



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2016-0104

Issued Date: 08/04/2016

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (10) Standards and Duties: Employees Shall Be Truthful and Complete In All Communications (Policy that was issued 04/01/2015)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Training Referral)
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The Named Employee was working in her assigned unit.

COMPLAINT

The complainant alleged that the Named Employee made a false statement against him in an effort to get him fired.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the complaint
2. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
3. Interview of SPD employee

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The complainant alleged the Named Employee authored an official email containing false statements concerning his (the complainant's) behavior. Specifically, in the email sent via her (the Named Employee's) SPD email account, the Named Employee described the complainant's behavior during an internal SPD meeting as "violent" and "making threats." The complainant asserted in his complaint he never became physically violent and did not threaten to harm anyone. During the Named Employee's OPA interview, the Named Employee agreed the complainant had not been physically violent. Instead, in using the word "violent," the Named Employee was referring to times when, according to others (this was not something the Named Employee had witnessed first-hand), the complainant got very angry at work and expressed this anger by standing up, yelling, cursing and throwing things around in his (the complainant's) cubicle. When asked by OPA to explain what she meant by "making threats," the Named Employee repeated what she heard from others, namely that the complainant had threatened to get back at someone by filing a high volume of Public Disclosure Requests (PDR). The Named Employee told OPA she did not mean that the complainant had threatened to do physical harm. Based on the preponderance of the evidence, it appears that the Named Employee chose the words "violent" and "threats" to describe a person who yells, curses, throws things inside his cubicle and promises to submit a multitude of Public Disclosure Requests to SPD. While the evidence does not support an allegation of dishonesty, it is clear the Named Employee chose words conveying a meaning different than she intended. The complainant's objection to the use of "violent" and "making threats" was not unreasonable and the Named Employee bears some responsibility for the offense taken by the complainant.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

The evidence supports that the Named Employee would benefit from additional training. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Training Referral) was issued for *Standards and Duties: Employees Shall Be Truthful and Complete In All Communications*.

Required Training: The Named Employee should be advised by her supervisor to be more precise and judicious in her choice of words when communicating regarding the actions of others.

NOTE: The Seattle Police Department Manual policies cited for the allegation(s) made for this OPA Investigation are policies that were in effect during the time of the incident. The issued date of the policy is listed.