



October 2023 Centralized Screening Monitoring Team Case Blocks
Published in December 2023

During October 2023, the OIG's Centralized Screening Monitoring Team randomly selected and opened 520 grievances for monitoring. This document presents five notable cases monitored and closed by the OIG during October 2023.

OIG Case Number
23-0059653-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

Between November 7, 2020, to July 4, 2023, supervisory custody staff, officers, and a counselor allegedly discriminated against an incarcerated person by refusing to hire him for job assignments and denying him access to programming groups which would earn credit toward time off his sentence. Additionally, the incarcerated person alleged female prison staff engaged in criminal and sexual misconduct with incarcerated persons, smuggled drugs, mobile phones, and weapons into the prison. The incarcerated person further alleged counselors conspired with other incarcerated persons to prevent the incarcerated person's transfer to another prison after the incarcerated person requested a transfer due to the alleged staff misconduct.

Disposition

The department's Centralized Screening Team (screening team) referred the discrimination, contraband, and staff sexual misconduct allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit and routed the credit earning and transfer prevention allegations back to the prison as routine issues. Although the OIG concurred with the screening team's decisions, the evaluation failed to identify the incarcerated person's request to transfer to another prison due to staff misconduct.

On October 20, 2023, following the OIG's review of the screening team's decisions, the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit disputed its receipt of the referral for alleged staff sexual misconduct, discrimination, and contraband induction into the prison based on a lack of details. When the screening team conducted a clarifying interview with the incarcerated person, the incarcerated person stated he knew the identity of the staff involved in the misconduct, but he refused to provide their names to the screening team. The screening team's notes failed to indicate whether the interviewer asked the incarcerated person why he would not reveal the identity of staff or if he would be willing to provide the names to someone else. After the clarification interview, the screening team routed the allegations of staff sexual misconduct, discrimination, and contraband induction back to the prison as routine issues. The OIG did not concur.





Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Although the screening team initially referred allegations of serious staff misconduct to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit, the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit refused to investigate these allegations for lack of sufficient details. After a clarification interview, the screening team rescinded their original referral to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit and routed the serious allegations of staff misconduct to the prison for local staff to conduct a routine fact-finding. The OIG disagreed with the screening team's final routing decision.

Furthermore, the OIG reviewed the prison's routine fact-finding report and determined that prison staff solely addressed the allegation of discrimination and failed to address the allegations of staff sexual misconduct and contraband induction.

OIG Case Number
23-0062178-CSM

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On May 24, 2023, an officer allegedly issued a rules violation report in error to an incarcerated person who was a victim of an assault, which caused the incarcerated person to fear for his life. A second officer allegedly shared with other incarcerated persons confidential information about the incarcerated person's commitment crime. A third officer allegedly disrupted the incarcerated person's sleep at night. Officers also allegedly refused to provide the incarcerated person a tablet, and together with other incarcerated persons, tampered with the incarcerated person's food and his coffee which caused damage to his eye. A counselor allegedly refused to allow the incarcerated person to go to court. Lastly, prison staff allegedly intercepted and prevented the incarcerated person's mail from being sent to family members.

Disposition

The department's Centralized Screening Team (screening team) routed all eight allegations back to the prison as routine issues, even though they identified six of the allegations were vague. The OIG did not concur with the routine routing of vague allegations against staff without the screening team first conducting a clarification interview with the incarcerated person. The screening team also failed to identify medical and mental health concerns within the grievance and route them back to the prison as routine issues. The OIG elevated its concerns and recommended the screening team complete a clarification interview. The screening team accepted the OIG's recommendation. However, because the incarcerated person refused to participate in the clarification interview, the screening team continued to process the allegations as routine. The OIG identified that the department assigned the officer, who was a subject of the complaint, to escort the incarcerated person to the



clarification interview and allowed the officer to complete the refusal paperwork. The OIG recommended the screening team make another attempt to complete the clarification interview to ensure there was no intimidation or impropriety. The screening team agreed, but the incarcerated person once again refused to participate in the clarification interview. The screening team elected to uphold their initial decision.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. An Armstrong class member made vague allegations of safety concerns with staff, including that staff picked on him, refused to provide a tablet or access to court, tampered with his food, and engaged in psychological abuse. However, the screening team did not identify the need for a clarification interview with the incarcerated person who submitted the grievance, and only attempted a clarification interview after the OIG's recommendation. The department also assigned an inappropriate officer to escort the incarcerated person to the interview.

OIG Case Number
23-0063060-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On August 24, 2023, an officer allegedly harassed an incarcerated person by accusing him of being under the influence of drugs, strip searched him three times, and forced him to provide a urine sample. After the incident, staff allegedly failed to call the incarcerated person to his work assignment.

Disposition

The department's Centralized Screening Team (screening team) routed the work assignment allegation back to the prison as a routine issue. While the OIG concurred with that decision, the screening team failed to address the allegation of harassment. The OIG recommended the screening team conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person about the harassment allegation, but the screening team declined to do so.

Case Rating

Overall, the department handled the screening and referral poorly. The screening team failed to identify and address an incarcerated person's, who was an Armstrong class member, allegation that officers harassed him. Following a recommendation by the OIG, the screening team declined to conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person about the alleged harassment. The screening team processed the grievance as a routine issue related to a work assignment.



OIG Case Number
23-0063091-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On August 28, 2023, an incarcerated person submitted a grievance with such poor handwriting that it was difficult to read. The grievance included reference to “patient . . . illegal . . . no food . . . canteen . . .”.

Disposition

The department’s Centralized Screening Team (screening team) determined the grievance did not contain allegations of staff misconduct and routed the grievance back to health care staff as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur with the screening team’s determination because the decision was premature as the screening team should have completed a clarification interview before making their routing decision. The OIG recommended a clarification interview, and the screening team agreed but the incarcerated person refused to participate. The screening team elected to uphold their initial decision.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The screening team failed to identify the need to conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person who submitted an illegible grievance and only attempted a clarification interview after the OIG’s recommendation.

OIG Case Number
23-0063262-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On August 29, 2023, a nurse allegedly harassed a wheelchair bound incarcerated person by putting a sign on his door that stated not to let the incarcerated person out of his cell unless he cleaned it. The nurse allegedly previously left the incarcerated person on the floor for two hours, telling him that he got himself into the situation, and to get himself out of it, while instructing a second nurse not to help the incarcerated person.

Disposition

The screening team routed the allegation that a nurse harassed an incarcerated person by putting a sign on his door back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG concurred with that decision. The screening team failed to identify the same nurse allegedly ignored the incarcerated person in need of assistance for two hours and instructed another nurse not to help the incarcerated person. The OIG elevated the



matter and the screening team agreed to conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person. However, the screening team reviewed the incarcerated person's medical file and determined the interview was unnecessary, based on unrelated medical notes and elected to uphold their original screening decision. The OIG did not concur.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The screening team failed to identify the allegation that a nurse left an incarcerated person on the floor for two hours, ignoring his requests for assistance, and instructing another nurse not to help the incarcerated person. Following the OIG's elevation, the screening team agreed to conduct a clarifying interview with the incarcerated person. However, the screening team conducted a review of the incarcerated person's medical file instead, and determined the interview was not necessary because on August 28, 2023, the nurse documented that the incarcerated person was disruptive and disrespectful towards staff following an off-site appointment and demanded a shower. The screening team's explanation was unrelated to the incarcerated person's allegation that he was left on the floor for hours. The screening team also did not confirm if the alleged incident occurred on August 28, 2023, before citing medical documents from that date. The screening team elected not to interview the incarcerated person and decided to uphold their original screening decision.