




CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: AUGUST 1, 2023

FROM: DIRECTOR GINO BETTS 
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

CASE NUMBER: 2023OPA-0062

Allegations of Misconduct & Director’s Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director’s Findings
# 1	5.001 - Standards and Duties 5.001-POL 11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication	Not Sustained - Inconclusive

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—a Seattle Police Department (SPD) Human Resources (HR) employee—alleged that the named employee (NE) was untruthful about being offered job accommodations.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

On July 12, 2023, the Office of Inspector General (OIG) certified OPA’s investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

On July 6, 2022, SPD’s HR issued NE a six-month medical accommodation. During that period, NE was permitted to forego forklift training—a requirement for her then position—while the department helped NE find a suitable alternate city position. The accommodation letter noted that if NE did not have a new job by January 6, 2023, NE would go on unpaid leave for another six months while the job search continued.

OPA reviewed several emails between Witness Employee #1 (WE#1)—an SPD HR employee—and NE, including four job listings WE#1 sent NE on August 1, 2022. Emails from September 2022 included NE expressing interest in a Seattle Fire Department job listing and WE#1 asking about NE’s job interview. On January 9, 2023, NE’s union requested additional job listings. On January 24, 2023, WE#1 sent NE three more listings.

On January 30, 2023, the Complainant and Witness Employee #2 (WE#2), a chief evidence warehouse, met with NE about her job search status. The Complainant noted that during that meeting, NE claimed that SPD HR never notified her about job openings. Following that meeting, the Complainant received emails from WE#1 showing that NE was sent nine potential job opportunities over five months.

OPA interviewed the Complainant, whose account was consistent with her OPA complaint. Additionally, she noted that during her January 30th meeting with NE, NE disputed several key elements related to her job accommodation,



including being offered a demotion—from senior evidence warehouse to evidence warehouse—and HR’s assistance with finding a new role.

OPA also interviewed WE#2, who agreed that NE claimed HR failed to offer her an alternate position. WE#2 said the Complainant confronted NE about several opportunities sent from HR, and NE replied that she was uninterested in those jobs because they did not pay enough.

NE separated from SPD before she could be compelled to participate in an OPA interview, and she did not respond to requests for a voluntary interview.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 - Allegation #1

5.001 - Standards and Duties 5.001-POL 11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication

Employees must be truthful and complete in all communications. SPD Policy 5.001-POL-11. The Seattle Police Officers’ Guild’s collective bargaining agreement (SPOG CBA) notes that a sustained complaint involving dishonesty during an officer’s official duties carries a “presumption of termination.” SPOG CBA, at § 3.1. Therefore, for termination cases where the allegation is stigmatizing to a law enforcement officer, the standard of review is elevated (i.e., more than a preponderance of the evidence). *Id.*

Here, the Complainant and WE#2 stated that, during their January 30th meeting, NE claimed she never received job options from HR. However, emails from WE#1 directly dispelled that claim. Still, WE#2 noted that when the Complainant confronted NE about opportunities provided by HR, NE clarified that she meant HR did not provide her with job openings that met her interest. For that reason, there is insufficient evidence that NE was dishonest rather than unclear—particularly when dishonesty allegations are stigmatizing.¹

Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Inconclusive.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained - Inconclusive**

¹ OPA recognizes that NE is no longer an SPD employee and unrepresented by SPOG, but the stigma of a dishonesty allegation is no less damaging.