



During March 2024, the OIG's Centralized Screening Monitoring Team randomly selected 588 grievances for monitoring. This document presents 10 notable cases monitored and closed by the OIG during March 2024.

OIG Case Number
24-0074146-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On February 7, 2024, officers allegedly ignored an incarcerated person's requests for medical assistance for an unresponsive incarcerated person.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation that an incarcerated person advised several officers that another incarcerated person needed medical attention back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team opened a new grievance log to address the allegation that officers ignored an incarcerated person's requests for medical assistance for an unresponsive incarcerated person as staff misconduct.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify staff misconduct and routed the allegation back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG elevated the complaint and recommended the Centralized Screening Team review the complaint again with a focus on the allegation that several officers allegedly ignored an incarcerated person's request for medical assistance for an unresponsive incarcerated person. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and opened a new grievance to refer the allegation against the officers to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.

OIG Case Number
24-0074147-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On October 2, 2023, a warehouse supervisor allegedly retaliated against an incarcerated person for filing a prior complaint by issuing him a false rules violation report for an incident that occurred on May 10, 2023. On February 7, 2024, a





lieutenant allegedly violated the incarcerated person's due process rights by failing to provide him with relevant documentation before his disciplinary hearing for the incident on May 10, 2023. The lieutenant also failed to address discrepancies in the store supervisor's statements at the disciplinary hearing. The incarcerated person requested the rules violation report be dismissed.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the due process allegation back to the prison as a routine issue and the Office of Grievance subsequently rejected the allegation as anticipatory because the hiring authority had not finalized the disciplinary hearing decision. The OIG concurred with that analysis; however, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegation that the store supervisor retaliated against the incarcerated person for previously filing a complaint against the store supervisor. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation 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 failed to identify the allegation that a store supervisor retaliated against the incarcerated person for filing a prior complaint against her by issuing the incarcerated person a fabricated rules violation report for an incident that occurred on May 10, 2023. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team opened a new grievance to address the allegation and referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

OIG Case Number
24-0071379-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

Between January 19, 2024, and January 20, 2024, an officer allegedly gave an incarcerated person's canteen items and property to his cellmate. A lieutenant and a second officer allegedly refused to speak to an incarcerated person regarding his allegation under the Prison Rape Elimination Act against another incarcerated person. A third officer allegedly made the incarcerated person wait hours before interviewing him about his allegation. Between January 20, 2024, and February 11, 2024, while the incarcerated person was housed in the restricted housing unit, officers allegedly failed to provide the incarcerated person clothes, shoes, access to shower, toiletries, and denied him telephone privileges. On January 21, 2024, a fourth officer allegedly hit the incarcerated person in the head with hand restraints. Unidentified officers allegedly allowed other incarcerated people to assault the incarcerated person during a cell extraction. Medical staff allegedly failed to provide the incarcerated person



medical attention or document his injuries from the cell extraction. A fifth officer and sixth officer allegedly stepped on the incarcerated person's shorts while they escorted him to medical, which caused the incarcerated person to fall. Medical staff allegedly administered an injection to the incarcerated person that caused him to hear voices. The incarcerated person alleged he heard custody and medical staff threaten his family, heard his family in the prison, and saw a gray car pushed into the electrical gate of the prison.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team reassigned the use-of-force complaint to the prison where the allegation originally took place before referring it to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit and routed the remaining allegations back to the prison as routine issues. The OIG agreed with this part of the Centralized Screening Team's decision. However, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify allegations that an officer gave the incarcerated person's canteen items and property to his cellmate and officers denied the incarcerated person telephone privileges. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and opened a new grievance to address the allegation against the officer that gave the incarcerated person's canteen items and property away and referred the allegation as staff misconduct to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify allegations that an officer gave the incarcerated person's canteen items and property to his cellmate and denied him telephone privileges. Following the OIG's elevation regarding the officer giving away the incarcerated person's property and goods, the Centralized Screening Team opened a new grievance to address the missed allegation and referred it to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.

OIG Case Number
24-0075504-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On February 26, 2024, custody staff allegedly opened an incarcerated person's legal mail, outside of his presence and then placed tape on the legal mail to keep it closed.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the legal mail allegation back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.



Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team initially determined the allegation that staff opened the incarcerated person's legal mail as a routine issue. The OIG elevated the decision and recommended that the Centralized Screening Team refer the allegation consistent with previous, similar allegations. The Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and referred the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.

OIG Case Number
24-0075572-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

Between August 1, 2023, and March 1, 2024, an officer allegedly used a computer system called "Demonology" to torture an incarcerated person, fill his body with electricity that released testosterone into his body and read his mind. Three additional officers allegedly rubbed their hands over the front of the incarcerated person's body and inappropriately touched his genitals. The same three officers allegedly performed unclothed body searches on the incarcerated person near a door where female staff could see and ridicule him.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur. The OIG elevated the complaint and indicated the allegations warranted a referral for staff misconduct despite the incarcerated person's complaint containing nonsensical statements. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team identified an allegation related to sexual misconduct as a routine issue. Subsequent to the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team acknowledged the claim met criteria on the Allegation Decision Index, amended their decision and referred the sexual misconduct claim to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.



OIG Case Number
24-0075611-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On February 29, 2024, two officers allegedly released incarcerated persons of specific races for their work assignments in the housing unit but did not release an incarcerated person of a different race for his work assignment. The same officers allegedly treated the incarcerated person unfairly due to the pigment of his skin and his psychiatric disability.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the discrimination allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry despite the claim meeting criteria on the Allegation Decision Index for retaliation. The OIG did not concur. The locally designated investigator later disputed the Centralized Screening Team's referral and routed the claim back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The OIG believed the allegation warranted a referral to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit but did not elevate the decision because the OIG was monitoring the local inquiry. The locally designated investigator disputed the referral without consulting with the OIG. The OIG does not know the basis of the locally designated investigator's dispute because the Centralized Screening Team did not include the details of the dispute in the case record, nor did they provide the details in subsequent email correspondence. Following the locally designated investigator's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team determined the allegation to be a routine issue. The Centralized Screening Team arrived at their new decision by citing and weighing documentary evidence, which is outside their scope for screening complaints. The Centralized Screening Team did report the documentary evidence in questions was not the basis of the locally designated investigator's dispute. The OIG did not agree with the Centralized Screening Team's decision to route an allegation of racial discrimination as a routine issue or their choice to weigh evidence during the screening phase of the complaint process.



OIG Case Number
24-0075746-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Superior

Incident Summary

Between October 5, 2023, and March 4, 2024, staff allegedly failed to transfer an incarcerated person to an appropriate prison based on his custody level. On February 27, 2024, a lieutenant, who allegedly harassed the incarcerated person in the past, allegedly mocked the incarcerated person and called him inappropriate names.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation that a lieutenant called the incarcerated person names and harassed him to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The Centralized Screening Team determined the incarcerated person's transfer request was substantially duplicative of a prior grievance and routed the request back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG concurred with both decisions.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed in a superior manner. The screener performed a thorough review of the complaint, which contained vague references to complaints the incarcerated person previously submitted that contained allegations of staff misconduct. The screener exercised due diligence, identified the relevant previously submitted complaints, included detailed notes, and made the appropriate screening decision.

OIG Case Number
24-0075753-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On March 3, 2024, two officers allegedly harassed and mocked an incarcerated person in retaliation for filing a complaint against one of the two officers. The second officer allegedly failed to wear a body-worn camera during an encounter with the incarcerated person.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur. The OIG elevated the complaint and indicated the incarcerated person filed a complaint against one of the two officers days prior, which supported the retaliation allegation. Additionally, the OIG advised the Centralized Screening Team the allegation regarding the officer not wearing her body-worn



camera was not addressed. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and referred both allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegation that two officers mocked and antagonized an incarcerated person as retaliation for a complaint the incarcerated person previously filed and failed to address an officer was not wearing her body-worn camera. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred both allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number
24-0075974-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On March 4, 2024, an incarcerated person alleged past experiences at his current prison made him feel unsafe and that officers had negatively impacted his mental health. The incarcerated person requested a transfer, so he would not "self-destruct." The incarcerated person threatened to stab a captain, who allegedly gave the incarcerated person "dirty looks," if he was released to the yard.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the transfer request back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG concurred with that analysis. However, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the imminent risks to personal safety and prison security. The OIG notified the Centralized Screening Team and the Office of Grievance regarding the imminent risks. The Office of Grievance notified the appropriate prison staff of the risks to personal safety and prison security.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify an imminent mental health risk for the incarcerated person and a threat against a captain. The OIG confirmed through document review that mental health staff had seen the incarcerated person regarding mental health statements he made in the complaint. The OIG also notified the prison about the threat against the captain, and confirmed relevant documentation regarding the threat notification was added to the complaint record.



OIG Case Number
24-0076076-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On March 4, 2024, an officer allegedly kicked an incarcerated person's cell door while the incarcerated person's face was pressed against the door. The officer allegedly caused the door to hit the incarcerated person's head and knocked him over.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation against the officer to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation for the allegation to be reconsidered as a use of force, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team identified an allegation of staff misconduct, however, they failed to identify the misconduct as use of force 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.