

Issued Date: March 26, 2026

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

Case Number: 2025OPA-0412

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

1. **Allegation #1:** 8.200 – Using Force, 8.200-POL-1. Using Force: When Authorized

Finding: Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper

2. **Allegation #2:** 8.100 – De-Escalation, 8.100-POL-1. When Safe, Feasible, and Without Compromising Law Enforcement Priorities, Sworn Employees Will Use De-Escalation Tactics to Reduce the Need for Force

Finding: Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper

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:

Named Employee #1 (NE#1) prohibited the Complainant from entering T-Mobile Park following an altercation between the Complainant and Community Member #1 (CM#1), a street preacher. The Complainant alleged that NE#1 failed to de-escalate and used unauthorized force by pushing him multiple times and nearly breaking his wrist while grabbing it.

Administrative Note:

On March 5, 2026, the Office of Inspector General certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

Summary of the Investigation:

OPA investigated this incident by reviewing the OPA complaint, privately recorded video, and interview statements from the Complainant and NE#1.

On October 15, 2025, the Complainant left OPA a voicemail, seeking to submit a complaint against NE#1. On November 4, 2025, OPA interviewed the Complainant. He said he was on a sidewalk near the home-plate entrance to T-Mobile Park, where he told CM#1 to leave. He said he was approached by NE#1, who told him that he did not have the right to be there and then pushed him back about five times, causing a mark on his chest. He said he tried entering the park with a ticket, but NE#1 told him that he was banned from the game. He said NE#1 then aggressively grabbed his wrist and escorted him away. He alleged that NE#1 nearly broke his wrist, was angry, and failed to de-escalate the encounter.

A privately recorded video featured a compilation of various clips. One clip showed the Complainant in a physical altercation with CM#1 outside T-Mobile Park. The Complainant then ran away with CM#1's sign. Another clip appeared to have been created by the Complainant with a caption stating, "I was just asulted [sic] by spd and the [sic] won't let me in the game [frowning emojis]." In this clip, the Complainant alleged that NE#1 violated his First Amendment rights and pushed him. A third clip showed NE#1 approaching a person, presumably the Complainant. NE#1 appeared to have instructed the Complainant not to follow him. The Complainant threatened to sue NE#1, who advised, "Get off stadium property. Don't come back." A female backing officer also instructed the Complainant not to return, prompting the Complainant to reply, "Shut the fuck up, bitch. Fuck yourself. Kill yourself, bitch."² A fourth clip showed the Complainant stating that he could not attend the game due to NE#1's hurt feelings. He expressed anger and again alleged that NE#1 assaulted him. Other clips showed the Complainant interacting with community members, jumping atop a vehicle, and dancing.

On January 14, 2026, OPA interviewed NE#1. NE#1 said he was assigned to the home-plate gate when park employees and fans informed him that someone was instigating a fight with CM#1. NE#1 said he went to the scene and observed the Complainant shouting at CM#1, who ignored the Complainant. NE#1 said he returned to his post but went back the scene later when someone alerted him to another disturbance. NE#1 said he saw the Complainant bumping into CM#1 with his stomach, so NE#1 felt obligated to intervene to prevent further assaults. NE#1 said he told the Complainant that he could yell and dance but should not bump into others. NE#1 said the Complainant became aggressive and advanced toward him, so NE#1 reacted by raising his hand and pushing him back. NE#1 said the Complainant advanced toward him two or three times. NE#1 said the Complainant continued shouting, claiming that he could do as he pleased. NE#1 said he informed the Complainant that he was prohibited from entering T-Mobile Park due to his behavior, so the Complainant left. NE#1 said he then returned to his post. NE#1 described the Complainant's demeanor as fluctuating between jovial and angry.

NE#1 said a park employee informed him that the Complainant attempted to reenter the park and refused to leave, even after being told that he was not allowed to enter. NE#1 said he went to the entrance and told the Complainant that he was trespassed for the day, but the Complainant refused to leave despite multiple requests. NE#1 said he and a backing officer grabbed the Complainant and escorted him off park property. NE#1 said he held onto the Complainant's elbow and forearm during the escort. NE#1 said that during the escort, the Complainant was rummaging in his pocket with his hand, which NE#1 found concerning since he had not frisked the Complainant and was unsure about what was inside. NE#1 said he removed the Complainant's hand from the pocket, kept the Complainant's arm nearby for better control, and grabbed his wrist. NE#1 acknowledged that this could have caused the Complainant's wrist to bend slightly, but he did not believe it would result in an injury. NE#1 said he used only a minimal amount of force to escort the Complainant off park property. NE#1 said he warned the Complainant not to reenter or he would be arrested. NE#1 denied recalling whether the Complainant expressed any pain.

Analysis and Conclusions:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

8.200 – Using Force, 8.200-POL-1. Using Force: When Authorized

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 used unauthorized force by pushing him multiple times and nearly breaking his wrist while grabbing it.

Sworn employees will only use objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional force to the threat or urgency of the situation to achieve a law enforcement objective while protecting the life and safety of all people. SPD Policy 8.200-POL-1. Reasonableness must consider that sworn employees are often forced to make split-second decisions about the amount of force necessary in a particular situation in tense, uncertain, dynamic, and rapidly evolving circumstances. *Id.* The question is whether the sworn employee's actions were objectively reasonable considering the facts and circumstances confronting them, without regard to their underlying intent or motivation. *Id.* Several factors should be weighed when evaluating reasonableness. *See id.* Force is necessary under the totality of the circumstances when there is no reasonably effective alternative to using physical or deadly force, and the type and amount of physical or deadly force used is a reasonable and proportional response to effect the legal purpose intended or to protect against the threat posed to the sworn employee or others. SPD Policy 8.050. Proportional force must reflect the totality of circumstances of the situation, including the nature and immediacy of any threats posed to sworn employees and others. *Id.* Sworn employees must rely on training, experience, and their assessment of the situation to decide an appropriate level of force. *Id.*

NE#1 did not use unauthorized force as alleged. More likely than not, NE#1 did not use any reportable force throughout his encounter with the Complainant. To the extent that NE#1 used *de minimis* force³ by pushing the Complainant away multiple times, such force was objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional to prevent the Complainant from advancing toward NE#1.

The privately recorded video corroborated NE#1's account by showing the Complainant assaulting CM#1 and shouting at NE#1 and his backing officer. The Complainant appeared escalated around this time. Due to the Complainant's aggressive demeanor, it was reasonable to conclude that he was also confrontational with NE#1 upon NE#1's arrival. NE#1's pushes were lawful and proper to maintain distance between them and to prevent the Complainant from assaulting NE#1.

Moreover, to the extent that NE#1 used force to escort the Complainant away from T-Mobile Park while grabbing his wrist, such force was likely *de minimis*, objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional. The Complainant attempted to reenter the park despite multiple orders to stay away. He also refused to leave while at the entrance. Therefore, NE#1 and his backing officer were authorized to use force to remove the Complainant from park property. Furthermore, NE#1's grasp on the Complainant's wrist was lawful and proper based on the safety concern that NE#1 articulated. According to NE#1, the Complainant had not been frisked and had been using his hand to rummage in his pocket during the escort. Therefore, NE#1 was authorized to control the Complainant's wrist at this moment. NE#1 believed that he slightly bent the Complainant's wrist in a way that would not result in injury. It appeared unlikely that NE#1 nearly broke the Complainant's wrist while grabbing it, particularly since NE#1 did not recall the Complainant expressing any pain. Moreover, video presumably from later that evening, showed the Complainant dancing shirtless with no apparent injuries. This video also corroborated NE#1's recollection of the Complainant uneven demeanor as he appeared to fluctuate from aggressive and confrontational with another community member—who himself used his left arm to push the Complainant back using a straight arm push the chest—to appearing to joke and laughing with that same community member.

Overall, NE#1's uses of force against CM#1—the repeated pushing, arm-holding escort, and wrist-grabbing—were lawful and proper under these circumstances. There was insufficient evidence to support the Complainant's allegation that his wrist was nearly broken.

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

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

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2

8.100 – De-Escalation, 8.100-POL-1. When Safe, Feasible, and Without Compromising Law Enforcement Priorities, Sworn Employees Will Use De-Escalation Tactics to Reduce the Need for Force

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 failed to de-escalate.

When safe, feasible, and without compromising law enforcement priorities, sworn employees will use de-escalation tactics to reduce the need for force. SPD Policy 8.100-POL-1. Team approaches to de-escalation are encouraged and will consider sworn employee training and skill level, the number of sworn employees, and whether any sworn employee has successfully established

rapport with the subject. *Id.* The totality of the circumstances should guide de-escalation options purposed for voluntary compliance through communication, time, distance, and shielding. *Id.*

OPA finds, by a preponderance of the evidence, that NE#1 de-escalated until it was no longer feasible and consistent with law enforcement priorities. Based on review of available video, NE#1's statements, and the Complainant's statements, OPA finds NE#1's recollection of events to be more credible. The evidence strongly suggests NE#1 was confrontational, disruptive, and assaultive towards others present and lawfully trespassed from the stadium based on his behavior. His allegation that NE#1 nearly broke his wrist—when compared to videos of him presumably from later that evening—also seem exaggerated. More likely than not, NE#1's two encounters with the Complainant reflected communication, time, and distance. In both encounters, NE#1 communicated to the Complainant that he should either avoid contact with CM#1 or leave the area. NE#1 also provided the Complainant with sufficient time to comply with those orders during both encounters. During the first encounter, NE#1 maintained his distance from the Complainant until the Complainant reportedly persisted in advancing toward NE#1. NE#1 also utilized distance by terminating contact with the Complainant and returning to his post. NE#1 only re-engaged the Complainant when he was alerted to the Complainant's attempt at reentering the park. Due to the Complainant's refusal to leave, NE#1 was authorized to use force to remove the Complainant from the park. Overall, NE#1 utilized communication, time, and distance to de-escalate the situation until he was required to use force.

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

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

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. The privately recorded video appeared to have been posted to Instagram and had much of the profanity mostly bleeped. However, the first utterance of “bitch” was audible at the end. Considering this, together with the syntax and tempo around the bleeped words, OPA finds that, more likely than not, the Complainant called the female officer a “bitch” each time.

Footnote 3. *De minimis* force is an action meant to separate, guide, and/or control without using control techniques that are intended to, or are reasonably likely to, cause pain or injury. SPD Policy 8.050. Examples include, but are not limited to, using hands or equipment to stop, push back, separate, or escort, and using compliance holds without using sufficient force to cause pain. *Id.*