Based on these records, a preponderance of the evidence showed the following:

On September 24, 2025, CM#1 entered the East Precinct to file a report about being stalked. After initially speaking with WO#1, CM#1 requested to speak with a supervisor and then spoke with NE#1. CM#1 reported, among other things, that he had been assaulted earlier and was being stalked, so he wanted the people stalking him arrested. NE#1 replied that he would prepare an incident report but told CM#1 that he had not provided enough information for an arrest. NE#1 also advised CM#1 to promptly call 911 if he saw anyone stalking him. CM#1 expressed dissatisfaction with NE#1's response and alleged mistreatment based on his race and gender.

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

CM#1 alleged that NE#1 would have acted on his report had he been a white woman.

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 or gender. 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. Body-worn video did not show NE#1 exhibiting bias in any way. Rather, NE#1 interviewed CM#1 and appropriately advised him to promptly call the police if he felt he was being stalked. Due to CM#1's vague descriptions of the suspects, their actions, and locations, NE#1 also appropriately indicated that he could not act based on such limited information. NE#1 recorded the interaction, documented it, and treated CM#1 with respect. Overall, OPA found no evidence supporting CM#1's interpretation of racial or gender mistreatment.

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).

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).