



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: OCTOBER 31, 2019

CASE NUMBER: 2019OPA-0341

Allegations of Misconduct & Director’s Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director’s Findings
# 1	5.001 - Standards and Duties 10. Employees Shall Strive to be Professional	Not Sustained (Unfounded)

This Closed Case Summary (CCS) represents the opinion of the OPA Director regarding the misconduct alleged and therefore sections are written in the first person.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Complainant alleged that during a public forum discussion the Named Employee failed to accurately provide information.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

This case was designated as an Expedited Investigation. This means that OPA, with the Office of Inspector General’s review and approval, believed that it could reach, and issue recommended findings based solely on its intake investigation and without interviewing the Named Employee. As such, the Named Employee was not interviewed as part of this case.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 - Allegations #1

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

OPA received an anonymous complaint that alleged that Named Employee #1 (NE#1) made an inaccurate statement during a public forum on April 23, 2019. At the time of that public forum, NE#1 was a candidate for the District 6 City Council position. NE#1 was asked how he voted on the latest Seattle Schools Education Levy. In response, NE#1 stated the following: “I showed up to work that day and asked my boss to go vote. I was still under the impression that we voted like we did in Florida where there’s a place to go. I would have voted yes.” The Complainant asserted that NE#1’s statement that he was a registered voter in Washington State in November of 2018 was untrue. The Complainant further alleged that NE#1: “clearly was not telling the truth in this political forum and this has to do with integrity and honesty of being a Seattle Police Officer.”

SPD Policy 5.001-POL-9 requires that SPD employees “strive to be professional at all times.” The policy further instructs that “employees may not engage in behavior that undermines public trust in the Department, the officer, or other officers.” (SPD Policy 5.001-POL-9.) The policy further states the following: “Any time employees represent the Department or identify themselves as police officers or Department employees, they will not use profanity directed as an insult or any language that is derogatory, contemptuous, or disrespectful toward any person.” (*Id.*)



The public forum in question was video recorded. A copy of the video was obtained by OPA, as well as a transcription of the questions posed to the candidates and their responses. This evidence contradicted the Complainant's characterization of NE#1's comments. Moreover, a review of King County Elections data indicated that NE#1 was, in fact, a registered voter in Washington State as of November of 2018. In addition, OPA's investigation yielded no evidence disproving NE#1's account that he intended to vote on the levy in the manner he described. Ultimately, the evidence in this case conclusively established that NE#1 did not make a false statement at the public forum or act unprofessionally in any respect.

For these reasons, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

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