

**Issued Date:** July 17, 2026

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



**Case Number:** 2025OPA-0477

---

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

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

1. **Allegation #1:** 5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-2. Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy, and Department Policy  
**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
  3. **Allegation #3:** 5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded
  4. **Allegation #4:** 4.010 – Employee Time Off, 4.010-POL-2. Employees Schedule Time Off With Their Sergeant/Supervisor  
**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 and Community Member #1 (CM#1)—Named Employee #1's (NE#1) mother—were in a relationship and resided together in a Texas home. However, their relationship deteriorated. On December 8, 2025, NE#1 traveled to their home and attempted to remove the Complainant. The Cleburne Police Department (CPD) became involved. The Complainant alleged that NE#1 unlawfully removed him from the Texas home and referred to him using derogatory terms, including “bitch ass.” OPA investigated whether NE#1 was dishonest when he reported on

his timesheet that he was training on December 8, 2025, despite being in Texas that day. OPA also investigated whether NE#1 received supervisory approval for his absence

### **Administrative Note:**

On July 15, 2026, the Office of Inspector General (OIG) certified OPA's investigation as thorough and timely but declined to certify it as objective. OIG raised concerns regarding what it perceived as OPA asking five "leading questions that affected the overall objectivity of [NE#1's first] interview." However, OPA respectfully disagrees with OIG's characterization of OPA's questioning as "leading." These five questions that OIG characterized as "leading" were, in fact, follow-up questions aimed at clarifying NE#1's responses to prior open-ended questions. OPA sought clarification by rephrasing NE#1's earlier statements and believes this was reasonable and appropriate during the interview. Regardless of how some OPA questions might be characterized, OPA does not believe this would render the entire investigation non-objective.

### **Summary of the Investigation:**

OPA investigated this incident by reviewing the OPA complaint, computer-aided dispatch (CAD) records, body-worn video (BWV), Ring videos, photographs, email correspondence, deed of trust, staffing calendar, and payroll records. OPA interviewed the Complainant via email. OPA also interviewed CM#1, Witness Supervisor #1 (WS#1), NE#1, and a CPD officer (Officer #1).

#### **A. OPA Complaint**

On December 9, 2025, the Complainant filed an OPA complaint, alleging that NE#1 was "forcefully removing" him from his Texas home, where he had lived with NE#1's mother (CM#1) for two years. The Complainant wrote that when he contacted CPD, CPD advised that the dispute was a civil matter requiring resolution in court. However, the Complainant alleged that NE#1 removed his belongings and placed them outside the home. The Complainant also alleged that NE#1 prevented him from retrieving the rest of his belongings from the home.

The Complainant preferred to email OPA in lieu of an interview. On December 15, 2025, the Complainant emailed OPA, writing that he and CM#1 dated and purchased a home in Texas. He wrote that he paid for the down payment, mortgage, property insurance, and vehicle maintenance. He wrote that on December 6 or 7, 2025, CM#1 wanted him to move out, but he declined. He wrote that she contacted CPD to have him removed, but CPD advised that the dispute was a civil matter.

The Complainant wrote that on December 8, 2025, NE#1 arrived at the home and spent the night in the guest room. He wrote that NE#1 advised him to move out by December 9. He wrote that NE#1 placed his belongings into trash bags and suitcases, despite being asked repeatedly to stop. He wrote that the garage remote had been taken from his vehicle. He wrote that he contacted CPD, after which Officer #1 informed NE#1 that the dispute was a civil matter and that NE#1 could not remove the Complainant's belongings or restrict his access to the home. He wrote that after Officer

#1 left, NE#1 continued removing his belongings. He wrote that he noticed his missing firearm magazines, but when he asked NE#1 about them, NE#1 replied, "Do you think I was going to allow you to have loaded magazines?" He wrote that NE#1 eventually returned the magazines after several requests, but NE#1 did not return the ammunition.

The Complainant wrote that NE#1 referred to him as a "bitch ass," along with other derogatory names. He wrote that he packed some of his belongings and departed. He wrote that he still had belongings at the home but was not permitted to retrieve them.

## **B. CAD Records and BWV**

CPD CAD records and BWV reflected the following:

### **1. December 6, 2025**

CAD records indicated that on December 6, 2025, at 2:37 PM, CPD received a call from CM#1, who reported that the Complainant was damaging her property, had multiple firearms in the home, and attempted to take her phone. CM#1 said she wanted the Complainant to leave. CPD officers responded, engaged the parties, and determined that the dispute was solely verbal.

CPD officers responded to the home and activated their BWV, capturing the following events. While outside, CM#1 reported to the officers that she had asked the Complainant to leave due to his infidelity. She said he removed a fan from the ceiling and declared that he would take everything he bought with him. She said he had a firearm on the nightstand. She denied any physical altercation occurring. She explained that although he had been living at this home with his belongings, he had only been home for several weeks due to his job. An officer informed CM#1 that CPD could not forcibly remove the Complainant since he technically lived at this home.

Inside the home, the Complainant reported to the officers that he and CM#1 argued but denied any physical altercation occurring or threatening her with a firearm. He confirmed that CM#1 asked him to leave. He said he was gathering his belongings while figuring out his next destination. The officers returned outside and spoke with CM#1, who reiterated her request for the Complainant to leave. She said he had his firearm visible but did not threaten her with it or aim it at her. An officer informed CM#1 that since no criminal conduct occurred, she should resolve the dispute in civil court.

### **2. December 7, 2025**

CAD records indicated that on December 7, 2025, at 10:40 AM, CPD received a call from CM#1, who requested to speak with officers regarding the Complainant. CM#1 reported that when she asked him to leave, he began damaging her property.

### 3. December 8, 2025

CAD records indicated that on December 8, 2025, at 3:16 PM, NE#1 entered the CPD lobby to request a conversation with an officer regarding alleged domestic violence (DV) against CM#1.

Officer #1 arrived at the lobby and activated her BWV, capturing the following events. NE#1 identified himself as an SPD officer. NE#1 said CM#1 had been in a “domestic abuse relationship” with the Complainant for two years and mentioned that when CM#1 contacted CPD two days ago, CPD took no action. Officer #1 explained that only a verbal dispute occurred, preventing CPD from intervening. NE#1 said CM#1 applied for a restraining order. NE#1 then asked about available resources for DV victims, to which Officer #1 replied that CM#1 did not report any DV. Officer #1 suggested considering a civil eviction process since the Complainant had established residency at the home. Officer #1 also explained that property damage was a civil, not criminal, matter, especially since the Complainant contributed to the mortgage. NE#1 said his chain of command approved his trip to Texas. NE#1 then expressed concerns about the numerous firearms in the home, to which Officer #1 replied that having multiple firearms in a Texas home was not unusual. NE#1 expressed concerns about what he perceived as a pattern of DV characterized by hostility and honeymoon phases. NE#1 said CM#1 might not have fully disclosed all details to him, including whether the Complainant had ever assaulted her. NE#1 expressed his commitment to support CM#1 and ensure that the Complainant leaves as promised. NE#1 said he did not intend to physically engage with the Complainant.

### 4. December 9, 2025

CAD records indicated that on December 9, 2025, at 10:48 AM, CPD received a call from the Complainant, who reported that CM#1 was attempting to remove him from the home while he was absent. Officer #1 indicated that a notice requiring the Complainant to vacate by December 11, 2025, at 12:00 PM had been affixed to the front door. Officer #1 noted that since this dispute was a civil matter, no further action was taken.

Officer #1 responded to the home and activated her BWV, capturing the following events. While outside, the Complainant reported that NE#1 was attempting to remove him from the home that day by packing his belongings and placing them outside. The Complainant said he planned to leave but needed to work first and then return home to collect his belongings. He said he wanted NE#1 to stop touching his belongings. Officer #1 explained that this dispute was a civil matter requiring court resolution.

Officer #1 interviewed NE#1 inside the home. NE#1 said the Complainant expressed his intent to leave that day but made no arrangements, so NE#1 assisted with packing his belongings. NE#1 said the Complainant did not object to this until NE#1 began placing his belongings outside. NE#1 emphasized that he was merely assisting the Complainant move his belongings. Officer #1 informed NE#1 that he could not force the Complainant to leave. However, NE#1 showed Officer #1 what he

claimed to be a judge-signed notice to vacate<sup>1</sup> on the front door, purportedly requiring the Complainant to vacate by December 11, 2025. NE#1 denied any physical altercation occurring.

Officer #1 returned to the Complainant and informed him of the notice to vacate. The Complainant asked about the reason for NE#1 moving his belongings outside if he was permitted to remain at the home until December 11. Officer #1 advised the Complainant to resolve the dispute in court.

Officer #1 returned to NE#1 and inquired about the notice to vacate, questioning whether it had been signed by a judge and why it specified a December 11 date instead of the standard 30 days. NE#1 expressed uncertainty and suggested Officer #1 to contact CM#1 about the notice. NE#1 opined that the judge and court staff believed that the Complainant needed to promptly vacate. Officer #1 reiterated her inability to force the Complainant to leave. NE#1 replied that he was merely assisting in packing the Complainant's belongings, not forcing him to leave. Officer #1 advised NE#1 to place the Complainant's belongings in the garage if it would not cause a disturbance, which NE#1 found agreeable. NE#1 speculated that the Complainant would stay until he was forcibly removed.

Officer #1 returned to the Complainant and informed him of NE#1's plan to place his belongings in the garage, which the Complainant found agreeable. Officer #1 then departed.

### **C. Ring Videos and Photographs**

CM#1 submitted multiple Ring videos to OPA. The videos captured the home's living room. They generally showed NE#1 and the Complainant packing and moving belongings to the garage or outside on December 9, 2025. Interactions between NE#1 and the Complainant were friendly and jovial. NE#1 cleared and packed the Complainant's firearms. At one point, Officer #1 arrived at the home but left. In other instances, NE#1 appeared to have called CM#1 to verify ownership of certain items. As NE#1 was leaving the home, he had the following interaction with the Complainant:

|                     |                                               |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| <b>NE#1:</b>        | Alright, [Complainant]. Don't be a bitch ass. |
| <b>Complainant:</b> | Say what now?                                 |
| <b>NE#1:</b>        | Don't be a bitch ass while I'm gone.          |
| <b>Complainant:</b> | Don't be a what?                              |
| <b>NE#1:</b>        | A bitch ass!                                  |
| <b>Complainant:</b> | Oh, a bitch ass!                              |
| <b>NE#1:</b>        | Yes, don't.                                   |
| <b>Complainant:</b> | Got you covered, brotha! [Laughter.]          |

On the following day, videos captured the Complainant and two other individuals helping him move his belongings to the garage. NE#1 and CM#1 were present but had limited interaction with the Complainant and two other individuals. These interactions were cordial.

The Complainant submitted multiple photographs to OPA. These photographs depicted NE#1 packing the Complainant's belongings and carrying them to the Complainant's vehicle parked in the driveway. One photograph depicted the notice to vacate affixed to the front door.

#### **D. OPA Interviews**

##### **1. Community Member #1**

On February 20, 2026, OPA interviewed CM#1. CM#1 said she learned on December 5, 2025, that the Complainant had been involved with another person, so she told him to pack his belongings and leave. CM#1 said the Complainant declined and removed the ceiling fan, prompting her to call CPD. CM#1 said the CPD officers advised her to resolve the matter in civil court. CM#1 said the Complainant had multiple firearms and, at one point, charged at her, so she had a firearm for self-defense. CM#1 said she felt captive for several days.

CM#1 said that on December 7, 2025, she called NE#1 for help. CM#1 said NE#1 told her that he had received approval to leave work, planned to take a flight the following morning, and intended to visit CPD to obtain DV resources. CM#1 said she was unable to obtain a restraining order but spoke with a judge's secretary, who advised her to post a 72-hour notice to vacate. CM#1 said she found such a notice online and affixed it to the front door during NE#1's absence.

CM#1 said NE#1 arrived at the home on December 8, 2025. CM#1 said she went to work on December 9. CM#1 said she observed interactions between NE#1 and the Complainant on camera. CM#1 said she did not perceive NE#1 as threatening or forcing the Complainant to pack and leave. CM#1 said she saw NE#1 help pack the Complainant's belongings since the Complainant promised to vacate by December 9. CM#1 said NE#1 left shortly after Officer #1 left. CM#1 said she heard the Complainant on camera voicing his unwillingness to pack his belongings but wanting NE#1 to do it instead. CM#1 said NE#1 arrived at the home and placed the Complainant's belongings outside. CM#1 said that on December 10, she saw the Complainant and another person packing and removing his belongings during the night. CM#1 said NE#1 left for Seattle later that morning.

##### **2. Witness Supervisor #1**

On February 23, 2026, OPA interviewed WS#1, a sergeant. WS#1 said NE#1 informed him of CM#1's situation, so WS#1 approved NE#1's absence for December 8, 2025. WS#1 said he entered "Training" in Workday merely as a placeholder. WS#1 clarified that other options—like sick leave, unpaid leave, vacation, or regular pay—were either not allowed in Workday or disingenuous. WS#1 said NE#1 was not involved with the time entry and was unaware of it. WS#1 said that after entering "Training," he forgot to submit a form to payroll, so he completed it and informed payroll to amend NE#1's timesheet. WS#1 provided OPA with an email corroborating this correction.

### 3. Named Employee #1

On March 12, 2026, OPA interviewed NE#1. NE#1 said CM#1 called him and cried on December 7, 2025, because the Complainant damaged property and loaded multiple firearms, yet CPD took no action. NE#1 said CM#1 believed that the Complainant misrepresented the situation to CPD. NE#1 cited his experience as a DV advocate and said he saw signs indicating a worsening situation. NE#1 said he was unable to find DV resources for CM#1, so he decided to travel to Texas after informing WS#1, who approved NE#1's absence. NE#1 denied entering his own time in Workday.

NE#1 said that on December 8, 2025, he visited CPD and spoke with Officer #1. NE#1 said he identified himself as an SPD officer to ensure transparency and assist Officer #1 in understanding the seriousness of the situation. NE#1 said he then went to CM#1's home, where the Complainant ignored him. NE#1 said he stayed awake most of the night for his own safety but eventually fell asleep on the morning of December 9 after CM#1 had left for work. NE#1 said he was awakened by a phone call from CM#1 and later discovered that the Complainant had not packed at all. NE#1 said he was skeptical of the Complainant leaving by December 9, as he had indicated. NE#1 said he told the Complainant that since he promised to leave by December 9, NE#1 would help fulfill that promise by packing his belongings and placing them outside. NE#1 said the Complainant told him that there would be no need for a physical confrontation or a gunfight. NE#1 described their interaction as cooperative while they packed the belongings. NE#1 said the Complainant's primary concern was keeping his clothes on their hangers.

NE#1 said he felt unsafe with the Complainant having loaded firearms, so he asked the Complainant to gather them all. NE#1 said the Complainant initially ignored this request but eventually complied. NE#1 said he cleared the firearms and took the magazines, to which the Complainant raised no objections. NE#1 said the Complainant later requested the magazines, so NE#1 unloaded them since the Complainant could not legally transport loaded firearms across state lines. NE#1 denied taking any property from the Complainant's vehicle.

NE#1 said he packed the Complainant's belongings because he believed the situation was dangerous for himself and CM#1, so he prioritized everyone's safety. NE#1 thought the constable's office granted CM#1 an expedited eviction notice, requiring the Complainant to vacate within two days. NE#1 opined that Texas law lacked adequate DV protections. When OPA asked whether the Complainant had the right to refuse to leave on December 9, NE#1 replied that the Complainant should have moved out sooner due to the DV situation involving loaded firearms. NE#1 believed that the Complainant was intimidating CM#1 and sought provocation. NE#1 noted that an aggressor's silence in a DV situation following three days of a hostile incident could escalate to a dangerous situation. NE#1 said DV impacted him emotionally since it involved his mother.

### 4. Officer #1

On March 20, 2026, OPA interviewed Officer #1. She said the destruction of community property is considered a civil issue in Texas. She said that when she responded to the home on December 9,

2025, she learned that the Complainant became upset about NE#1 placing his belongings outside but had no concerns about NE#1 packing his belongings. She said a reasonable solution was for NE#1 to place the belongings in the garage, which both parties found agreeable. She said she was new to the county, so she did not recognize the notice to vacate, although it appeared official to her. She acknowledged that the notice was not signed by a judge and was uncertain about its implications. She denied observing any unprofessional conduct from NE#1.

#### 5. Named Employee #1 – Reinterview

On July 13, 2026, OPA reinterviewed NE#1. NE#1 admitted to calling the Complainant a “bitch ass.” NE#1 said his intent was to deter the Complainant from damaging property or bringing his belongings back inside the home. NE#1 denied having any knowledge of how his time was entered but indicated that WS#1 was responsible for it. NE#1 opined that Texas law did not address DV absent an assault and claimed that DV was more nuanced than mere assault. NE#1 concluded that CM#1 was involved with DV based on the Complainant damaging property, loading firearms, handing a firearm to CM#1, even though she did not own a weapon, and remaining silent for days.

---

### **Analysis and Conclusions:**

#### **Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1**

##### **5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-2. Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy, and Department Policy**

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 unlawfully removed him from the Texas home.

Employees must adhere to laws, city policy, and department policy. SPD Policy 5.001-POL-2.

OPA finds that NE#1 did not violate Texas law based on the evidence gathered for this investigation. CPD determined that the Complainant established residency at the home since he had his belongings there and contributed to the mortgage and other expenses. Given this determination, CPD officers advised the Complainant and CM#1 to resolve the dispute in civil court. The Texas statute most relevant to this dispute is likely Texas Property Code Chapter 24 (Forcible Entry and Detainer), which governs the civil eviction process. CM#1 might have needed to apply this statute to legally evict the Complainant from the home. Had NE#1 forcibly removed the Complainant from the home, he would have likely violated Texas Property Code Chapter 24. However, for the reasons described below, OPA finds that NE#1 did not intentionally violate Texas law.

First, the Complainant did not clearly refuse to leave the home. Rather, the evidence indicated that there was an informal arrangement for him to leave by a certain date. The Complainant confirmed this arrangement, as he was captured on BWV informing a CPD officer on December 6 that he was gathering his belongings while figuring out his next destination. Second, NE#1 assisted the

Complainant pack and move his belongings instead of compelling him to leave. Upon Officer #1's arrival at the home on December 9, NE#1 communicated his intent to assist the Complainant. The Complainant reiterated to Officer #1 that he planned to leave but had work obligations. Third, the Complainant's objection to NE#1's action did not concern NE#1 packing his belongings; rather, it concerned NE#1 moving his belongings outside the home. Both the Complainant and NE#1 eventually agreed for NE#1 to place his belongings in the garage. Overall, the Complainant's statements and conduct reinforced his intent to voluntarily vacate the home.

Fourth, Ring videos captured the Complainant and his associates packing and moving his belongings on December 9. Interactions between NE#1 and the Complainant were professional and friendly. There was no indication that NE#1 was forcibly removing the Complainant, who still did not express any objections to leaving. Fifth, NE#1's actions were motivated by safety concerns for CM#1. Drawing from his experience as a DV advocate, NE#1 genuinely believed that CM#1 was subjected to DV. He also expressed concerns about the multiple firearms in the home. In fact, NE#1 was so troubled by the situation that he requested time off from work and traveled to Texas to support CM#1. NE#1 even sought police assistance and requested DV resources on CM#1's behalf. The totality of this evidence indicated that NE#1 was motivated to de-escalate the situation and separate the parties to avert a dangerous situation. NE#1's insistence on assisting the Complainant move out was not coercive, especially since the Complainant could have ultimately refused to leave at any point. Had that occurred, NE#1 and CM#1 would have been required to take legal action to formally evict the Complainant pursuant to Texas Property Code Chapter 24. Still, OPA advises NE#1 to be mindful of the civil court processes applicable in such disputes.

Concerning the Complainant's other allegations—namely, that NE#1 prevented him from retrieving the rest of his belongings from the home and that NE#1 took the garage remote from his vehicle—OPA found insufficient evidence to support these allegations.

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 referred to him using derogatory terms, including “bitch ass.”

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.* Employees representing the Department or identifying themselves as police officers or Department employees will not use profanity directed as an insult or any derogatory, contemptuous, or disrespectful language at anyone. *Id.*

Although NE#1, in fact, referred to the Complainant as a “bitch ass,” the context in which NE#1 uttered this statement suggested that NE#1 was being playful. The Complainant appeared to grasp the tone of NE#1’s comment, responding with, “Got you covered, brotha,” followed by laughter. Based on the totality of the circumstances of this conversation, NE#1 did not appear to use profanity directed as an insult toward the Complainant. OPA also notes that NE#1 was not in uniform and not engaged in an escalated conversation with the Complainant when he uttered that statement. Thus, OPA finds this allegation unfounded in review of the totality of the circumstances. To the extent that the Complainant also alleged that NE#1 referred to him using other derogatory terms, OPA found no evidence supporting this claim.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

### **Named Employee #1 – Allegation #3**

#### **5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication**

NE#1 was allegedly dishonest when he reported on his timesheet that he was training on December 8, 2025, despite being in Texas that day.

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. WS#1 informed OPA that he entered “Training” in Workday as a placeholder for NE#1 but then contacted payroll to correct NE#1’s timesheet. WS#1 also indicated that NE#1 was not involved with the time entry and was unaware of it. NE#1 corroborated WS#1’s statements, denying any involvement with entering his own time in Workday. As such, OPA found no evidence of dishonesty.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

#### **Named Employee #1 – Allegation #4**

#### **4.010 – Employee Time Off, 4.010-POL-2. Employees Schedule Time Off With Their Sergeant/Supervisor**

NE#1 allegedly did not receive supervisory approval for his absence.

Employees will request sergeant or supervisor approval for scheduled and unscheduled time off. SPD Policy 4.010-POL-2. Employees will submit a leave request application to request over four consecutive calendar days off. *Id.* Employees will contact their sergeant or supervisor before their scheduled work shift to request an unscheduled absence from duty. *Id.* If the request for time off is not approved, the employee will report for work as scheduled. *Id.*

This allegation is unfounded for the same reasons articulated in Named Employee #1 – Allegation #3. WS#1 informed OPA that he approved NE#1's absence, which NE#1 also corroborated.

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

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

---

**Footnote 1.** The Complainant photographed this notice and submitted it to OPA. The notice was titled, "30-DAY NOTICE TO TERMINATE TENANCY" and instructed the Complainant to vacate the premises by December 11, 2025, at 12:00 PM. The notice purportedly granted the landlord all rights and remedies provided under the rental agreement and applicable Texas laws. The notice was dated December 8, 2025, and signed by CM#1.