

Issued Date: June 16, 2026

From: Director Bonnie Glenn
Office of Police Accountability



Case Number: 2026OPA-0021

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

1. **Allegation #1:** 5.001 - Standards and Duties POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional

Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded

2. **Allegation #2:** 5.001 POL 2. Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy, and Department Policy

Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded

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 Complainant alleged that he and Named Employee #1 (NE#1) were students together in a post-secondary criminal justice program in 2009. The Complainant alleged that, during this time, NE#1 jokingly shoved him into a urinal and, when the Complainant attempted to shove NE#1 back, removed his department-issued firearm from its holster.

Administrative Note:

On June 2, 2026, the Office of Inspector General certified this investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

Summary of the Investigation:

In January 2026, the Complainant sent multiple emails alleging the following. The Complainant wrote that he was “with a buddy and drinking and reminiscing about college.” During that conversation, the Complainant told his friend about a time that NE#1 followed him into the bathroom, “jokingly shoved” him into a urinal, and removed his firearm from his holster when the Complainant attempted to shove him back. The Complainant specified NE#1 did not point the firearm at him, only removed it from the holster. The Complainant stated he was “so enthralled and upset by everything” that he did not report this incident earlier.

OPA investigated this complaint by a document identifying NE#1 as having attended the post-secondary criminal justice program and interviewing witnesses, including NE#1. The Complainant responded to several OPA emails and was offered the opportunity to interview on multiple occasions. The Complainant did not respond to OPA’s offers to interview or speak over the phone.

1. OPA Interview – Named Employee #1

OPA interviewed NE#1 on April 27, 2026. NE#1 stated he was enrolled in the post-secondary criminal justice program in 2009 during a time he worked as a patrol officer. NE#1 explained he attended the program in his personal time at his own expense. NE#1 stated he did not wear a uniform to the class and would not have carried his department-issued firearm. NE#1 stated he possibly carried a personal, off-duty firearm, but noted he did not believe this was the case as it would have made other students less comfortable. NE#1 stated he always followed the “four cardinal rules” of firearm safety and viewed firearms as “tools.” He stated he felt the complaint “sounds completely fabricated” because of the level of seriousness he gives to firearm safety. He explained he is “not a big firearms guy.”

NE#1 stated he did not remember the Complainant and noted that, when the complaint first came in, he directed it go to OPA. NE#1 provided the names of three professors whose names he remembered from the program, as well as two other students: Witness #1 (a civilian SPD employee) and Witness #2 (a federal law enforcement agent). He described attending the program similar to “a job” and not “for fun,” and that he had “very few friends going there.” He stated he was there to obtain a degree and “move on.”

NE#1 denied pushing the Complainant in the bathroom. He stated his view that the “bathroom is a private time, so go in, use the restroom, wash your hands, and go out.”

NE#1 described his level of suspicion about the complaint because of how out of character the allegation was. NE#1 described his awareness of his authority as a police officer. NE#1 also said, except in a law enforcement capacity, training, or cleaning, “my firearm does not come out of my holster, period.”

2. OPA Interview – Witness #1

OPA interviewed Witness #1 on May 8, 2026. Witness #1 confirmed he attended the post-secondary program with NE#1 and the Complainant. He stated he was not aware of this incident at the time. He said that the Complainant had reached out to him in the past couple months over a social media platform to ask, “whether it was worth going through this process.” Witness #1 elaborated, “I think probably somebody from your office [OPA] had reached out to him, and he was debating whether he should continue.” Witness #1 said he told the Complainant it was his decision.

Witness #1 described the program as a small one, and his relationship with the Complainant was purely as peers who attended the same school. Witness #1 did not know if the Complainant and NE#1 had classes together but remarked that, due to the size of the program, he was “sure” NE#1 and the Complainant knew one another. He said he was unaware of any confrontation between NE#1 and other students.

3. OPA Interview – Witness #2

OPA interviewed Witness #2 on May 13, 2026. Witness #2 confirmed she attended the post-secondary program with NE#1 and the Complainant. She confirmed she knew both individuals. When asked whether NE#1 and the Complainant knew each other, she responded, “You know that’s 18 years ago, I can’t recall specifically but we were a fairly small cohort. So, it would be highly likely that we all attended classes together. Especially since we all started the program, I believe, in the same time period.” She estimated the class cohort was about 20-25 students. Witness #2 said she was not aware of any issues or confrontations between NE#1 and the Complainant, and “[NE#1] was always very well loved and respected by all of his classmates.”

When prompted with the specific allegations in this case, Witness #2 stated, “I never recall that ever happening nor do I recall anybody ever discussing it. Pretty sure if something had happened and there was more, you know, that that would have spread around as like a rumor, or you know, conversation point because we are all so—such a small group.”

Analysis and Conclusions:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

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

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 shoved him into a urinal and drew his firearm at him.

SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10 requires that SPD employees “strive to be professional.” The policy further instructs that “employees may not engage in behavior that undermines public trust in the Department, the officer, or other officers” whether on or off duty. SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10.

Additionally, the policy instructs Department employees to “avoid unnecessary escalation of events even if those events do not end in reportable uses of force.” *Id.*

Had NE#1 shoved the Complainant into a urinal and drawn his firearm, as alleged, it would have violated SPD’s professionalism policy. It also would, very likely, have constituted a crime. See RCW 9A.46.020 (a person is guilty of harassment if, without authority, they threaten to cause bodily injury to a person and, by words or conduct, cause the threatened person to be in “reasonable fear” the threat would be carried out).

Here, OPA was able to verify that the Complainant attended the same program as NE#1. Moreover, based on the Complainant reaching out to Witness #1 through social media, OPA could also determine that, more likely than not, the Complainant was who he purported to be. Finally, the Complainant’s allegation was, on its face, plausible.

However, several other indicators cast some doubt on the Complainant’s allegation. First, the extreme passage of time between the incident and the complaint was notable. Second, OPA found no evidence that the Complainant relayed these allegations to anyone at the time they occurred or at any other time over the preceding 15 years. The Complainant said they were too “enthralled and upset” to do so, and neither witness was aware of the allegation at the time despite being in a small cohort of students. This passage of time is notable considering the level of intensity the Complainant now conveys his allegation. Third, NE#1 denied the allegations and described a relationship with firearms inconsistent with the allegations. Witness #2 also described NE#1’s character and temperament at the time of the alleged incident as being inconsistent with the allegations. Fourth, the nature of the altercation—“jokingly” pushing each other into urinals—was odd for individuals in their mid-to-late twenties and not fully explained by the Complainant.

Although not determinative on its own, OPA also assessed the background, tone, and phrasing used in the Complainant’s allegations. The Complainant said he was out drinking and reminiscing with an unidentified college friend when he recalled this incident. He then sent a message to an SPD Crime Prevention Coordinator from his cellphone. The message used shorthand and ended with qualifiers such as “this was years ago and nothing can be done now,” and “this is a fruitless effort.” The Complainant also expressed open antagonism towards NE#1 and law enforcement (“you will do nothing and nothing will be noted with him”; “I just wanted this on that asshole’s record when he slips up again”; “You can tell I don’t like him from my experiences with him”; “I know you’re not a cop. But this instance is precisely why people hate cops. They do stupid shit with no accountability and feel like they can do whatever they want”; “I am sickened by the state of what these people think they can do”).

OPA is charged with reaching administrative findings based on the preponderance of the evidence—that is determining what “more likely than not” occurred. This is true both for proving and disproving allegations. See OPA Manual section 7.1.¹ Although nothing conclusively proves or disproves the allegations in this case, that is not the standard that must be met. OPA finds that, more likely than not, this allegation did not occur or did not occur as alleged. In reaching this finding, OPA places particular weight on the combination of the following: the length of time between the alleged occurrence and the allegation being made, the lack of any awareness of

other students concerning this alleged incident, descriptions of NE#1's character at the time of the alleged incident from Witness #2, the Complainant's admitted current feelings towards NE#1, and the unexplained details concerning how the pushing incident started and how the incident concluded. Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2

5.001 POL 2. Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy, and Department Policy

SPD Policy 5.001-POL-2 requires that employees adhere to laws, City policy, and Department policy.

For the same reasons articulated above at Named Employee #1, Allegation #1, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

Footnote 1. “The OPA Director reviews completed investigations and issues recommended findings for each allegation using a preponderance of the evidence standard. Applying this standard, if the greater weight of the evidence—more than 50%—supports the allegation, the recommended finding will be ‘sustained.’ If the preponderance of the evidence shows that misconduct did not occur, or that minor misconduct occurred but is better handled through retraining and counseling, the recommended finding will be ‘not sustained.’” OPA Internal Operations and Training Manual, 7.1.