

Issued Date: May 19, 2026

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

Case Number: 2025OPA-0458

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

Finding: Not Sustained - Inconclusive (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:

Named Employee #1 (NE#1), a parking enforcement officer, contacted Community Member #1 (CM#1) for illegal parking. CM#1 alleged that NE#1 was rude based on her race.

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 employee. As such, OPA did not interview the named employee in this case.

On January 12, 2026, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

Summary of the Investigation:

OPA investigated this incident by reviewing the OPA complaint, Google maps, and interview statements from CM#1. Based on these records, a preponderance of the evidence showed the following:

According to CM#1, on November 4, 2025, she parked her vehicle with her hazard lights activated in a three-minute passenger loading zone beside a business in downtown Seattle. She said she was unable to recall how long she was parked. She said that, while she was waiting, NE#1 drove behind her, honked, and shouted at her, demanding her departure. She felt that NE#1 was rude based on her race. However, she said NE#1 did not issue her a traffic citation. She also claimed that NE#1 behaved similarly when her mother parked in that zone.

The Complainant, a parking enforcement officer supervisor, submitted an OPA complaint via Blue Team. According to the complaint, the Complainant spoke with NE#1, who reported that CM#1's vehicle was illegally parked over pavement markings that obstructed a driveway, so NE#1 directed her to depart. Moreover, NE#1 reportedly offered CM#1 alternative parking options, like the three-minute passenger loading zone. According to NE#1, CM#1 became upset and confrontational, prompting NE#1 to leave without issuing any citations.

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 was rude based on her race.

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. 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.

More likely than not, this allegation is unfounded. CM#1's allegation that NE#1 was racially biased was entirely based on her personal feelings. CM#1 was unable to identify any language indicating racial bias. Both CM#1 and NE#1 indicated that NE#1 contacted CM#1 due to her parking location. CM#1 alleged that NE#1's rudeness began before he even exited his vehicle by honking at her. Ultimately, both parties also agreed NE#1 ended the encounter by departing the scene without citing CM#1. Based on the evidence available, it is more likely than not NE#1's actions towards CM#1 were motivated by her parking location instead of her race.

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-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional

CM#1 alleged that NE#1 was rude.

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.*

There is insufficient evidence for OPA to determine whether NE#1 was unprofessional. As a parking enforcement officer, NE#1 was not equipped with a BWV, so OPA cannot conclusively determine whether NE#1 honked at or spoke to CM#1 in a rude or condescending manner. Nor can OPA determine conclusively whether CM#1’s parking location was blocking a driveway, exceeding a three-minute loading time limit, or legally standing in the three-minute loading zone. The available evidence appeared to indicate that NE#1 contacted CM#1 for what he perceived to be a parking violation, directed her to either leave or park elsewhere, and then departed the area without issuing any citations. But the specifics of CM#1’s allegations concerned NE#1 allegedly honking at her and speaking to her in a rude and aggressive manner. The evidence is not sufficient to prove or disprove that.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Inconclusive (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).