



During November 2023, the OIG's Centralized Screening Monitoring Team randomly selected 677 grievances for monitoring. This document presents nine notable cases monitored and closed by the OIG during November 2023.

OIG Case Number
23-0064844-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Superior

Incident Summary

On September 25, 2023, a sergeant allegedly forced his way into an intersex incarcerated person's cell, pushed her to the ground, and sexually assaulted her. An associate warden allegedly ordered staff to look at the incarcerated person's underwear for blood stains. An officer allegedly refused to give the incarcerated person her earbuds, called her a derogatory name, and stated she did not deserve anything, and he would make her life a living hell. A second officer, who had allegedly sexually assaulted the incarcerated person previously, allegedly did not provide her dinner, and made mocking and discriminatory comments toward her. The incarcerated person alleged other incarcerated people at two men's prisons said they would sexually assault incarcerated people who did not identify as male, that other incarcerated people previously sexually assaulted her, and filed grievances in her name. The incarcerated person alleged a lack of food caused her stomach cramps, that she was afraid to go to the exercise yard after another incarcerated person spit on her, and that she had safety concerns with her placement in the restrictive housing unit. The incarcerated person requested her property, female clothing, hygiene products, and transfer to another prison.

Disposition

The department's Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation that the second officer made mocking comments and all the allegations against the sergeant and first officer to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation. The Centralized Screening Team redirected the allegation about stomach cramps to health care. The Centralized Screening Team rejected the allegations against the associate warden and that the second officer previously sexually assaulted the incarcerated person as substantially duplicative of prior grievances. The Centralized Screening Team routed the remaining allegations back to the prison as routine issues. The OIG concurred.



Case Rating

Overall, the department performed in a superior manner. The Centralized Screening Team identified fifteen allegations within the grievance and appropriately separated and addressed each allegation. The screener exercised due diligence in identifying all issues, adding detailed notes, and making the appropriate screening decisions for each allegation in the grievance.

OIG Case Number
23-0065207-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On September 24, 2023, an officer allegedly inappropriately issued an incarcerated person a rules violation report for showing his middle finger to a second incarcerated person, which the incarcerated person alleged was unnecessary because he was playing around with a friend. Later that day, a second officer allegedly “violently put” the incarcerated person against a wall and put handcuffs on the incarcerated person too tightly. On October 20, 2023, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarifying interview in which the incarcerated person again stated the officer’s actions were aggressive and violent.

Disposition

The department’s Centralized Screening Team initially routed the grievance back to the prison as a routine disciplinary dispute. The OIG concurred. However, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the alleged use-of-force allegation. The OIG elevated the grievance, and the Centralized Screening Team elected to conduct a clarification interview to obtain additional information about the alleged use of force, and subsequently determined the incarcerated person failed to describe behavior supporting a use-of-force allegation. The OIG did not concur and elevated the issue and recommended a clarification interview. The manager approved the clarification interview. After the interview, the manager did not agree with the OIG’s determination the grievance met the criteria for excessive force.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify a use-of-force allegation. The Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview, only after the OIG identified the missed allegation. The Centralized Screening Team interviewer began the clarification interview, as observed by the OIG, by telling the incarcerated person they had a couple questions about the use-of-force incident, which could have led the incarcerated person to believe the Centralized Screening Team was already treating the allegation as an inappropriate use of force. The interviewer then failed to ask questions that could reasonably illicit responses to determine whether the incarcerated person was alleging an



inappropriate use of force. Following the interview, the Centralized Screening Team did not process the allegation as an inappropriate use of force while claiming the incarcerated person failed to provide enough information describing the alleged force.

OIG Case Number
23-0065871-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On October 12, 2023, an incarcerated person told a nursing assistant he felt like hurting himself and asked her to call a registered nurse. The nursing assistant allegedly told the incarcerated person to kill himself, to stop asking for help if he wanted to die, and called him a “scumbag.”

Disposition

The department’s Centralized Screening Team routed the allegations to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The OIG did not concur as the allegations clearly warranted a referral to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit pursuant to departmental policy. Following an elevation by the OIG, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegations of staff misconduct to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team inappropriately routed the allegations to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. While the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation following the elevation by the OIG, the original routing decision was clearly contrary to departmental policy.

OIG Case Number
23-0065875-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On July 7, 2023, an officer responded to a fight between incarcerated persons and allegedly struck an uninvolved incarcerated person in the face with a less-lethal round. Officers and a nurse allegedly falsified reports stating the incarcerated person refused medical treatment for his injury. Prison staff allegedly failed to give the incarcerated person a copy of the incident report and attempted to cover up the first officer’s actions. The incarcerated person requested to be interviewed regarding the excessive force and that the first officer receive training.



Disposition

The department's Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation back to the prison as a routine issue, noting the allegation did not rise to the level of staff misconduct on the Allegation Decision Index. The OIG did not concur as the incarcerated person made a clear allegation of excessive force which is listed on the Allegation Decision Index. Additionally, the Centralized Screening Team did not identify allegations that officers and a nurse falsified documents that he refused treatment to conceal the officer's misconduct and failed to provide him a copy of the incident report. Following an elevation by the OIG, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegations of excessive force and that staff concealed misconduct to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegation of excessive force as staff misconduct and inappropriately routed the allegation back to the prison as a routine matter. Further, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify allegations that officers and a nurse falsified refusals by the incarcerated person to conceal the officer's shooting of an uninvolved incarcerated person with a less-lethal round and failed to provide the incarcerated person a copy of the incident report. Only after the OIG elevated the matter, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately amended their decision and referred the allegations of excessive force and concealing the excessive force to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

OIG Case Number
23-0066116-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On October 17, 2023, a physician allegedly failed to properly examine an incarcerated person for unexplained weight loss. The incarcerated person alleged he felt uncomfortable around the physician, who allegedly made inappropriate comments about sexual orientation and homosexual relationships to the incarcerated person during a previous encounter. Approximately two months prior to this alleged incident, the physician told the incarcerated person he was "fine and sexy" and it was not inappropriate for two men to have a relationship. The incarcerated person allegedly reported the comments to a sergeant, and two days later, the physician allegedly discontinued the incarcerated person's pain medication.

Disposition

The department's Centralized Screening Team determined the grievance did not contain any staff misconduct allegations and routed the grievance back to the hiring authority as a routine disagreement with treatment. The OIG did not concur. Following



an elevation by the OIG, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview with the incarcerated person about the alleged sexual harassment. After the interview, a health care subject matter expert notified the OIG the incarcerated person had not provided sufficient specific information to warrant a referral for investigation. The OIG elevated the allegation again. A manager eventually agreed to refer the sexual harassment allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team failed to independently identify the need for a clarification interview with the incarcerated person, and only conducted the interview after the OIG's recommendation. Following the clarification interview, a health care subject matter expert determined the alleged sexual harassment did not rise to the level of staff misconduct. Following a second elevation by the OIG, the Centralized Screening Team agreed to refer the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number
23-0066228-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On September 11, 2023, officers allegedly put a restrained incarcerated person into a transportation van and failed to secure his seatbelt. As the van was exiting the prison's parking lot, a nurse, in her personal vehicle, allegedly struck the van causing the incarcerated person to be thrown into the metal partition in the van and sustain injuries to his head. The officers allegedly failed to get medical attention for the incarcerated person before continuing the transport. The incarcerated person requested medical attention for his continued neck pain from the accident and requested an interview with a counselor to obtain information about all staff who were present at or responded to the accident.

Disposition

A Centralized Screening Team analyst recommended the allegations about the accident be referred to the hiring authority for a local inquiry and returned the requests for medical treatment and an interview back to the prison as routine issues. A Centralized Screening Team supervisor overruled the analyst and decided to refer the allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Centralized Screening Team supervisors correctly identified the allegations needed to be reassigned to the prison where the accident occurred and referred to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation. However, the Centralized Screening Team received



the grievance on September 25, 2023, and unreasonably delayed the referral until November 20, 2023, 57 days thereafter, while reassigning the case four times between three prisons.

OIG Case Number
23-0066384-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On October 14, 2023, after an incarcerated person requested a nursing assistant provide his tablet so he could speak to his family, the nursing assistant allegedly used profanities towards the incarcerated person and told him to kill himself. The incarcerated person allegedly attempted suicide the following day.

Disposition

The department's Centralized Screening Team routed the allegations to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The OIG did not concur. Following an elevation by the OIG, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team initially inappropriately routed the allegations to the hiring authority for a local inquiry after concluding that they did not meet any criteria in the Allegation Decision Index despite the allegation that the nursing assistant encouraged the incarcerated person to harm himself. While the Centralized Screening Team eventually appropriately referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation following the elevation by the OIG, the original processing of the allegation was poor.

OIG Case Number
23-0067432-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On October 28, 2023, in retaliation for an incarcerated person filing a grievance against a sergeant the week prior, the sergeant allegedly harassed the incarcerated person and issued him a counseling memorandum for being out of bounds while the incarcerated person was allegedly in the gaming room in his role as a volunteer console technician. The sergeant allegedly refused to acknowledge the updated list of technicians and issued the disciplinary report using an old list.



Disposition

The department's Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation regarding the counseling memorandum back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG concurred. However, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the alleged retaliation for filing staff misconduct grievances. Following an elevation by the OIG, the Centralized Screening Team upheld their original decision.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify an allegation of retaliation for filing a staff misconduct grievance. Following an elevation by the OIG, the Centralized Screening Team failed to acknowledge the alleged retaliation, claiming the incarcerated person's prior grievance did not negate the sergeant's ability to hold the incarcerated person accountable. The Centralized Screening Team dismissed the incarcerated person's allegation without addressing the possibility that the sergeant's counseling memorandum was retaliatory.

OIG Case Number
23-0067524-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On November 6, 2023, an instructor allegedly discriminated against a developmentally disabled incarcerated person by refusing him the opportunity to make up missed classes and earn credits toward his release date yet allowed non-disabled incarcerated people to make up classes. Prison staff allegedly failed to provide the incarcerated person with the reminders to attend his classes that his disability required, resulting in him missing classes.

Disposition

The department's Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation regarding missed classes back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG concurred. However, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the alleged discrimination by the instructor or that prison staff failed to accommodate the incarcerated person's required reminders to attend his classes. Following an elevation by the OIG, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and referred the allegation that prison staff failed to follow policy and remind the incarcerated person about his classes, to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. However, the Centralized Screening Team decided that the incarcerated person did not adequately articulate an allegation of discrimination.



Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team initially failed to identify two allegations of staff misconduct. Following an elevation by the OIG, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegation that prison staff failed to follow policy and remind a developmentally disabled incarcerated person to attend his classes, to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. However, the Centralized Screening Team should have referred the allegations of discrimination to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigations Unit. The Centralized Screening Team inappropriately determined the incarcerated person's allegation did not adequately articulate an allegation of discrimination.