

**Issued Date:** April 10, 2026

**From:** Director Bonnie Glenn  
Office of Police Accountability



**Case Number:** 2025OPA-0418

---

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

**Named Employee #1**

- 1. Allegation #1:** 5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded
  - 2. Allegation #2:** 5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded
- 

**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 Complainant previously worked as a civilian administrative employee in SPD's Background Investigation Unit (BIU) but reapplied for her former job and was offered the position. However, SPD's human resources (HR) later rescinded the offer. The Complainant alleged that Named Employee #1 (NE#1), a BIU sergeant on the incident date, was dishonest about the reasons for the offer rescission and wrongfully blamed her for improper hiring incentive payments.

**Administrative Note:**

On March 18, 2026, 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, text messages, and email correspondence. OPA also interviewed the Complainant, four witness employees (WE#1 through WE#4), and NE#1.

### **A. OPA Complaint and Complainant Interview**

On October 21, 2025, the Complainant submitted an OPA complaint, alleging dishonest and unprofessional conduct from NE#1. On November 12, 2025, OPA interviewed the Complainant. She said she worked in BIU for about 11 years until her resignation around July or August 2025. She said NE#1 contacted her, asking if she wanted to return, as the HR director indicated that her return might be possible. She said she reapplied for her position, interviewed in September 2025, and received a job offer. She said that in October 2025, she learned that she was being blamed for the improper payment of hiring incentives. She said she received an email from SPD HR informing her that her start date was being postponed, but when she asked NE#1 about it, she said NE#1 expressed uncertainty. She said she received an email on October 9, 2025, from WE#3, indicating that her job offer had been rescinded. She said she contacted NE#1, who replied that the position would not be reopened.

The Complainant told OPA that BIU has weekly meetings, during which NE#1 informed staff that she would be returning, only to later announce in a subsequent meeting that she would not be returning. She said NE#1 blamed her for the improper hiring incentive payments and communicated these concerns to command staff. She said she lacked the authority to approve the payments and was uninvolved in that process. She said her duties included handling moving expenses. She emphasized that NE#1 and the HR director approved her return, only for her offer to be rescinded later. She believed that NE#1 blamed her for the improper payments because NE#1 was seeking a promotion to lieutenant, which could be jeopardized had he been blamed for those payments.

### **B. Text Messages and Email Correspondence**

The Complainant submitted screenshots showing a text conversation between NE#1 and herself. The text messages discussed the possibility of the Complainant's return to SPD and the associated process. The text messages indicated that the HR director approved the Complainant's return. Later in the text messages, the Complainant asked NE#1 about the situation, to which NE#1 expressed uncertainty but indicated that "[s]omething came up" requiring the chief's and deputy chief's involvement. NE#1 explained that he lacked clarity to the process, which he described as a "command level decision." NE#1 later clarified that the position had been closed and would not be reopened. NE#1 maintained that he was unaware of the circumstances.

Emails between the Complainant and SPD HR indicated that the Complainant discussed the position with HR. The Complainant received a job offer, with a start date of October 8, 2025. The Complainant was later notified of a postponement, followed by a formal letter indicating that the job

offer had been rescinded. The letter did not provide a reason for the rescission. The Complainant requested an explanation but was referred to the letter.

OPA searched for email records to verify whether there was any documentation regarding the improper hiring incentive payments. OPA narrowed the search parameters and located an email exchange between the Complainant and one candidate. In one email, the Complainant apologized to the candidate for sending the wrong paperwork.

### **C. Interviews of the Witness Employees (WE#1 through WE#4) and NE#1**

#### Witness Employee #1

On January 2, 2026, OPA interviewed WE#1, who identified himself as an HR sergeant. WE#1 said the Complainant was expected to return to SPD, but he learned that the position had been placed on hold. WE#1 said he asked NE#1 for the reason, but NE#1 expressed uncertainty. WE#1 said NE#1 reported “concerns” but did not clarify those “concerns,” and WE#1 did not seek clarification. WE#1 said he later learned that the Complainant would not be returning. WE#1 recalled hearing about an issue concerning hiring incentive payments but did not hear this from NE#1.

#### Witness Employee #2

On January 7, 2026, OPA interviewed WE#2, who identified himself as an HR detective. WE#2 said he learned that the Complainant would not be returning to SPD but was not told about the reason. WE#2 said NE#1 expressed “concerns” about the Complainant’s return. WE#2 said NE#1 indicated that the Complainant was involved in a process concerning seven improper \$50,000 hiring incentive payments. WE#2 believed that the Complainant handled some paperwork in her role. WE#2 said he told the Complainant that NE#1 communicated in a meeting that the Complainant would not be returning due to improper hiring incentive payments. However, WE#2 clarified with OPA that he was unsure about whether this was the real reason for the offer rescission.

#### Witness Employee #3

On January 14, 2026, OPA interviewed WE#3, who identified herself as HR’s deputy director. WE#3 said she is authorized to make hiring decisions. WE#3 said that, with the HR director’s approval, the Complainant was selected to fill the position, so an offer letter was sent to her. WE#3 said some time later, the HR director instructed HR staff to notify the Complainant that the position would be placed on hold. WE#3 said the HR director told her that the offer needed to be rescinded, so she sent a rescission letter to the Complainant. WE#3 said communications with the Complainant did not include a reason for the hold or rescission. WE#3 said a rescission, while uncommon, could occur due to issues in backgrounding or budget constraints that eliminate the position.

WE#3 said NE#1 did not contact her to express concerns about the Complainant. WE#3 said hiring incentive payments are handled through the sworn hiring process in which she does not participate. WE#3 said BIU is responsible for verifying and approving hiring incentive payments, which are forwarded to the Payroll Unit. WE#3 denied knowing the circumstances of this incident. WE#3 said

the Complainant worked in BIU and completed paperwork but was unsure about the Complainant's specific duties.

#### Named Employee #1

On January 15, 2026, OPA interviewed NE#1. NE#1 said his duties included supervising detectives and conducting background investigations. NE#1 said the Complainant worked as a BIU administrative employee for about 10 years before voluntarily relocating out of state. NE#1 said the HR director selected the candidate for the open position. NE#1 said he did not participate in the civilian hiring process. NE#1 said that after the Complainant was given the offer, he became aware of improper hiring incentive payments that resulted in seven candidates each receiving an overpayment of \$42,500, likely due to a clerical error. NE#1 said he was uninvolved in discussions about how this issue would impact the Complainant's return. NE#1 said the HR director notified him of the Complainant's postponed start date and the subsequent offer rescission. NE#1 emphasized that he did not provide any input on these decisions and was not informed of the reasons.

NE#1 said he had no concerns about the Complainant's return at the time the offer was given. Although NE#1 said he did not participate in the process of rescinding the offer, he assumed the overpayments were the reason. NE#1 said the Complainant's duties related to the hiring incentive payment process included sending the final offer letter and associated paperwork to the candidates, receiving them, and reviewing them with HR employees. NE#1 said he did not participate in the investigation concerning the overpayments. NE#1 confirmed that he told detectives that the Complainant's offer was rescinded due to the hiring incentive payments, as he assumed that was the reason for the rescission. NE#1 denied blaming the Complainant to protect himself, noting that he did not send the wrong paperwork to the candidates.

#### Witness Employee #4

On March 5, 2026, OPA interviewed WE#4, who identified herself as SPD's deputy chief. WE#4 said she works closely with the HR director and HR employees. WE#4 said she was aware of the incident but did not know the Complainant. WE#4 said the HR director, NE#1, and an HR lieutenant notified her about concerns with the Complainant's return. WE#4 said the HR director ultimately decided to rescind the job offer. WE#4 said the improper hiring incentive payments were a significant reason for this decision, although not necessarily the sole reason. WE#4 said the Complainant was not responsible for approving or issuing the hiring incentive payments but was responsible for the paperwork that eventually led to those payments.

---

### **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 was dishonest about the reasons for the offer rescission.

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

Under the Seattle Police Officers' Guild Collective Bargaining Agreement (SPOG CBA), a sustained complaint involving dishonesty "relating to the administration of justice" carries a presumption of termination. SPOG CBA article 3.1. In such cases, dishonesty is defined as "intentionally providing false information, which the officer knows to be false, or intentionally providing incomplete responses to specific questions, regarding facts that are material to the investigation." *Id.* Dishonesty means "more than mere inaccuracy or faulty memory." *Id.* For termination cases where "the alleged offense is stigmatizing to a law enforcement officer," an "elevated standard of review (i.e. – more than preponderance of the evidence)" applies. *Id.*

This allegation is unfounded, even if OPA evaluated the evidence under the lower preponderance of the evidence standard instead of the elevated standard of review. NE#1 maintained that he was unaware of the reason for the offer rescission, as he had not participated in those discussions. Although NE#1 told BIU detectives during a meeting that the Complainant would not be returning due to improper hiring incentive payments, he explained to OPA that this was merely speculation. WE#4 corroborated NE#1's theory. WE#4 told OPA that she and the HR director discussed the matter, and the HR director ultimately decided to rescind the job offer, primarily motivated by the improper hiring incentive payments. WE#4 noted that although the Complainant was not responsible for approving or issuing the payments, she was responsible for the paperwork that eventually led to those payments. Email correspondence corroborated WE#4's account, as one email exchange between the Complainant and one candidate indicated that the Complainant sent the wrong paperwork to the candidate. Ultimately, NE#1's speculation concerning the reason for the offer rescission was indeed accurate. Therefore, NE#1 was not being dishonest when he told BIU detectives that the Complainant would not be returning due to improper hiring incentive payments.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

**Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2**

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

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 wrongfully blamed her for improper hiring incentive payments.

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.*

This allegation is unfounded. As noted above, NE#1 appeared to have a well-founded belief that the Complainant was, in whole or in part, responsible for the overpayments of hiring incentives. The

evidence suggested that seven candidates received overpayments, which NE#1 believed stemmed from clerical errors. The Complainant appeared to have sent the wrong paperwork to seven candidates. OPA identified one such occurrence in email correspondence. Even if NE#1 blamed the Complainant for the improper payments, NE#1 told OPA that he did not participate in the hiring process or the investigation into those overpayments. The HR director ultimately decided to rescind the offer. NE#1's involvement was limited or nonexistent during the decisions to offer the Complainant her former job and subsequently rescind it. NE#1 appeared to act primarily as an intermediary between the Complainant and HR. Overall, based on the evidence and totality of the circumstances, OPA found no evidence supporting the Complainant's allegation that NE#1 blamed the Complainant to protect his promotion to lieutenant.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**