



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: JUNE 25, 2025

FROM: INTERIM DIRECTOR BONNIE GLENN
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

CASE NUMBER: 2025OPA-0034

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional	Sustained
# 2	15.180 – Primary Investigations, 15.180-POL 5. Officers Shall Document All Primary Investigations on a Report	Not Sustained – Training Referral
Imposed Discipline		
Written Reprimand		

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), along with Witness Officer #1 (WO#1), responded to an assault call involving the Complainant, the alleged victim, and subsequently prepared an incident report documenting the incident. The Complainant alleged that NE#1's incident report was not thorough because it omitted his claim that the suspect tried to urinate on him. OPA also alleged that NE#1 acted unprofessionally by shouting at Community Member #1 (CM#1), "Move, bitch" and "fuck you think you are?"

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

During its intake investigation, OPA identified WO#1 allegedly preparing an inaccurate report. OPA sent WO#1's potential violation of SPD Policy 15.180-POL-5 (Officers Shall Document all Primary Investigations on a Report) to his chain of command for Supervisor Action.¹

On June 5, 2025, the Office of Inspector General certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

A. OPA Complaint

On January 30, 2025, the Complainant left a voicemail for OPA. He reported that his ex-girlfriend and her current partner (Boyfriend #1) were violating a no-contact order, and that Boyfriend #1 was repeatedly assaulting him. He

¹ A Supervisor Action generally involves a minor policy violation or performance issue the employee's supervisor addresses through training, communication, or coaching. See OPA Internal Operations and Training Manual section 5.4(B)(ii).



said the incident report documenting his claim was “written so poorly and wrongly.” Specifically, he said NE#1 failed to document his claim that Boyfriend #1 tried to urinate on him. His statements to OPA during his interview on February 6, 2025, were consistent with his statements on voicemail.

Furthermore, during its intake investigation, OPA identified NE#1 shouting at CM#1 while searching for Boyfriend #1. The details of this encounter are set forth below.

OPA investigated the complaint by reviewing the computer-aided dispatch (CAD) call report, body-worn video (BWV), and incident report. In addition to interviewing the Complainant, OPA also interviewed NE#1.

B. Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) Call Report and Body-Worn Video (BWV)

On December 7, 2024, at 2:27 PM, an assault was coded into CAD.

NE#1 and his partner, WO#1, responded to the Complainant’s location with their BWV activated, capturing the following:

NE#1 approached the Complainant on a sidewalk while WO#1 remained in their patrol vehicle. The Complainant reported being assaulted by Boyfriend #1. The Complainant reported that Boyfriend #1 exposed his penis and threatened to urinate on the Complainant. The Complainant then reported that Boyfriend #1 pushed him down. The Complainant believed Boyfriend #1 was likely around the corner, heading toward his ex-girlfriend’s residence. NE#1 told the Complainant that he would search for Boyfriend #1.

NE#1 entered the patrol vehicle and drove around the area while discussing details of the assault with WO#1. After several minutes of searching the area, NE#1 said he would drive through an alley. NE#1 then made a right turn into the alley, partially lowered his window, and stopped the patrol vehicle. CM#1 stood near the entrance, partially blocking NE#1’s path. NE#1 chirped his siren. The following conversation occurred:

CM#1: *The fuck you want?!*
NE#1: *Move, bitch!²*
WO#1: *Yo, move. What’s wrong with you, man?*
NE#1: *Fucking move out of the alley next time!*
CM#1: *I do what the fuck I want!*
NE#1: *Fuck you think you are?*

NE#1 entered the alley, radioed that they could not find Boyfriend #1, and returned to the Complainant.

After NE#1 and WO#1 approached the Complainant, he again reported that Boyfriend #1 had assaulted him. The Complainant repeated his prior claim that Boyfriend #1 exposed his penis and threatened to urinate on the Complainant. The Complainant showed NE#1 a picture of Boyfriend #1 and identified Boyfriend #1’s vehicle. WO#1 sought clarification about Boyfriend #1 exposing his penis. The Complainant said he saw Boyfriend #1’s penis, after which Boyfriend #1 threatened to urinate on him. WO#1 advised the Complainant to avoid the area. WO#1 also said

² CM#1 began walking away from the alley’s entrance.



they would document the incident and search for Boyfriend #1. NE#1 and WO#1 concluded their contact with the Complainant.

C. Incident Report

NE#1's incident report was consistent with OPA's BWV observations. Among other things, NE#1 documented, "[The Complainant] said [Boyfriend #1] pulled out his penis and flashed it at [the Complainant]."

D. OPA Interview

On March 24, 2025, OPA interviewed NE#1. OPA played the video capturing NE#1's interaction with CM#1 and asked NE#1 for his response. NE#1 explained:

Just I had a temper that day. Uh, he didn't move. I don't like to be challenged like that, especially in that area. Um, not uh professional at all, but it is what it is. It happened. He didn't want to move. Uh, I don't know what that little jerking was that he did, but it annoyed me, and uh, yeah. Didn't – that was I guess my way of de-escalating because if I felt like if I didn't do anything about it – if I didn't address it. Um, yeah, I don't know, but that's the way I reacted. Yeah.

OPA asked whether NE#1 was experiencing any personal issues that day, to which NE#1 replied no. He repeated that he was "in a temper that day." OPA requested NE#1 to clarify his statement about not wanting to be challenged. He explained, "Well, I feel like if you back down to a lot of these people, they'll kind of see some weakness." He clarified that "these people" referred to the "community at large." He further clarified:

I feel like if someone challenges you or, you know, sees some kind of weakness in an officer, their – they'll feel like they can get away with it or they can, I don't know, commit crime and something won't happen. It kind of seems like it's the reputation of this department, so I just didn't take it lightly.

OPA asked about NE#1's incident report, specifically about the difference between a person flashing his penis and a person trying to urinate on someone. NE#1 expressed uncertainty about this distinction but claimed to have not heard the Complainant reporting that Boyfriend #1 tried to urinate on him. He said he was in the middle of a different call at the time and the situation was somewhat chaotic. He said he was specifically attentive to the elements of assault while listening to the Complainant. He believed his incident report was complete, thorough, and accurate to the best of his knowledge.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

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

OPA alleged that NE#1 acted unprofessionally by shouting at CM#1, "Move, bitch" and "fuck you think you are?"

SPD employees must "strive to be professional." SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10. Further, "employees may not engage in behavior that undermines public trust in the Department, the officer, or other officers," whether on or off duty. *Id.* Employees will avoid unnecessary escalation of events, even if those events do not end in reportable uses of force.



Id. 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 anyone. *Id.*

NE#1's captured comments were derogatory, contemptuous, and disrespectful toward CM#1. NE#1 admitted to being unprofessional, annoyed, and having a temper on that day, yet he claimed his statements were his way of de-escalating. NE#1's reaction was, in fact, escalatory and reflected his anger toward CM#1 for merely failing to move out of the way. NE#1's statements violated SPD's professionalism standards and reflected negatively on NE#1 and the department.

Furthermore, OPA is troubled by NE#1's comments—that he did not appreciate being “challenged like that” by “these people.” Such an attitude conveys contempt and is unacceptable in the law enforcement profession, which is not meant for officers to exert dominance over the community members they are sworn to protect and serve. The department expects its employees to uphold its professionalism standards, even under hostile or challenging circumstances. Overall, NE#1's irate reaction to CM#1's failure to move was unwarranted and undermined public trust in the department.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2

15.180 – Primary Investigations, 15.180-POL-5. Officers Shall Document all Primary Investigations on a Report

The Complainant alleged that NE#1's incident report was unthorough because it omitted his claim that Boyfriend #1 tried to urinate on him.

Officers must document all primary investigations in a report. SPD Policy 15.180-POL-5. All reports must be complete, thorough, and accurate. *Id.*

NE#1's incident report was consistent with OPA's BWV observations. Although NE#1 documented the claim that Boyfriend #1 exposed his penis, he failed to document the claim that Boyfriend #1 threatened to urinate on the Complainant. The incident report would have been more complete and thorough had NE#1 clarified the circumstances in which Boyfriend #1 exposed his penis, particularly since the Complainant reported on three separate occasions that Boyfriend #1 threatened to urinate on him. NE#1 claimed to have not heard this specific detail and maintained that the situation was somewhat chaotic. OPA credits this explanation since other aspects of his incident report, especially the reported assault, were consistent with the information reported by the Complainant. Thus, OPA does not consider NE#1's omission to constitute misconduct but believes retraining in report writing is warranted.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Training Referral.

- **Required Training:** NE#1's chain of command should discuss OPA's findings with him, review SPD Policy 15.180-POL-5 with him, and provide any other retraining and counseling it deems necessary. This retraining



and counseling should emphasize the importance of taking notes during interviews with community members. Any retraining and counseling should be documented and maintained in Blue Team.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Training Referral**