



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: MARCH 11, 2025

FROM: INTERIM DIRECTOR BONNIE GLENN
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

CASE NUMBER: 2024OPA-0384

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	5.140 – Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing	Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)
# 2	5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-6. Employees May Use Discretion	Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper (Expedited)

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:

Named Employee #1 (NE#1) responded to an assault call involving the Complainant's daughter, Community Member #1 (CM#1), who was the alleged victim. The Complainant alleged that NE#1 exercised unreasonable discretion by leaving CM#1 on a bench, where CM#1 allegedly fell and struck her head. The Complainant also alleged that NE#1 was racially and economically biased against CM#1.

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 October 24, 2024, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

OPA investigated the complaint by reviewing the computer-aided dispatch (CAD) call report, body-worn video (BWV), and incident report. OPA also interviewed the Complainant.

On March 11, 2024, CAD call remarks noted a 911 caller reporting an incident involving a male who had tackled a female to the ground, causing her to lose consciousness. Per the CAD call, the male appeared to get in his vehicle and had no weapons. NE#1 drove to the incident location with his BWV activated, capturing the following events. Upon arrival NE#1 was approached by an armed security guard from across the street. The security guard told his Field Training Officer (FTO) that he heard something, and ran across to see if someone had been hit by a car. NE#1's BWV shows a backing police officer talking to a fellow backing police officer and to CM#1's friend (Friend #1). NE#1 talks



to another officer about what happened and walks over to Friend #1 who was standing nearby and discussed the suspects description.

BWV captures CM#1 seated on a bench along a sidewalk while NE#1 and two backing officers investigated the incident. The officers interviewed CM#1's friend (Friend #1), who reported that a male tackled CM#1, causing CM#1's head to strike the pavement. NE#1's passenger—an American Medical Response emergency medical technician (EMT#1)—evaluated CM#1 and advised her to visit a hospital due to her head injury.¹ Although CM#1 was responsive to questions, she did not recall what had occurred. EMT#1 told NE#1 that she believed CM#1 had a seizure. Seattle Fire Department (SFD) personnel arrived and evaluated CM#1, who declined medical assistance. Friend #1 said another friend would come to pick them up. Although the officers initially agreed to wait for the friend's arrival, a shooting was reported over radio. NE#1 told CM#1 and Friend #1 that he needed to respond to the shooting and asked if they would be alright on their own. Friend #1 said they would be fine. NE#1 said he would return to the scene to check on them.

NE#1's incident report stated that upon his return to the scene, he discovered CM#1 and Friend #1 still present at the location, with CM#1's condition worsening. NE#1 wrote that CM#1 vomited, was nonresponsive, and collapsed forward, resembling a seizure. NE#1 wrote that CM#1 was subsequently transported to a hospital.

During her OPA interview, the Complainant reported that following the officers' departure, CM#1 fell from the bench and struck her head, causing her to lose consciousness. She believed the officers should not have moved CM#1 to the bench. She also alleged that NE#1 was racially and economically biased against CM#1.

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

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 was racially and economically biased against CM#1.

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 or economic status. *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.

NE#1 and the backing officers investigated the incident, interviewed relevant witnesses, and summoned SFD personnel to evaluate CM#1. NE#1 prioritized CM#1's well-being before departing. OPA found no evidence supporting the Complainant's allegation of racial or economic bias.

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

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

¹ The EMT was a ride-along observer who was employed by AMR.



Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2

5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-6. Employees May Use Discretion

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 exercised unreasonable discretion by leaving CM#1 on a bench.

Employees are authorized and expected to use discretion in a reasonable manner consistent with the department's mission and duties of their office and assignment. SPD Policy 5.001-POL-6. Discretion is proportional to the severity of the crime or public safety issue being addressed. *Id.*

NE#1 and the backing officers found CM#1 seated on a bench upon their arrival. They did not move her. CM#1 was alert and responsive to the officers, although she could not remember the events that transpired. SFD personnel were summoned to evaluate CM#1, who ultimately declined medical assistance. NE#1 ensured CM#1's well-being before departing. NE#1 could not be held responsible for CM#1's deteriorating condition, as it was not foreseeable based on the information available to NE#1. Overall, NE#1 exercised reasonable discretion under the circumstances.

Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper (Expedited).

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper (Expedited)**