

Issued Date: October 14, 2025

From: Interim Deputy Director Nelson Leese (on behalf of Interim Director Bonnie Glenn)
Office of Police Accountability



Case Number: 2025OPA-0151

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

1. **Allegation #1:** 15.180 – Primary Investigations, 15.180-POL-5. Officers Shall Document all Primary Investigations on a Report

Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)

2. **Allegation #2:** 6.180 – Searches-General, 6.180-POL-1 Community Caretaking Searches, 1. Officers May Perform Warrantless Community Caretaking Searches Under Specific Circumstances

Finding: Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper (Expedited)

Named Employee #2

1. **Allegation #1:** 15.180 – Primary Investigations, 15.180-POL-5. Officers Shall Document all Primary Investigations on a Report

Finding: Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)

2. **Allegation #2:** 6.180 – Searches-General, 6.180-POL-1 Community Caretaking Searches, 1. Officers May Perform Warrantless Community Caretaking Searches Under Specific Circumstances

Finding: 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 may be written in the first person.

Executive Summary:

The named employees (NE#1 and NE#2) responded to a townhouse following a call concerning a

missing person. The Complainant alleged that the named employees unlawfully entered her townhouse for a welfare check based on unreliable information from Mother. The Complainant also alleged that the police reports were inaccurate.

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 employees. As such, OPA did not interview the named employees in this case.

On May 28, 2025, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

Summary of the Investigation:

OPA's investigation included reviewing the OPA complaint, computer-aided dispatch (CAD) call report, body worn video (BWV), missing persons and supplement reports, and interview statements from the Complainant. Based on these records, OPA finds the following have occurred:

On December 3, 2024, NE#2 responded to the Complainant's townhouse following Mother's 911 call concerning her missing daughter. Mother reported that her last communication with the Complainant occurred about three weeks ago, which she found unusual because they typically communicated several times each week. Mother said her calls to the Complainant went directly to voicemail and were not returned. Mother said the Complainant's online business indicated that it was on a break. Out of concern, Mother traveled from Hawaii, her residence, to Seattle. NE#2 spoke with a neighbor, who said he had not seen the Complainant for some time. NE#2 inspected the doors and windows of the townhouse, searched for a spare key, and requested dispatch to check local hospitals and vehicle registrations under the Complainant's name. Dispatch reported no findings. NE#1, a sergeant, arrived and authorized a warrantless entry. After NE#2 forced entry, the Complainant was not found inside the townhouse. NE#2 later learned that the Complainant was on vacation.

Analysis and Conclusions:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

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

The Complainant alleged that the police reports were inaccurate.

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

The named employees' missing persons and supplement reports were complete, thorough, and accurate. Although the Complainant pointed out several putative inaccuracies within the reports, the named employees documented information as it was reported to them. The named employees often cited Mother as the source of their information throughout their reports. Finally, the reports were consistent with OPA's BWV observations. There was no indication that either named employee intentionally or recklessly entered inaccurate information, even if some information they were provided later turned out to be incorrect.

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

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

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2

6.180 – Searches-General, 6.180-POL-1 Community Caretaking Searches, 1. Officers May Perform Warrantless Community Caretaking Searches Under Specific Circumstances

The Complainant alleged that the named employees unlawfully entered her townhouse for a welfare check based on unreliable information from Mother.

An officer may conduct a warrantless community caretaking search when: (1) the officer has a subjective belief that someone likely needs assistance for health or safety concerns; (2) a reasonable person in the same situation would similarly believe there is a need for assistance; (3) there is a reasonable basis to associate the need for assistance with the place searched; (4) there is an imminent threat of substantial bodily injury to persons or substantial damage to property; and (5) a specific person or property needs immediate help for health or safety reasons. SPD Policy 6.180 POL-1(1).

There was no indication at the time that Mother's information was unreliable. The named employees were presented with information that, when considered collectively, would suggest the Complainant might have needed assistance. Here, Mother abruptly lost contact with the Complainant, a neighbor had not seen the Complainant for some time, the Complainant's voicemail and website were not being managed, and Mother was so concerned that she traveled from Hawaii to Seattle. NE#2 also attempted to locate the Complainant through a hospital check, although this was unsuccessful. The named employees were genuinely concerned that the Complainant might have experienced a

medical emergency. Given these circumstances, the requirements for a community caretaking search were met, justifying a warrantless entry.

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

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #1

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

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

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

Named Employee #2 – Allegation #2

6.180 – Searches-General, 6.180-POL-1 Community Caretaking Searches, 1. Officers May Perform Warrantless Community Caretaking Searches Under Specific Circumstances

For the reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper (Expedited).

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