



During February 2024, the OIG’s Centralized Screening Monitoring Team randomly selected 548 grievances for monitoring. This document presents 11 notable cases monitored and closed by the OIG during February 2024.

In summarizing the allegations made against staff, the OIG has tried to provide the exact language from the incarcerated person or parolee to the extent possible. In some instances, the OIG summarized the complaint instead for reasons related to the length of the complaint, the number of redactions needed making the original writing difficult to follow, or when another reporting party submitted the complaint on behalf of the incarcerated person or parolee. When quoting the incarcerated person’s complaint, the OIG left the dates, spelling, and grammar as written by the incarcerated person to maintain accuracy of the complaint.

OIG Case Number  
23-0069002-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
**Poor**

### Incident Summary

On November 22, 2023, an incarcerated person wrote in relevant part, “. . . the last grievance I put outside my door . . . was given back to me and I noticed the writing on there was slightly different . . . I noticed documents in my possession were rewritten. Several of them. . . I have not been getting my legal mail from the central district court on time and my legal mail was opened several times . . . before giving it me but not in my presence. . . .”

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the legal mail allegation back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegation about the altered grievances. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview and subsequently opened a new grievance log to address the allegation that staff altered a grievance; however, they elected to maintain their original decision regarding the legal mail. Following a second elevation, the Centralized Screening Team management agreed to refer the legal mail allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team misclassified the allegation that officers opened the incarcerated person’s legal mail back to the prison as a routine issue and failed to identify the allegation that staff





altered his prior grievances. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview and opened a new grievance log to address the allegation of altered grievances but elected to keep the allegation about the legal mail as a routine allegation. Only after the OIG's additional elevation to the Centralized Screening Team's management did the Centralized Screening Team decide to refer the legal mail allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. Following the decision to reclassify the legal mail allegation as staff misconduct on January 19, 2024, the department failed to open the new grievance until February 14, 2024, 18 business days thereafter. The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation to the hiring authority on February 16, 2024, a total of 20 business days following their decision, and 57 business days following their initial receipt of the complaint.

OIG Case Number  
24-0070903-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
**Poor**

### Incident Summary

An incarcerated person made a verbal allegation to prison staff that on December 2, 2023, a sergeant and four officers used excessive force on him.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined there was no allegation of staff misconduct and returned the complaint back to the prison. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview, during which the incarcerated person requested to speak with his lawyer before giving a statement. The Centralized Screening Team elected not to refer the allegation as an allegation of staff misconduct, citing insufficient information.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team prematurely made a screening decision without knowing the actual statement alleged by the incarcerated person, as prison staff responsible for reporting the verbal allegation failed to provide specific information or attach detailed source documents. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview with the incarcerated person, but upheld their original decision, citing insufficient information to warrant a use-of-force investigation, when the incarcerated person requested to speak to a lawyer before providing additional details. Following a second elevation, management from the Centralized Screening Team noted the allegation "should have been returned to the institution to determine what the 'verbal allegation of unnecessary / excessive force' was," but ultimately concluded the Centralized Screening Team did not have enough information to consider the allegation to be staff misconduct.



OIG Case Number  
24-0071379-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
Poor

### Incident Summary

An incarcerated person wrote in relevant part, “On December 13, 2023, [mental health and nursing staff] saw my bruised swollen nose and difficulty breathing subsequent [to] custody entering my cell off camera to repeatedly kick and punch me with closed fists in my head, torso, and face, yet mental health staff contribute to the pattern practice of patient abuse by insubordination towards DOM 51020.17.8, provisions then by ordering forced injection of excessive psychotropic medications to disorientate and demobilize me while nursing – medical contribute to the pattern practice of patient abuse by insubordination towards DOM 51020.17.8, provisions then by omitting to record the extent of injuries or provide medical care. . . .”

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation of assault by custody staff to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation. While the OIG concurred with that decision, the Centralized Screening Team inappropriately determined there were no allegations of staff misconduct involving health care staff. After the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and referred the allegation against health care staff to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify any misconduct against health care staff. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team agreed to refer the allegations against the health care staff to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit for as a failure to report misconduct by another employee.

OIG Case Number  
24-0072058-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
Poor

### Incident Summary

On December 18, 2023, an officer allegedly harassed an incarcerated person by issuing him a counseling memorandum for altering personal property when he tried to repair another incarcerated person’s television. A second officer allegedly called the incarcerated person a liar for filing a prior complaint against the first officer. The incarcerated person’s cellmate allegedly informed him the second officer threatened to make the incarcerated person’s life miserable if he kept filing complaints.



## Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation about the counseling memorandum back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG concurred; however, the Centralized Screening Team failed to consider the vague allegations of harassment, retaliation, and threatening comments by the second officer. The OIG elevated the complaint back to the Centralized Screening Team and recommended the Centralized Screening Team conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person who submitted the complaint, and the Centralized Screening Team agreed. Subsequently, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation that an officer called the incarcerated person a liar to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The Centralized Screening Team routed the claim about the unprofessional comments back to the prison as routine issues.

## Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the need to conduct a clarification interview with an *Armstrong* class member about his vague allegation of retaliation, harassment, and threatening comments. The OIG recommended that the Centralized Screening Team conduct a clarification interview to gather additional details of the alleged staff misconduct. The Centralized Screening Team agreed; however, they failed to include the OIG in the clarification interview as requested. Subsequently, the Centralized Screening Team determined the allegation did not meet the criteria for retaliation or harassment. Based on a review of the Centralized Screening Team's documentation of the interview, the OIG concurred. The Centralized Screening Team appropriately addressed the previously unidentified allegations with one referral to the hiring authority and one routed back to the prison as a routine issue.

OIG Case Number  
24-0072149-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
Poor

## Incident Summary

An incarcerated person wrote in relevant part, "This petitioner was victim of criminal assault by staff on November 9, 2023, at same time staff wrote rules violation [report] on petitioner. . . . The petitioner was transferred to [the restricted housing] unit denied food and water for 3 to 4 days, all property, all [illegible] privileges, phone privileges, all [illegible] and legal mail..." The incarcerated person made allegations that staff destroyed evidence and covered up criminal activity. Specifically writing, a lieutenant said, "it doesn't matter, it's his duty to find all inmates guilty." During a clarification interview, the incarcerated person alleged a sergeant spit in his face, cut his wrist while applying handcuffs, took his property, and threatened his life if he did not withdraw a prior complaint. The incarcerated person also clarified he was not



denied food or water, but staff failed to provide him silverware and a cup to eat and drink with.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team identified a single disciplinary issue in the complaint, which they returned to the prison as routine. While the OIG concurred, the Centralized Screening Team failed to thoroughly review the entire complaint. The OIG elevated the complaint back to the Centralized Screening Team as the complaint was partially illegible but contained allegations of use of force, the denial of food and water, property, and access to privileges and legal mail, allegations against a lieutenant, and destruction of evidence. The Centralized Screening Team completed a clarification interview with the incarcerated who submitted the complaint, and subsequently opened a new grievance log to address multiple missed allegations.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team identified a single rules violation report issue and failed to identify the need for a clarification interview, as the grievance was mostly illegible, before rendering a final decision. Following the OIG's elevation regarding the incarcerated person's unclear allegations of force and being denied food and water for days, the Centralized Screening Team elected to conduct a clarification interview. Subsequently, the Centralized Screening Team opened a new grievance to address the incarcerated person's allegations of excessive force, denial of silverware and a cup, a lieutenant making it his duty to find the incarcerated person guilty, and the destruction of evidence.

OIG Case Number  
24-0072280-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
**Poor**

### Incident Summary

On January 5, 2024, a sergeant allegedly failed to respond to an incarcerated person's request to speak to a sergeant while the incarcerated person was on suicide watch and experiencing chest pains. On January 6, 2024, an officer allegedly asked the incarcerated person where his tablet was, knowing it had been taken, and told the incarcerated person, "That's what happens when you write up a sergeant." The incarcerated person alleged he could not eat his food when the same officer provided his meal trays. On unknown dates, a second officer allegedly turned off his body-worn camera while interviewing the incarcerated person in a holding cell. Other officers allegedly asked the incarcerated person why he filed a complaint against their sergeant but had their body-worn cameras turned off and their names covered up. The incarcerated person alleged the behavior by the sergeant and the officers to be ongoing harassment and retaliation for filing a complaint against a second sergeant.



## Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation that a single officer turned off his body-worn camera while interviewing the incarcerated person to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation, referred the allegation that officers asked the incarcerated person why he filed a complaint against their sergeant to the hiring authority for a local inquiry, and returned the allegations that a sergeant refused to speak to the incarcerated person and that an officer asked about the incarcerated person's tablet back to the prison as routine issues. The OIG agreed with the Centralized Screening Team's referral to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit and routing the allegation about the sergeant as a routine issue but did not concur with the rest of the screening decisions. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview with the incarcerated person who submitted the complaint, and subsequently referred the allegation against the officer who told the incarcerated person his tablet was taken because he filed a complaint against a sergeant to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. The Centralized Screening Team also agreed the allegation they referred to the hiring authority did not include the body-worn camera-element and that it should have been referred to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. Since the locally designated investigator had already started the interviews for the local inquiry, the Centralized Screening Team noted it was up to the investigator to suspend and elevate the allegation. The Centralized Screening Team determined the food service was not an allegation of any kind.

## Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegation of the officers turning off their body-worn cameras and refer it to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify and refer the allegation that an officer told the incarcerated person his tablet had been taken because he filed a complaint against a sergeant, or that the incarcerated person did not feel comfortable eating meals served by the officer. The Centralized Screening Team failed to consider any of the allegations to be retaliation or harassment and failed to identify a possible risk to the incarcerated person's safety about reported chest pains because of the harassment. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team agreed the claim of officers turning off their body-worn cameras should have been referred to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit; however, since the locally designated investigator had already started the interviews for the inappropriately referred local inquiry, the Centralized Screening Team noted it was up to the investigator to suspend and elevate the allegation. The Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview with the incarcerated person who submitted the complaint about the tablet claim and asked questions already addressed in the written complaint. Following the interview, the Centralized Screening Team referred the incarcerated person's allegation of retaliation for filing complaints to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation



Unit. The Centralized Screening Team did not believe the incarcerated person's claim of feeling uncomfortable eating meals, served by the same officer whose conduct they referred to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit as retaliation, was an allegation. The Centralized Screening Team's January 17, 2023, poor initial review resulted in multiple delays. The Centralized Screening Team did not make the required imminent risk notification until January 30, 2024, 12 calendar days following receipt of the complaint. The Centralized Screening Team did not refer an allegation of retaliation for filing staff misconduct complaints for an investigation until February 1, 2024, 14 calendar days following their initial receipt. In addition, the Centralized Screening Team's incomplete summary of an allegation which resulted in an inappropriate referral to a locally designated investigator, also caused a delay. The assigned locally designated investigator documented his disagreement on January 31, 2024, but as of March 1, 2024, 44 calendar days following the Centralized Screening Team's initial review, the investigator still had not suspended and elevated the local inquiry for referral to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number  
24-0073280-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
**Satisfactory**

### Incident Summary

On November 16, 2023, a parole agent allegedly harassed a parolee by inappropriately searching areas of a residence to which the parolee did not have access.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation back to the parole office as a routine issue. The OIG concurred.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed satisfactorily. An analyst with the Centralized Screening Team conducted a telephonic interview with the parolee to obtain additional information because a family member submitted the written complaint on his behalf. Based on our review of the documents, the analyst asked appropriate questions, took detailed notes, and even documented comments made by the parolee's family members who were listening to the interview.



OIG Case Number  
24-0073348-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
Poor

### Incident Summary

An incarcerated person wrote in relevant part, “On January 9, 2024, I was awoken at approximately 6:00 AM. [The investigative services unit] was conducting some type of search. I was taken to [housing unit] dayroom where I was stripped down in the presence of females . . . I was told that there has been ‘[gang] activity’ . . . This investigation is baseless (free of hard facts), profiling (racially), discriminatory, and harassing. . . .”

During a clarification interview with the Centralized Screening Team, the incarcerated person alleged male custody staff strip searched him in the middle of the day room, without a privacy screen, while two female staff members stood 30 to 40 feet away. The incarcerated person alleged he knew the females were watching him during the unclothed body search because they both made eye contact with him during the search.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the strip search allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry and returned the claim about the investigative services unit process back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur with the referral to the hiring authority because the OIG considered the unclothed body search allegation to meet the criteria for a sexual misconduct violation which warranted a referral to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview with the incarcerated person who submitted the complaint, but ultimately, the Centralized Screening Team maintained their position that the unclothed body search violations did not warrant a referral to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team failed to consider the investigative services unit staff’s violation of the department’s unclothed body search policy to be staff sexual misconduct, specifically an “invasion of privacy, beyond that reasonably necessary to maintain safety and security.” Following the OIG’s first elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview with the incarcerated person, and subsequently upheld their original decision. Following the OIG’s second elevation, the Centralized Screening Team upheld their original decision to refer the case for a local inquiry only. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team responded that while the incarcerated person reported female staff made eye contact with him during the unclothed body search, he did “not indicate they were being voyeuristic.” Based on the OIG’s monitoring of the clarification interview, the Centralized Screening Team asked what the female staff were doing during the unclothed body search. The incarcerated person informed the





interviewer that the female staff were standing by a table with a duffle bag in front of them, but they were not looking at, or doing anything with, the duffle bag, and he knew they were watching him during the search because they made eye contact with him. The Centralized Screening Team did not ask any further questions regarding the female staff's behavior that would have resulted in the incarcerated person describing "voyeuristic" behavior.

OIG Case Number  
24-0073576-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
Poor

### Incident Summary

On January 26, 2024, an incarcerated person wrote in relevant part, "I wish to appeal the [rules violation report] for "refusing a [cellmate]" that was given to me by [prison]'s Officer [redacted] out of retaliation and spite due to my [clinician] telling me to not talk to him and stay away. My [clinician] helping me file reports for the physical abuse & sexual harassment [the officer] has subjected me to; as well as the [staff complaints] I filed each time he sexually harassed me & exposed me naked/peeped in at be naked illegally. Because of this, and the fact I'm trans/nonbinary, [the officer] would try to put people in my cell that I would not be compatible with, nor felt safe/sexually comfortable with, knowing I'd refuse, just to write me up out of retaliation . . . I tried to commit suicide due to the incident & harassment by [the officer]. He tried to force a [cellmate] in my cell while I was naked, bullied me, then refused to shut my door exposing me naked to everyone while laughing. . . ."

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegations of the officer's harassment, the rules violation report, and forcing incompatible cellmates back to the prison as routine issues. The OIG did not concur and elevated the routine routing decision of the allegations against the officer for harassment and retaliation. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and referred the allegations of continued harassment and retaliation by the officer to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team incorrectly identified the allegations that an officer exposed a naked incarcerated person to other incarcerated people and continually harassed the incarcerated person to the point of the incarcerated person attempting suicide, as a routine allegation. The Centralized Screening Team should have identified the allegation contained additional information relevant to an open investigation with the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. Additionally, the Centralized Screening Team failed to refer the allegation against the officer for issuing the incarcerated person a rules violation report in retaliation for filing prior staff complaints against the officer. Following



the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately amended their decisions and referred both the harassment and retaliation allegations against the officer to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number  
24-0073917-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
Poor

### Incident Summary

An incarcerated person wrote in relevant part, "Falsification of [rules violation] reports . . . On January 16, 2024, I was housed at [redacted] . . . As I'm being search by Officer [redacted] he was roughly searching me for some reason so [I] asked [the officer] why are you search me so hard?? . . . at this time [the officer] take hold of my left arm and hand and roughly twist my arm and hand behind by back to the point pain shot up my shoulder . . . On January 24, 2024, they took all of my property they took my tablet I still don't have my property. . . ." [sic]

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the property and rules violation report allegations back to the prison as routine claims. While the OIG concurred with those decisions, the Centralized Screening Team inappropriately included the excessive force allegation as part of the routine rules violation report dispute. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the excessive force allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team inappropriately included the excessive force allegation with the rules violation report dispute as a routine claim. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team documented, "Although claimant uses verbiage indicating staff misconduct, CST decision is that no staff misconduct has been identified as context provided does not validate misdirection of standard policy/procedure." Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the excessive force allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

OIG Case Number  
24-0073937-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
Poor

### Incident Summary

An incarcerated person wrote in relevant part, "Today [February 2, 2024], I was sitting on my bed waiting for pill call 8pm & I heard Officer [redacted] talking down the



full tier to the nurse about how [incarcerated person's cell number] is 'fake' & a 'sex offender.' . . . I told [the officer] I heard him & that I need to speak to the Sergeant. Sergeant [redacted] comes & I tell him what happens, & how this is making me uncomfortable & is very stressful."

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation against the officer to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The OIG did not concur and elevated the decision for reconsideration as staff misconduct which would warrant a referral to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. The Centralized Screening Team agreed.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. While the Centralized Screening Team identified an allegation of staff misconduct, they failed to identify the misconduct was on the Allegation Decision Index and inappropriately referred the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team agreed to refer the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit as an allegation of creating an opportunity or motive for one incarcerated person to harm another by announcing the incarcerated person was a sex offender. The OIG recommended the Centralized Screening Team include the additional detail regarding a sergeant's apparent failure to report the officer's alleged misconduct. The Centralized Screening Team included language in the referred claim about the incarcerated person notifying the sergeant of the officer's alleged behavior.