



During April 2024, the OIG's Centralized Screening Monitoring Team randomly selected 631 grievances for monitoring. This document presents eight notable cases monitored and closed by the OIG during April 2024.

OIG Case Number
24-0076095-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On February 6, 2024, an officer allegedly abandoned his post to play cards with other officers. After the officer left his post, a riot ensued, which resulted in an incarcerated person being attacked and injured.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation the officer abandoned his post 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 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 failed to properly identify the allegation that an officer abandoned his post to play cards with other officers, which resulted in a riot where an incarcerated person was attacked and injured, as staff misconduct. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team opened a new grievance log and appropriately referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

OIG Case Number
24-0076650-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

Between February 21, 2024, and March 14, 2024, officers allegedly allowed other incarcerated persons to access an incarcerated person's cell to steal his personal items and put feces and poison oak on his property.





Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team identified a single allegation against the incarcerated persons as a routine issue. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegation that officers contributed to the event by allowing other incarcerated persons to access the incarcerated person's cell. The OIG elevated the complaint to the Centralized Screening Team to address the allegation related to the officers and to conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person who filed the complaint. The Centralized Screening Team chose not to conduct a clarification interview or to process the allegation against the officers.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify and address the incarcerated person's allegation that officers allowed other incarcerated persons to access the incarcerated person's cell to put feces and poison oak on his personal items and steal his property. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team inappropriately chose not to conduct a clarification interview or process the allegation against the officers. Further, the prison's Office of Grievances incorrectly rejected the allegation against the incarcerated persons as duplicative to a prior grievance resulting in the department failing to conduct even the lowest-level fact finding into the allegations.

OIG Case Number
24-0076791-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On March 9, 2024, an officer allegedly harassed a disabled incarcerated person of a specific race who remained standing during an alarm when the officer told him to get on the ground despite the incarcerated person wearing his mobility impaired vest. The officer allegedly ignored other incarcerated persons of a different race who also remained standing during the alarm. The officer allegedly refused to give the incarcerated person her name, and a second officer refused to provide his badge number when the incarcerated person requested the information to file a complaint. After the alarm had cleared, a sergeant allegedly told the first officer she was wrong, and the incarcerated person was right about not having to sit down due to his mobility impairment. The incarcerated person alleged the first officer frequently acted rudely toward incarcerated people of a specific race and only searched the bunks of incarcerated persons of that race.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation against the two officers to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The OIG did not concur. The OIG elevated the complaint to the Centralized Screening Team regarding the decision not to refer an



alleged racial discrimination allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team upheld their original decision.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team inappropriately referred an allegation of racial discrimination to the hiring authority for a local inquiry instead of the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation. The OIG elevated the decision to the Centralized Screening Team who arbitrarily determined details not presented in the grievance and upheld their decision based on supposition and conjecture. The Centralized Screening Team determined it was more likely the reason the officer did not tell the other incarcerated persons to get down during the alarm was because the incarcerated person engaged the officer in an argument.

OIG Case Number
24-0076932-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On January 29, 2023, officers allegedly denied an incarcerated person assistance under the Americans with Disabilities Act when they refused to assist him with transferring from the floor to his wheelchair and denied him thickener for his water. On February 21, 2024, the Office of Appeals determined the prison inappropriately denied the incarcerated person's initial grievance and ordered the prison to open a new grievance to address the issue appropriately.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation that officers allegedly denied an incarcerated person's Americans with Disabilities Act assistance by refusing to assist him with transferring from the floor to his wheelchair and denied him thickener for his water back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision, opened a new grievance, and referred the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The department opened the grievance solely to address deficiencies in a prior grievance submitted by the incarcerated person, which the department failed to process completely and appropriately. However, the screener again identified the staff misconduct allegation, that officers denied an incarcerated person assistance and medical supplies afforded under the Americans with Disabilities Act, as a routine issue. Only after the OIG's elevation did



the Centralized Screening Team appropriately refer the allegation as staff misconduct to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.

OIG Case Number
24-0077917-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On March 30, 2024, an officer allegedly refused to allow an incarcerated person out of his cell to report to work and subsequently ignored the incarcerated person's reported chest pains.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegations against the officer back to the prison as a single, routine issue. The OIG did not concur. The OIG elevated the decision to the Centralized Screening Team, advising that an officer who ignored a medical emergency was not a routine issue. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team improperly identified the allegation the officer ignored the incarcerated person's chest pains as a routine issue. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. In addition, the Centralized Screening Team grouped the incarcerated person's work assignment allegation with the chest pains allegation, so by default they referred the work assignment allegation for a local inquiry, which was unnecessary.

OIG Case Number
24-0078287-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On March 14, 2024, a psychiatric technician allegedly ignored an incarcerated person's medical emergency for approximately 30 minutes, while the incarcerated person was gasping for air.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation of the psychiatric technician's negligence back to health care staff to address as a routine issue. The OIG did not



concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation against the psychiatric technician to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team inappropriately referred an allegation of staff misconduct related to a psychiatric technician's negligence by ignoring an incarcerated person experiencing a medical emergency as a routine issue. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately amended their decision and referred the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.

OIG Case Number
24-0079303-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Satisfactory

Incident Summary

Between March 31, 2024, and April 1, 2024, a nurse allegedly refused to administer and refill an incarcerated person's medication and allegedly played computer games while working. An officer allegedly issued the incarcerated person a counseling memorandum for disrespecting nursing staff. The incarcerated person requested the counseling memorandum be removed from his file, claiming he was not disrespectful and did not make threatening movements or gestures toward staff.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the medication request for reassignment to health care services as a routine issue and routed the counseling memorandum dispute to the prison as a routine issue. The Centralized Screening Team also identified the staff misconduct allegation related to the nurse playing computer games while working to the prison. The OIG concurred.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed satisfactorily. The Centralized Screening Team appropriately routed the allegation against staff failing to refill the incarcerated person's medication and counseling memorandum dispute back to the prison as routine issue. In addition, the Centralized Screening Team identified an allegation of staff misconduct not involving an incarcerated person and routed the allegation to the prison.



OIG Case Number
24-0079544-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On April 7, 2024, two officers allegedly denied an incarcerated person access to the dining hall, claiming he was “late.” The incarcerated person advised the officers that workers were still serving food, to which the officers allegedly responded that they did “not give a sh*t.” When the incarcerated person requested to speak to a sergeant, the officers allegedly threatened to retaliate against the incarcerated person by “messing with” the dormitory where he was housed.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the access to the dining hall claim to the prison as a routine issue and failed to identify the two officers’ alleged unprofessionalism and threats. Prior to the OIG’s review, the prison’s Office of Grievances disputed the Centralized Screening Team’s routine decision and recommended the allegation be referred to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The Centralized Screening Team agreed. The OIG concurred with the final decision.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team determined an allegation that officers denied an incarcerated person a meal during dining hall hours, used unprofessional language toward the incarcerated person, and threatened to retaliate against the incarcerated person if he insisted on speaking to a sergeant, to be a routine dining hall access issue. Following a dispute by the prison’s Office of Grievances, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. However, the Centralized Screening Team failed to update the claim details in the department’s staff misconduct database to include the unprofessional and threatening comments. The department trains locally designated investigators to focus only on the claim detail the Centralized Screening Team provides. Therefore, it is unclear how, or if, the Centralized Screening Team communicated the additional elements of the allegation to the assigned investigator. As of May 1, 2024, 13 business days following the amended decision, the claim the Centralized Screening Team referred to the prison only noted inaccurately and incompletely that an incarcerated person was late to the dining hall and the officers denied his meal, to which the Centralized Screening Team elevated the claim from a routine decision to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The allegation did not include the officers’ unprofessional or threatening statements.