

**Issued Date:** October 21, 2025

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



**Case Number:** 2025OPA-0168

---

### **Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings**

#### **Named Employee #1**

1. **Allegation #1:** 5.140 – Bias-Free Policing, 5.140-POL-2. Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing

**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)

2. **Allegation #2:** 15.180 – Primary Investigations, 15.180-POL-5. Officers Shall Document all Primary Investigations on a Report

**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:**

Named Employee #1 (NE#1) met with the Complainant to take a report on multiple incidents. The Complainant alleged that NE#1 prepared an inadequate report due to bias against his economic status, race, sexual orientation, and national origin.

#### **Administrative Note:**

During its intake investigation, OPA identified NE#1 failing to notify the Complainant that he was being recorded. OPA sent NE#1's potential violation of SPD Policy 16.090-POL-2(1) (Notification of Recording) to her chain of command for Supervisor Action.

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 June 12, 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 call report, body-worn video, incident report, text messages, the Complainant's report, and interview statements from the Complainant. Based on these records, a preponderance of the evidence showed the following:

On February 23, 2025, NE#1 met with the Complainant at a public library, where he provided NE#1 with a report documenting seven different incidents. Following this meeting, NE#1 returned to the West Precinct, reviewed the Complainant's report, and prepared an incident report documenting those seven incidents. According to NE#1's incident report, the Complainant noted that three incidents occurred at a homeless shelter and four incidents occurred throughout the City of Seattle. NE#1 wrote that the Complainant felt unsafe at the homeless shelter due to his sexuality, believed people were spying on him in the bathroom, and felt targeted by sex offenders there. NE#1 wrote that the Complainant left the homeless shelter, moved between various homeless shelters, and stayed at the airport until he was asked to leave. NE#1 wrote that other incidents, occurring on the bus or near bus stops, involved aggressive males who shouted at the Complainant and made him feel unsafe.

NE#1 later contacted the Complainant and advised him to call the police if someone followed him or behaved aggressively. NE#1 also submitted the Complainant's report into evidence.

---

### **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 exhibited bias against economic status, race, sexual orientation, and national origin.

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 economic status, race, sexual orientation, or national origin. 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.

OPA found no evidence of bias. The Complainant claimed to have experienced voyeurism, harassment, a hate crime, stalking, and an assault. However, the seven incidents he reported either did not constitute a crime or were outdated misdemeanors unlikely to result in an arrest or prosecution. Regardless of these circumstances, NE#1 still met with the Complainant, reviewed his report and documented it in her incident report, and advised him to call the police if he felt threatened. NE#1 also entered the Complainant's report into evidence, allowing for the possibility of further investigation or future criminal charges. Overall, OPA found no evidence indicating bias against the Complainant.

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

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

### **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 prepared an inadequate report.

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

OPA found NE#1's incident report consistent with the Complainant's report. Although NE#1's documentation of the Complainant's report was brief, it accurately summarized the seven incidents that the Complainant claimed to have occurred. NE#1 also documented the Complainant's emotions, noting his perception of being unsafe and targeted due to his sexuality. Even if the Complainant believed NE#1's incident report lacked detail, NE#1 submitted his report into evidence, permitting its reexamination should NE#1's incident report be inadequate in any way.

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

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