


Issued Date: January 28, 2026

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

Case Number: 2025OPA-0218

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

1. **Allegation #1: 15.140 - Domestic Violence Investigation - POL - 3 - Officers Will Make a Reasonable Effort to Protect the Victim and Arrest the Suspect**
Finding: Sustained
 2. **Allegation #2: 15.140 - Domestic Violence Investigation 15.140-POL 5. The Department is Committed to a Thorough Primary Investigation of Domestic Violence Incidents**
Finding: Sustained
 3. **Allegation #3: 15.140 – Domestic Violence Investigation – TSK – 1 Patrol Officer Primary Investigation of a Domestic Violence Incident**
Finding: Sustained
 4. **Allegation #4: 16.090 – In-Car and Body-Worn Video, 16.090-POL-2 Sworn Employees Recording Police Activity, 1. Notification of Recording.**
Finding: Not Sustained - Training Referral
- **Proposed Discipline: 9 Hours (One Day) to 27 Hours (Three Days) Suspension**
 - **Imposed Discipline: 18 Hours (Two Days) Suspension**
-

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) responded to a domestic violence (DV) call involving the Complainant and her ex-boyfriend (Community Member #1 or CM#1). The Complainant alleged that NE#1 conducted an

inadequate DV investigation. OPA also investigated whether NE#1 failed to notify the Complainant that she was being recorded.

Administrative Note:

On October 23, 2025, the Office of Inspector General certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

Summary of the Investigation:

OPA investigated this incident by reviewing the OPA complaint, computer-aided dispatch (CAD) call report, body-worn video (BWV), incident report, and interview statements from the Complainant and NE#1.

A. OPA Complaint and Complainant Interview

On May 23, 2025, the Complainant left OPA a voicemail, requesting to discuss an incident. On May 30 and June 6, 2025, OPA interviewed the Complainant. She reported that CM#1 took her purse containing \$5,000 and other belongings.¹ She said she then followed CM#1 to his apartment, where a conversation occurred, followed by CM#1 pushing her to the ground and fleeing. She claimed that NE#1 responded to the location several hours later but failed to investigate the incident or attempt to contact CM#1.

B. Computer-Aided Dispatch Call Report and Body-Worn Video

On May 22, 2025, at 8:25 AM, CAD coded an incident as DV assault, with the following call remarks:

YESTERDAY [REPORTING PARTY'S] BOYF[RIEND] THREW HER ON THE GROUND, STOLEN HER PURSE, MONEY, & PHONE. BOYF[RIEND] IS CURRENTLY AT HIS OWN [APARTMENT]. MEDICS DECLINED.

BWV captured NE#1 responding to an apartment building. Accompanied by an employee, NE#1 approached a unit and spoke with a resident, who told NE#1 that the Complainant was waiting outside. NE#1 went outside, located the Complainant, and began an interview without advising her that she was being recorded. She reported that she was asleep at a different location when CM#1 took her purse containing \$5,000. She said she later confronted CM#1 at this location to retrieve her belongings, but CM#1 told her to leave, pushed her down, and fled. She told NE#1 that she wanted her belongings returned or CM#1 to be jailed. NE#1 offered to document the incident and refer the report to the proper channels but cautioned that this process would not be quick. The Complainant clarified that she was

¹ The Complainant claimed to have received \$5,000 from a new landlord. On June 13, 2025, OPA contacted this purported landlord. He told OPA that he had given the Complainant \$5,000 as part of an agreement for her to vacate her apartment.

unable to retrieve any of her belongings, as CM#1 refused to speak with her. NE#1 replied, “Well, I will write a report, um, and see where it goes from there. Okay?” The Complainant acknowledged.

Two apartment employees approached the Complainant and NE#1. The Complainant repeated her account to them. She said CM#1 was home and claimed that several residents could corroborate CM#1’s theft of her belongings. One employee said the Complainant should have contacted staff due to a restraining order. The Complainant insisted that the restraining order had been dismissed due to CM#1’s failure to appear in court. She also claimed that CM#1 lied to obtain a temporary restraining order and had physically abused her. The employee said that regardless of the restraining order’s status, the Complainant was not permitted to be in the apartment building since she was not registered on any resident’s guest list. The Complainant clarified to NE#1 that CM#1 lived in this building, while she did not. She offered to show NE#1 the restraining order’s dismissal on her phone. During this process, the employee told NE#1 that the Complainant was not permitted to be on apartment property and explored the possibility of trespassing her. The Complainant was unable to locate the order’s dismissal on her phone.

NE#1 addressed the Complainant. NE#1 said that even if the order was ultimately dismissed, a judge initially deemed a temporary restraining order to be appropriate. NE#1 said the Complainant was not permitted to be on this property since she did not reside here and was no longer in a relationship with CM#1. NE#1 said he was not blaming her for the alleged incident but thought this incident would not have occurred had she stayed away. She clarified that CM#1 stole her purse at a different location, so she went to this location to retrieve it. NE#1 questioned her decision to confront CM#1 instead of calling the police. She insisted that a witness who had seen CM#1 take her purse was in CM#1’s apartment. She said an employee at the front desk called the police on her behalf, yet she had to wait three hours for the police to respond. NE#1 apologized for the delay, attributing it to the absence of an in-progress incident. She contested that characterization, claiming that CM#1 had just knocked her down. NE#1 clarified that by then, the incident had concluded, and she was unharmed since she declined a medical evaluation.

NE#1 escorted the Complainant to the sidewalk and issued a trespass warning. She asked whether NE#1 would contact CM#1, to which he replied, “I’m going to speak with them.² I’m going to write a report. I don’t know if I’m going to go banging on a door for something that you’re alleging occurred.” While crying, the Complainant replied, “Hold on. Let me get this straight. So, somebody can just – okay.” NE#1 advised her to have a better day and then concluded their interaction by saying, “I’m not going to stand here and argue with you.” NE#1 returned to the two apartment employees and told them that he would not disturb CM#1, as he believed the Complainant was not permitted to be at this location and regarded her allegation as retaliatory. NE#1 said he would prepare an incident report. The employees agreed to this resolution.

² NE#1’s reference to “them” was unclear but appeared to refer to the two apartment employees.

C. Named Employee #1 Interview

On October 14, 2025, OPA interviewed NE#1. After NE#1 provided a brief overview of the incident, he offered the following response:

I'm not contesting these [SPD policy violations]. I – I – I knew that I – I screwed up. You know, I felt – I feel bad about it. My – if – if you could see my disciplinary history, I've never done anything like this before. Um, I didn't believe a word she said, but that's not my job to determine that, and I – I guess I was having a bad day, and I just did not do my job on that call. I mean there's – there's no way around it. I mean you see the video, and you know what her allegations are. I think they're completely fabricated. However, like I said, that's not my job to determine, and I failed to investigate it

OPA discussed each SPD policy that NE#1 was alleged to have violated. NE#1 admitted to violating each policy.

Analysis and Conclusions:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

15.410 – Domestic Violence Investigation, 15.410-POL-3. Officers Will Make a Reasonable Effort to Protect the Victim and Arrest the Suspect

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 failed to take appropriate action when responding to a DV incident.

In DV investigations, officers will make a reasonable effort to protect the victim and arrest the suspect. SPD Policy 15.410-POL-3. When responding to a DV incident, officers will take specific actions. *See id.*

OPA sustains this allegation. The Complainant reported that CM#1, her ex-boyfriend, had pushed her to the ground. NE#1 was presented with information that, if true, would have constituted DV assault—an arrestable offense, even if had occurred outside the mandatory four-hour arrest period.³ Thus, the requirements outlined in SPD Policy-15.410-POL-3 would have been triggered at this moment. Policy required NE#1 to determine whether the call was a DV incident, handle the call with at least another officer, conduct a primary investigation, advise the Complainant of resources available to prevent further abuse, provide her with the SPD DV Resource Guide, explain the process for seeking a DV protection order, ask whether firearms or other deadly weapons were accessible to CM#1, and facilitate her transportation to a hospital, safe location, or shelter. NE#1 failed to take any of these actions. NE#1 only completed the requirement to document the incident, but even this he completed five days later, on May 27, 2025. NE#1 also inappropriately concluded—without interviewing CM#1 or any witnesses—that the Complainant's allegations were “completely fabricated” and retaliatory against CM#1. Such a

³ It is very possible the pushing incident occurred within the preceding four hours, but NE#1 did not clarify this with the Complainant.

conclusion could not have been reached based on limited information. Overall, a preponderance of the evidence showed NE#1's failure to take appropriate actions when responding to a DV incident.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2

15.410 – Domestic Violence Investigation, 15.410-POL-5. The Department is Committed to a Thorough Primary Investigation of Domestic Violence Incidents (See Manual Section 15.180 – Primary Investigations)

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 conducted an inadequate DV investigation.

SPD is committed to a thorough primary investigation of DV incidents. SPD Policy 15.410-POL-5. Besides following SPD Policy 15.180 (Primary Investigations), officers will attempt to obtain the DV history of the involved suspect, including information about previous victims; complete the DV supplement, including an assessment of the presence or ownership of firearms; and use the sworn affirmation when taking a statement from a victim or witness. *Id.*

OPA sustains this allegation. NE#1 did not conduct a thorough and complete search for evidence as required under SPD Policy 15.180. NE#1 did not interview CM#1 or any witnesses who reportedly observed the purported theft. NE#1 also did not attempt to corroborate other parts of the Complainant's account by, for example, seeking security footage of the alleged assault, if it existed, from the apartment employees or contacting the Complainant's new landlord to verify the \$5,000 payment. Additionally, SPD Policy 15.410-POL-5 required NE#1 to obtain CM#1's DV history, including information about prior victims; complete a DV supplement, including an assessment of the presence or ownership of firearms; and use the sworn affirmation when taking the Complainant's statement. NE#1 failed to take any of these actions. Thus, a preponderance of the evidence showed NE#1's failure to conduct a thorough primary investigation into a DV incident.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #3

15.410 – Domestic Violence Investigation, 15.410-TSK-1 Patrol Officer Primary Investigation of a Domestic Violence Incident

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 conducted an inadequate DV investigation.

When an officer is completing a DV investigation, the officer will take specific actions. SPD Policy 15.410-TSK-1.

OPA sustains this allegation. NE#1 responded to the scene, interviewed the Complainant, and, five days later, prepared an incident report. But NE#1 failed to take specific actions during the DV investigation as required. In addition to the deficiencies noted above, NE#1 did not coordinate CM#1's possible arrest, process the scene, photograph the Complainant's appearance, or instruct the Complainant to take photographs of injuries later. A particularly egregious oversight was NE#1's failure to verify whether the Complainant and CM#1 had any current court orders, especially since NE#1, the Complainant, and an apartment employee discussed the existence and status of a purported restraining order. Instead of verifying the order himself, NE#1 relied on the Complainant's representations. OPA appreciates NE#1's candor that he did not conduct a proper and thorough DV investigation during this call.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #4

16.090 – In-Car and Body-Worn Video, 16.090-POL-2 Sworn Employees Recording Police Activity, 1. Notification of Recording

NE#1 allegedly failed to notify the Complainant that she was being recorded.

Sworn employees will notify people that they are being recorded as soon as practical, and the notification will be on the recording. SPD Policy 16.090-POL-2(1).

Upon contacting the Complainant, NE#1 did not advise her that she was being recorded. NE#1 also did not provide this advisement at any other point during their encounter. On review of NE#1's record, OPA did not observe any prior Sustained findings, training referrals, or supervisor actions concerning BWV notifications. OPA issues a training referral on this issue and reminds NE#1 that future lapses may result in Sustained findings.

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

- **Training Referral:** NE#1's chain of command should discuss OPA's findings with NE#1, review SPD Policy 16.090-POL-2(1) with NE#1, and provide any further retraining and counseling that it deems appropriate. The retraining and counseling conducted should be documented in Blue Team.

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