



During the December 2023 review period, the OIG's Local Inquiry Team retrospectively reviewed 18 random local inquiry cases that were closed by the department from June through September 2023, in order to assess the department's performance on local inquiry cases that our office did not contemporaneously monitor.

OIG Case Number
23-0067233-INQ

Rating Assessment
Poor

Case Summary

On March 11, 2023, officers allegedly disregarded an incarcerated person's medical authorization for a lower bunk and did not provide the incarcerated person with access to electricity so that he could use personal appliances.

Case Disposition

The hiring authority conducted an inquiry and found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations.

Overall Inquiry Assessment

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team improperly assigned this case for local inquiry when the incarcerated person alleged disability discrimination based on officers not assigning him a lower bunk despite having medical authorization, an allegation classified under the Allegation Decision Index for investigation by the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. The investigator did not conduct any staff interviews relating to the incarcerated person's allegation that staff refused to medically accommodate him and did not identify applicable departmental policies and procedures. The notices of interview the investigator issued indicated that both witnesses had opted to audio record their interviews, but there was no confirmation whether the interviews were recorded and if so, there was no department copy of the interviews available for the OIG's review. The Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit manager and the hiring authority did not recognize the investigator failed to address the incarcerated person's allegation of discrimination, nor that the relevant departmental policies and procedures were omitted from the inquiry report. The Centralized Screening



Team received the complaint on March 16, 2023, but the hiring authority did not render a final decision until July 21, 2023, 127 days thereafter and 37 days beyond the department goal. The department unreasonably delayed its completion of the allegation inquiry report in several ways. The investigator submitted the draft inquiry report to the Office of Grievances on March 25, 2023, but the Office of Grievances did not forward the draft inquiry report to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit until May 2, 2023, 38 days thereafter. The Allegation Investigation Unit manager did not return a reviewed copy of the inquiry report, instructing further inquiry until June 4, 2023, 33 days thereafter. After the revised inquiry report was completed by the investigator and resubmitted to the Allegation Investigation Unit on June 13, 2023, the Allegation Investigation Unit manager did not complete a review and return the approved inquiry report until July 19, 2023, 36 days thereafter.

OIG Case Number
23-0067234-INQ

Rating Assessment
Poor

Case Summary

In April 2023, an officer was allegedly disrespectful to an incarcerated person by telling him that she did not care about his feelings and was always disrespectful towards incarcerated persons of a particular race.

Case Disposition

The hiring authority conducted an inquiry and determined that the evidence conclusively proved the misconduct did not occur.

Overall Inquiry Assessment

Overall, the department performed poorly. The investigator did not identify relevant departmental policies or procedures, did not interview witnesses in the order provided for in training and best practices, and did not identify or interview any staff witnesses. The investigator was assigned to the case on May 8, 2023, but did not conduct the first interview until July 11, 2023, 64 days thereafter. The Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit manager failed to recognize the investigator did not identify in the inquiry report relevant departmental policies or procedures, and the investigator did not identify or interview any staff witnesses. The hiring authority incorrectly determined the inquiry conclusively proved the misconduct did not occur. Instead, the hiring authority should have determined there was insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations.



OIG Case Number
23-0068619-INQ

Rating Assessment
Poor

Case Summary

On July 14, 2023, an officer allegedly assaulted an incarcerated person by applying handcuffs excessively tight.

Case Disposition

The hiring authority conducted an inquiry and found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegation.

Overall Inquiry Assessment

Overall, the department performed poorly. Video evidence demonstrated potentially unprofessional conduct by the officer at the incarcerated person's cell front. The investigator did not conduct additional inquiry into the video evidence even though the video evidence showed there were multiple witnesses present, and the incarcerated person alleged that the officer had been provoking the incarcerated person. The investigator failed to include in the draft inquiry report departmental policies and procedures related to unprofessional conduct. The Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit manager failed to recognize the lack of reference or identification of applicable departmental policies and procedures relating to unprofessional conduct. The hiring authority also failed to recognize the issue relating to the officer's potentially unprofessional conduct and provocation of the incarcerated person.

OIG Case Number
23-0069223-INQ

Rating Assessment
Poor

Case Summary

On September 26, 2022, an officer allegedly allowed an incarcerated person to pack the personal property of a second incarcerated person who was rehoused.

Case Disposition

The hiring authority conducted an inquiry and found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations.

Overall Inquiry Assessment

Overall, the department performed poorly. The investigator failed to identify any relevant departmental policies or procedures in the inquiry report. The investigator also failed to interview a staff witness who was working at the time of the alleged incident or a second staff witness who relocated to another prison. Additionally, the



investigator did not include in the inquiry report whether he made an attempt to interview the incarcerated person at his cell front when he refused to exit his cell to be interviewed. The Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit manager failed to recognize the above omissions in the inquiry report.

OIG Case Number
23-0067230-INQ

Rating Assessment
Poor

Case Summary

On December 8, 2022, three officers, one sergeant, and one lieutenant allegedly failed to secure an incarcerated person's cell door after he was rehoused, resulting in his personal property being stolen.

Case Disposition

The hiring authority conducted an inquiry and found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegation.

Overall Inquiry Assessment

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team identified an officer, a sergeant, and a lieutenant as subjects. The investigator did not mention these individuals in the inquiry report and instead identified two alternate officers as subjects, neither of which was the officer the Centralized Screening Team originally identified. The incarcerated person's grievance identified two other officers as the individuals suspected of not securing the incarcerated person's cell door at the time he was rehoused. This resulted in the inquiry having findings on two new subjects that were not reflected in the department's staff misconduct database, no findings against the three original subjects the Centralized Screening Team identified, and no inquiry into the two officers who the incarcerated person identified in the grievance. Additionally, based on the three original subjects the Centralized Screening Team identified, the investigator assigned to this case was not at least one rank higher than the highest-ranking subject, a lieutenant. The investigator did not include in the inquiry report a copy of the property inventory form which showed the signatures of the officers involved with inventorying and packing the incarcerated person's property, an employee sign-in sheet for those working on the day of the incident, or any relevant departmental policies and procedures. The investigator did not explain in the inquiry report what steps he took, if any, to identify additional staff potentially involved after the first two staff witnesses denied any involvement. The investigator did not indicate in the inquiry report what efforts were made to interview the witnesses the incarcerated person identified in the grievance and did not provide an explanation for why the investigator did not interview the subjects the Centralized Screening Team identified. The Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit manager did not require the investigator to include a copy of the property inventory form that included the signature block, did not have the investigator include departmental policies and



procedures, did not have the investigator identify and interview additional witnesses who were working at the time, and did not have the investigator explain why the two officers alleged of misconduct in the staff complaint were not interviewed and how the two new subjects were identified. The hiring authority did not have the investigator explain why the two officers alleged of misconduct in the staff complaint were not interviewed and how the two new subjects were identified.

OIG Case Number
23-0067282-INQ

Rating Assessment
Poor

Case Summary

On January 10, 2023, a lieutenant was allegedly disrespectful and argumentative towards an incarcerated person during a rules violation hearing.

Case Disposition

The hiring authority conducted an inquiry and found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegation.

Overall Inquiry Assessment

Overall, the department performed poorly. The department assigned an investigator that was the same rank as the subject who was a lieutenant. The investigator also failed to identify departmental policies or procedures related to rule violation hearings and staff professionalism. The Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit manager failed to recognize the above omissions in the inquiry report.

OIG Case Number
23-0067270-INQ

Rating Assessment
Satisfactory

Case Summary

On March 14, 2023, an officer allegedly denied an incarcerated person access to the law library and acted unprofessionally by slamming a window shut in front of the incarcerated person, causing pain to the incarcerated person's ears.

Case Disposition

The hiring authority conducted an inquiry and found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegation.

Overall Inquiry Assessment

Overall, the department performed satisfactorily.



OIG Case Number
23-0067273-INQ

Rating Assessment
Poor

Case Summary

On March 21, 2023, a counselor allegedly did not process the incarcerated person's family visit application because the counselor did not want to do more work than necessary.

Case Disposition

The hiring authority conducted an inquiry and found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegation.

Overall Inquiry Assessment

Overall, the department performed poorly. The investigator did not identify departmental policies and procedures related to family visits and did not address the incarcerated person's allegation that a counselor did not act on a February 2023 application for family visits. The Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit manager did not recognize the investigator did not identify and include in the inquiry report applicable departmental policies and procedures, did not address the incarcerated person's allegation the counselor did not act on a February 2023 application for family visits, and did not return the inquiry report to the investigator to address these issues. The hiring authority determined the investigation was adequate and rendered a decision despite the inquiry report not identifying any applicable departmental policies and procedures, and not addressing the incarcerated person's allegation that the counselor did not act on a February 2023 application for family visits.

OIG Case Number
23-0066644-INQ

Rating Assessment
Poor

Case Summary

On April 8, 2023, two officers allegedly damaged an incarcerated person's electric razor during a cell search. One of the officers allegedly threatened to retaliate by writing up the incarcerated person if he filed a complaint.

Case Disposition

The hiring authority conducted an inquiry and found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations.



Overall Inquiry Assessment

Overall, the department performed poorly. The investigator did not identify any relevant departmental policies and procedures, did not include the incarcerated person's grievance nor a copy of the cell search receipt in the inquiry report, and improperly provided a recommendation to the hiring authority in the inquiry report. Additionally, the investigator did not recognize the potential retaliation and dishonesty misconduct that warranted suspending and elevating the inquiry to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation. The Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit manager failed to recognize the inquiry report did not include the incarcerated person's grievance nor a copy of the cell search receipt and did not instruct the investigator to remove a recommendation to the hiring authority from the inquiry report. The manager also did not recognize the potential staff misconduct of retaliation and dishonesty which warranted suspending and elevating the inquiry to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation. The hiring authority did not recognize the potential staff misconduct of retaliation and dishonesty which warranted suspending and elevating the inquiry to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation. Additionally, the hiring authority did not render the proper decision in this case based on the evidence provided: the first officer admitted to damaging the shaver, the second officer corroborated the damage, and the cell search receipt documented the damage. Accordingly, the hiring authority should have sustained the allegation.

OIG Case Number
23-0067269-INQ

Rating Assessment
Poor

Case Summary

On April 29, 2023, a supervising cook allegedly retaliated against an incarcerated person by telling other incarcerated persons that the first incarcerated person filed a complaint against the cook.

Case Disposition

The hiring authority conducted an inquiry and found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegation.

Overall Inquiry Assessment

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team improperly routed this case for local inquiry even though the incarcerated person alleged retaliation based on filing of a grievance, which is an allegation of staff misconduct identified on the Allegation Decision Index and designated for investigation by the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. The investigator did not recognize the Centralized Screening Team improperly routed this case, did not identify any applicable departmental policies or procedures, did not identify the incarcerated person witnesses whom the investigator indicated had



refused to interview, and did not include any exhibits in the investigative report. The Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit manager failed to recognize the Centralized Screening Team improperly routed this case for local inquiry and approved the inquiry report as adequate despite the above issues. The hiring authority failed to recognize the Centralized Screening Team improperly routed this case for local inquiry and approved the inquiry report as adequate despite the issues.

OIG Case Number
23-0067219-INQ

Rating Assessment
Poor

Case Summary

Between December 2022 and May 31, 2023, correctional staff allegedly failed to address an incarcerated person's generalized claims of having safety concerns.

Case Disposition

The hiring authority conducted an inquiry and found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations.

Overall Inquiry Assessment

Overall, the department performed poorly. The investigator did not interview any staff, did not identify any applicable departmental policies or procedures, and did not indicate if the inquiry included a review of whether the prison's investigative services unit ever interviewed the incarcerated person regarding safety concerns. The Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit manager failed to recognize the above issues in the inquiry report. The hiring authority's closure memorandum was dated 31 days before the hiring authority determined the inquiry report to be adequate. The hiring authority did not make a finding in accordance with departmental policy.

OIG Case Number
23-0066627-INQ

Rating Assessment
Poor

Case Summary

On May 22, 2023, two officers allegedly conducted a cell search improperly, resulting in damage to an incarcerated person's personal property, were disrespectful towards the incarcerated person regarding the search, and were dishonest about the damage.

Case Disposition

The hiring authority conducted an inquiry and found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegation.



Overall Inquiry Assessment

Overall, the department performed poorly. The investigator did not identify relevant departmental policies and procedures regarding cell searches in the inquiry report. Additionally, video evidence depicted one incarcerated person and two officers who were potential witnesses, but the investigator did not interview them as a part of the inquiry. The incarcerated person also alleged damages to an audio/video cable and headphones which the investigator did not address in the inquiry report. The investigator did not include a notice of staff complaint, notices of interview, nor an advisement of rights in the inquiry report. The Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit manager failed to recognize the investigator did not include relevant departmental policies and procedures in the inquiry report, did not discuss the alleged damaged audio/video cable and headphones, nor include notices and the advisement of rights for staff witnesses.

OIG Case Number
23-0068868-INQ

Rating Assessment
Poor

Case Summary

On June 2, 2023, an officer allegedly acted unprofessional and intimidated an incarcerated person when the officer was dismissive of a question asked by the incarcerated person and stared at the incarcerated person as though the officer wanted to fight.

Case Disposition

The hiring authority conducted an inquiry and found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegation.

Overall Inquiry Assessment

Overall, the department performed poorly. The investigator failed to gather and review a sufficient duration of video evidence relative to the alleged time of the incident, relying only on ten minutes of footage which revealed no interaction between the officer and the incarcerated person. Additionally, the officer failed to gather and review relevant departmental policies regarding employee conduct and include the policies and video footage as supporting exhibits to the inquiry report. The investigator also failed to interview the officer who was the subject of the inquiry. The Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit manager failed to recognize the above omissions in the inquiry report.



OIG Case Number
23-0067227-INQ

Rating Assessment
Satisfactory

Case Summary

On June 29, 2023, an officer and a nurse allegedly spoke rudely and disrespectfully to an incarcerated person and refused to take her to a group counseling session.

Case Disposition

The hiring authority conducted an inquiry and found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations.

Overall Inquiry Assessment

Overall, the department performed satisfactorily.

OIG Case Number
23-0069202-INQ

Rating Assessment
Poor

Case Summary

On July 10, 2023, two officers allegedly risked the safety of an incarcerated person when they attempted to move the incarcerated person to an occupied cell prior to determining if the two incarcerated persons were compatible. When the incarcerated person refused the cell move, one of the two officers allegedly acted discourteous and hostile towards the incarcerated person.

Case Disposition

The hiring authority conducted an inquiry and found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations.

Overall Inquiry Assessment

Overall, the department performed poorly. The investigator failed to gather and review relevant policies and procedures pertaining to employee conduct and include them as supporting exhibits to the inquiry report. The investigator also failed to interview both officers who were the subjects of the inquiry. The Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit manager failed to recognize the above omissions from the inquiry report.



OIG Case Number
23-0068683-INQ

Rating Assessment
Poor

Case Summary

In July 2023, three officers allegedly slept on duty resulting in their failure to release incarcerated persons from their cells as scheduled.

Case Disposition

The hiring authority conducted an inquiry and determined that the inquiry conclusively proved the misconduct did not occur.

Overall Inquiry Assessment

Overall, the department performed poorly. The investigator failed to identify relevant departmental policies and procedures and retrieve video recordings. The investigator also failed to interview four incarcerated persons and one officer who were witnesses. The investigator conducted an interview of one incarcerated person witness but failed to explain how the incarcerated person was identified or his relevance to the inquiry. The Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit manager and the hiring authority failed to recognize the above omissions in the inquiry report. The OIG did not concur with the hiring authority's determination that the allegations were unfounded. According to the department's operations manual, the evidentiary threshold was not met in this case, and the hiring authority should have found the allegations to be not sustained.

OIG Case Number
23-0068929-INQ

Rating Assessment
Poor

Case Summary

Between May 2023, and June 2023, two officers allegedly injured an incarcerated person's previously dislocated shoulder when they handcuffed him for no reason. The officers allegedly also refused on multiple instances to open the incarcerated person's cell door for breakfast and disclosed personal information about him to other staff and incarcerated persons.

Case Disposition

The hiring authority conducted an inquiry and found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations.

Overall Inquiry Assessment

Overall, the department performed poorly. The investigator failed to gather and review any relevant policies and procedures and include them with memorandums



dated July 13, 2023, and July 20, 2023, which provided the time and location of the alleged incident, as supporting exhibits to the inquiry report. The investigator failed to document whether she conducted a search of the incarcerated person's medical record regarding his shoulder dislocation or made other attempts using information available to her to determine the dates of the incarcerated person's allegations. Additionally, the investigator erroneously documented in the inquiry report that the incarcerated person failed to make allegations against staff members despite the incarcerated person's allegation of misconduct by at least two officers who he could not identify. The investigator also incorrectly documented the date of her inquiry assignment as July 13, 2023; she incorrectly documented that the incarcerated person alleged racial profanity instead of racial profiling; and she failed to include and investigate the allegation that officers improperly disclosed personal information about the incarcerated person to other staff and incarcerated people. The Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit manager failed to recognize the above omissions in the inquiry report. Finally, the department's August 23, 2023, closure memorandum response to the incarcerated person who filed the complaint predates the hiring authority's August 30, 2023, approval of the inquiry report.

OIG Case Number
23-0068917-INQ

Rating Assessment
Poor

Case Summary

On July 25, 2023, a sergeant allegedly did not have his body-worn camera turned on during an interview with an incarcerated person and a second sergeant allegedly attempted to dissuade the incarcerated person from pursuing a grievance.

Case Disposition

The hiring authority conducted an inquiry and found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations.

Overall Inquiry Assessment

Overall, the department performed poorly. The investigator failed to collect video evidence even though the complaint provided the date and approximate time of the alleged incident. The investigator also failed to gather and review any relevant departmental policies and procedures and include them with the notice of interview and notice of admonishment provided to each subject of the inquiry as supporting exhibits to the inquiry report. The Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit manager failed to recognize the above omissions in the inquiry report.