




## ***CLOSED CASE SUMMARY***

ISSUED DATE: MAY 13, 2025

FROM: INTERIM DIRECTOR BONNIE GLENN  
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY 

CASE NUMBER: 2024OPA-0410

### **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 - Unfounded
# 2	5.001 - Standards and Duties; 15. Employees Obey any Lawful Order Issued by a Superior Officer	Not Sustained - Unfounded

#### **Named Employee #2**

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	5.002 - Responsibilities of Employees Concerning Alleged Policy Violations 5. Supervisors Will Investigate or Refer Allegations of Policy Violations Depending on the Severity of the Violation	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—an SPD sergeant—alleged her subordinate officer, Named Employee #1 (NE#1), was (1) insubordinate by attempting to work as an acting sergeant when she had told him he could not, and (2) dishonest by filing a complaint alleging she retaliated against him by not letting him work as an acting sergeant. The Complainant also alleged her Watch Commander, Named Employee #2 (NE#2), failed to appropriately investigate or refer her allegations when she attempted to report these to him.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:**

On May 2, 2025, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

### **SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:**

This case is one of several related investigations concerning a police officer and his sergeant. In this case, the sergeant is the Complainant. The police officer is NE#1. Their Watch Commander is NE#2.

The Complainant was assigned to supervise a patrol squad in April 2024. NE#1 was one of the police officers in NE#1's squad. Thereafter, NE#1 approached the Complainant about serving as an "acting" sergeant, when needed. The Complainant and NE#1 also engaged in texting each other and meeting for coffee—the exact nature of their



interactions over text and in person are central to these series of cases. Around the end of July or early August 2024, the Complainant received permission for NE#1 to work as an acting sergeant from their then-Watch Commander and Precinct Commander. Around this same time, the Complainant invited NE#1 to her house for a party or get-together. NE#1 did not attend.

NE#1 was on vacation during some of August 2024. On August 5, 2024, NE#1 worked an extra shift during his vacation. According to NE#1, he told the Complainant during that shift that “we need to put a stop on this, you know, my wife is getting very upset.” The Complainant’s recollection of this event differs; she characterizes it as her telling him they could only be friends.

On September 10, 2024, NE#1 came to work. A permanent acting sergeant asked him to work as an acting sergeant for the day. NE#1 contacted the Complainant for her to change his pay rate for the day to reflect the acting sergeant rate and to get him access to timekeeping and report approval. The Complainant did not do this and emailed NE#2 and all sergeants and acting sergeants on their watch. The email read: “I already have a meeting set with [NE#2] in which I’ll be discussing [NE#1] being able to be an acting Sgt. this wasn’t finalized prior to [former Watch Commander] leaving for various reasons. Please do not ask him to act at this time.”

Thereafter, a series of back-and-forth allegations were filed between the Complainant and NE#1. An outline of these cases is provided in “Case Timelines” below.

## **1. Case Timelines**

The timelines of the OPA cases<sup>1</sup> involving the Complainant and NE#1 are:

- 2024OPA-0363: On September 11, 2024, NE#1 reported that the Complainant was retaliating against him by not allowing him to work as an Acting Sergeant.<sup>2</sup> The Complainant received her Classification Notice on October 11, 2024. OPA recommended findings in this case on May 6, 2025.
- 2024OPA-0405: On October 15, 2024, the Complainant alleged NE#1 physically assaulted her on August 5, 2024, by putting his hand over her mouth to prevent her from speaking to another sergeant. NE#1 received his Classification Notice on February 27, 2025. This investigation is ongoing.
- 2024OPA-0410 (this case): On October 22, 2024, the Complainant alleged NE#1, (1) was insubordinate by attempting to work as an acting sergeant when she had told him he could not, (2) retaliated against her by filing a complaint against her before she could report him for insubordination, sexually harassing texts on August 29, 2024, and the physical assault, (3) was dishonest by filing a complaint alleging she retaliated against him by not letting him work as an acting sergeant, and (4) discriminated against her due to her gender. The Complainant also alleged NE#2 refused to let her report these violations on September 13, 2024. NE#1 received his EEO Classification Notice on November 4, 2024, and OPA Classification Notice on November 15, 2024.

<sup>1</sup> SPD’s EEO Office and the City of Seattle Human Resources are also investigating other aspects of the allegations between the Complainant and NE#1 that are within their respective jurisdictions.

<sup>2</sup> The Complainant’s union gave this information to the Complainant’s Watch Commander on September 10, 2024.



- 2024OPA-0437: On November 10, 2024, NE#1 alleged the Complainant's allegations in this case, 2024OPA-0410, were retaliation against him. The Complainant received her Classification Notice on December 11, 2024. OPA recommended findings in this case on May 6, 2025.
- 2025OPA-0046: On February 7, 2025, OPA alleged the Complainant was not truthful or complete and failed to fully cooperate during her January 14, 2025, OPA interview in 2024OPA-0363 when she denied sending sexual text messages to NE#1. The Complainant received her Classification Notice on February 13, 2025. This investigation is ongoing.
- 2025OPA-0147: On April 23, 2025, a complaint was filed that remains in the intake phase. No Classification Notice has been sent. The details of this complaint are not specified in this DCM to maintain the integrity of this investigation.

## **2. Summary of Evidence**

The evidentiary background of this case is summarized in the DCM for 2024OPA-0363.

The Complainant, NE#1, and NE#2 were all interviewed specifically for this case.

### *a. Complainant*

The Complainant stated NE#1 filed dishonest OPA and EEO complaints against her, and that NE#1 was insubordinate by working as an acting sergeant.

The Complainant stated NE#1 should not work as an acting sergeant because he did not have the ability to approve reports. The Complainant alleged NE#1 "knew" this, despite admitting that she did not document a training plan with NE#1. The Complainant also admitted she never told NE#1 directly that he could not be an acting sergeant. Instead, she stated, "he understood that he needed to be trained and so, in my mind, well, I mean, that speaks for itself. He, he had an understanding that he needed to be trained prior to that, and we talked about the reasons why he needed to be trained." The Complainant said the first time she ever told him he could not work as an acting sergeant without a permanent rank sergeant present was over the phone on September 10, 2024.

The Complainant also indicated that NE#1's August 31, 2024, text messages to her indicated that he sexually propositioned her.

The Complainant described her "meeting" with NE#2 on September 13, 2024, as "no meeting." The Complainant stated NE#2 told her that a complaint had been filed against her, so she was unable to provide NE#2 with her allegations that NE#1 was insubordinate, harassing, and assaultive. The Complainant's assault allegations is being investigated under OPA case number 2024OPA-0405.

The Complainant also expressed her reasons for believing the investigations were "biased" against her because she heard that NE#2 told NE#1 that he was "the victim" in the case and the EEO investigator expressed concern to NE#1 that the Complainant might retaliate against NE#1.



---

*b. Named Employee #1*

NE#1 described his experience working as an acting sergeant, noting he had first served as an acting sergeant several years prior to the incident giving rise to these complaints. NE#1 stated that the Complainant had an unofficial training plan to show him time entry and similar processes, but there was no formal training plan in place. He said the Complainant did not tell him he could not work as an acting sergeant prior to September 10, 2024.

NE#1 described initially taking his concerns about the Complainant's behavior to his union president, seeking only to facilitate a change in assignment. NE#1 said that his union president sent his concerns to NE#2, who then filed an EEO complaint on his behalf. NE#1 said that, thereafter, NE#2 permitted him to work as an acting sergeant. NE#1 also said it was not possible for him to be insubordinate as he was working as an acting sergeant under permission from his former and current Watch Commanders, both lieutenants.

*Named Employee #2*

NE#2 stated NE#1 told him on September 11, 2024, that he had been receiving unwanted text messages from the Complainant for weeks or months, had told the Complainant to stop, and that the Complainant retaliated against him. NE#2 said he referred these allegations to SPD EEO, after which the EEO investigator told him she would refer allegations to OPA. NE#2 said the only issue anyone ever raised with him regarding NE#1 working as an acting sergeant was the Complainant's September 10 email. NE#2 said he had no information that would give him concern about NE#1 working in an acting sergeant capacity and that, ultimately, this was the watch and precinct commanders' decision.

NE#2 stated that NE#1 expressed fear of retaliation from the Complainant.

NE#2 also said that the September 13, 2024, meeting between himself and the Complainant was originally to discuss a pursuit that had occurred—not to discuss any issues between the Complainant and NE#1. After the Complainant sent the September 10 email, they were also going to discuss her concerns about NE#1 working as an acting sergeant. He said that, prior to the meeting, his precinct captain told him to inform the Complainant that a complaint had been filed and to keep her interactions with officers professional, based solely on the operational needs of the department, and not to delete or alter any evidence.

NE#2 said that, at the September 13 meeting with the Complainant, they briefly discussed the pursuit, but the Complainant kept discussing the EEO complaint. NE#2 said that, after he told the Complainant there had been a complaint, she immediately discerned it was from NE#1 without any additional information from him. NE#2 described the Complainant as becoming extremely emotional to the point of crying, sobbing, and being unable to catch her breath. NE#2 recalled the Complainant saying she wanted to file an EEO complaint against NE#1. NE#2 said he had previously discussed this possibility with the EEO investigator. NE#2 said he cautioned the Complainant that filing an EEO complaint immediately after getting notice of NE#1's complaint could be viewed as retaliation. NE#2 said he told the Complainant to wait until she was called by the EEO investigator to provide her side of the story. NE#2 said that the Complainant agreed to this course of action at the time.

Concerning the Complainant's assault allegations, NE#2 said he was not able to clearly discern that the Complainant was trying to report an assault. He said the Complainant reported that NE#1 had touched her mouth at one point, but he believed this occurred months in the past and was related to the EEO complaint and not a separate criminal allegation. NE#2 also said it was hard to understand the Complainant because she was so upset.



NE#2 acknowledged stopping the Complainant from continuing to talk. NE#2 said that the Complainant started talking about the nature of her relationship with NE#1, which NE#2 understood to be the subject of the EEO complaint. He said he informed the Complainant she should not discuss an open complaint with him as he was not an EEO investigator and no longer worked for OPA.<sup>3</sup>

NE#2 stated he believed he complied with policy, noting that the Complainant's union representative was present and agreed with him that immediately filing a complaint against NE#1 could be viewed as retaliatory.

**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***

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 filed dishonest EEO and OPA allegations against her.

SPD Policy 5.001-POL-11 requires Department employees to be truthful and complete in all communications.

As discussed in 2024OPA-0363, resolving this serious allegation requires OPA to determine which of two narratives — the Complainant's or NE#1's — is more likely to have occurred. Broadly, both parties agree that the Complainant started as the Complainant's supervisor in April 2024. Thereafter, two things happened, (1) NE#1 expressed interest in working as an acting sergeant, and (2) the Complainant and NE#1 began sending each other "flirty" text messages. They also agree that, after August 5, 2024, the nature of their relationship changed. Both allege the other acted inappropriately, and those crisscrossing allegations are being managed between OPA, SPD EEO, and SDHR.

OPA finds the Complainant's allegation that NE#1 was dishonest to be unfounded. First, the Complainant's allegation here is that NE#1 retaliation allegation in 2024OPA-0363 was dishonest. Not so. OPA recommended a sustained finding in 2024OPA-0363, against the Complainant. Second, OPA is unable to identify any communications that NE#1 made that were untrue, even by a preponderance of the evidence standard. Finally, for the reasons articulated in 2024OPA-0363, OPA finds NE#1's version of events more credible than the Complainant's.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

**Named Employee #1 — Allegation #2**

***5.001 — Standards and Duties; 15. Employees Obey any Lawful Order Issued by a Superior Officer***

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 was insubordinate by working as an acting sergeant without a permanent rank sergeant present.

SPD Policy 5.001-POL-15 requires that Department employees obey any lawful order issued by a superior officer. The failure to do so constitutes insubordination.

---

<sup>3</sup> NE#2 previously worked as an OPA sergeant investigator under a previous OPA administration.



This allegation is unfounded for two reasons. First, the Complainant admitted that, prior to September 10, 2024, she did not explicitly order NE#1 that he was prohibited from working as an acting sergeant without a permanent rank sergeant present. Second, the Complainant could not unilaterally override the decisions of the Watch Commander and Precinct Commander to approve NE#1 to work as an acting sergeant.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

**Named Employee #2 — Allegation #1**

***5.002 — Responsibilities of Employees Concerning Alleged Policy Violations 5. Supervisors Will Investigate or Refer Allegations of Policy Violations Depending on the Severity of the Violation***

The Complainant alleged that NE#2 failed to investigate or refer her allegations of misconduct against NE#1.

SPD Policy 5.002-POL-5 requires supervisors who become aware of a potential policy violation to investigate or refer the allegations depending on their severity. Minor allegations of misconduct may be investigated by a supervisor, while allegations of serious misconduct – such as the use of excessive force – must be referred to OPA. SPD Policy 5.002-POL-5.

This allegation is unfounded. Prior to the September 13, 2024, meeting between the Complainant and NE#2, the agenda for their meeting was to discuss an unrelated pursuit and then, per the Complainant's September 10 email, "[NE#1] being able to be an acting Sgt." No mention was made that the Complainant may have misconduct allegations to make against NE#1, nor did anything prevent the Complainant from reporting her allegations to OPA, EEO, or the chain of command earlier. Between September 10 and September 13, NE#1 raised his allegations against the Complainant with both his union and NE#2. NE#2 referred NE#1's allegations to SPD EEO and was informed that allegations would also be investigated by OPA. According to NE#2, he and the EEO investigator also discussed the possibility the Complainant may file an EEO allegation against NE#1. NE#2 said he and the EEO investigator agreed that the Complainant could present any of her allegations against NE#1 to the EEO investigator during her EEO interview.

Even according to the Complainant's written complaint in this case, NE#2 did not prevent her from speaking to him entirely. Instead, he told her that she would need a union representative with her for their meeting. The Complainant noted she reported her allegations to her union representative at that time. According to NE#2, they proceeded with their conversation with the Complainant's union representative present, and all agreed at that time that it could be seen as retaliatory for the Complainant to report her allegations then.

Here, NE#2's decision to tell the Complainant to have a union representative present before speaking with her was prudent. This did not prevent the Complainant from providing her side of the story or making allegation against NE#1 but instead ensured that an incident that was already under investigation was handled under the appropriate process.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**