



February 2025 Centralized Screening Monitoring Team Case Blocks Published in April 2025

During February 2025, the OIG's Centralized Screening Monitoring Team monitored and closed 1,082 grievances. The OIG assessed the 1,082 grievances as follows:

The OIG disputed 50 screening decisions, and the Centralized Screening Team agreed with the OIG in 47 of those cases. This resulted in the Centralized Screening Team referring an additional 30 allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit and an additional seven allegations for review as allegations of staff misconduct not on the Allegation Decision Index, for a total of 37 additional staff misconduct investigations or reviews.

The OIG found the Centralized Screening Team made an incorrect decision in 48 cases, failed to identify every allegation within a complaint 70 times, failed to identify the need for a clarification interview six times, and opened 23 new grievances solely to correct a mistake they made in a prior screening decision.

This document presents seven notable cases monitored and closed by the OIG during January 2025.

The OIG's Assessment of 1,082 Grievances for February 2025

Rating	No. of Grievances
Adequate	982
Improvement Needed	49
Inadequate	51

Note: 4.5% of the grievances our office monitored received an *improvement needed* rating, and 4.5% received an *inadequate* rating.

Source: Analysis prepared by staff of the Office of the Inspector General.

OIG Case Number
25-0102016-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On November 21, 2024, officers allegedly dragged an incarcerated person out of his cell and repeatedly hit him.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the complaint did not contain an allegation of staff misconduct. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the unreasonable force allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.



Case Rating

The department's performance was inadequate. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegation that officers dragged an incarcerated person out of his cell and repeatedly struck him as an allegation of unreasonable force. After the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and appropriately referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

OIG Case Number
25-0102279-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On December 20, 2024, an officer allegedly used physical force to take an incarcerated person, who posed no imminent threat to the officer, to the ground.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the complaint did not contain an allegation of staff misconduct. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the unreasonable force allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

Case Rating

The department's performance was inadequate. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegation that an officer used unreasonable force on an incarcerated person who posed no threat as an allegation of staff misconduct on the Allegation Decision Index. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the unreasonable force allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

OIG Case Number
25-0102733-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Adequate

Incident Summary

On January 22, 2025, a physician allegedly confiscated an incarcerated person's crutches during an examination of his injured knee. After the incarcerated person told an officer he needed to go "man down" because he could not walk, the physician allegedly made the incarcerated person hop down a hall on one leg to retrieve his crutches.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation against the physician back to the prison as a routine allegation of staff misconduct. The OIG concurred.



Case Rating

The department's performance was adequate. However, while the Centralized Screening Team made the appropriate screening decision, this case shed light on serious concerns with recent regulatory changes related to health care complaint decisions. Specifically, the OIG discovered the health care Allegation of Staff Misconduct Screening Team disagreed with the Centralized Screening Team's decision, inappropriately determining "the concerns to be conjecture/perception of the [incarcerated person]; therefore, is not being addressed as [staff misconduct]..." However, instead of disputing the decision with the Centralized Screening Team, the Allegation of Staff Misconduct Screening Team simply proceeded with the claim as a routine health care claim. Following multiple correspondences with managers of the Centralized Screening Team and the health care Allegation of Staff Misconduct Screening Team – including one wherein health care staff informed the OIG they did not have to dispute decisions made by the Centralized Screening Team even if they chose not to process the claims in the manner the Centralized Screening Team determined – the health care management noted they believed the allegation to be "deliberate endangerment of an incarcerated person." However, the same health care manager ultimately referred the allegation as a routine allegation of staff misconduct – as originally determined by the Centralized Screening Team – despite suggesting the allegation met the criteria on the Allegation Decision Index warranting a referral to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

The health care management informed the OIG they would dispute allegations the Centralized Screening Team missed or considered routine, which health care found to be staff misconduct. However, they failed to respond to the OIG's question as to whether they would also dispute allegations the Centralized Screening Team determined to be staff misconduct, but which health care found to be routine.

OIG Case Number
25-0103883-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On January 28, 2025, and February 4, 2025, staff allegedly racially discriminated against an incarcerated person by refusing to provide his soft food diet despite him having no upper teeth to chew solid food with. The incarcerated person requested dental implants or dentures.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegations of discrimination and dental implants request back to the prison as routine policy claims. While the OIG concurred with the routing of the dental implants request, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify allegations of discrimination based on their face-value screening criteria. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team elected to route the allegation of discrimination as noncompliance with a soft food diet back to the prison



as a routine allegation of staff misconduct, noting the case could be suspended and elevated through the routine fact-finding process.

Case Rating

The department's performance was inadequate. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify an allegation of racial discrimination in accordance with their face-value screening criteria. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team failed to appropriately refer the alleged racial discrimination to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit, where allegations of discrimination are supposed to be routed, and elected to route the allegation as noncompliance with the soft food diet back to the prison as a routine allegation of staff misconduct. The Centralized Screening Team noted prison staff could suspend and elevate the case through the routine fact-finding process if they identified racial discrimination may have occurred.

OIG Case Number
25-0103912-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

Between January 24, 2025, and January 27, 2025, three officers and two nurses allegedly failed to respond and provide medical assistance when an incarcerated person attempted to commit suicide by cutting himself. On January 27, 2025, one of the officers allegedly instructed staff to clean the incarcerated person's cell before taking evidentiary photographs of the scene. The same officer allegedly made a sexual comment about the incarcerated person's genitals after he provided the incarcerated person a smock to wear.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the alleged staff sexual misconduct to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation and routed the allegation that officers failed to respond when an incarcerated person tried to take his own life as a routine allegation of staff misconduct. The OIG concurred only with the decision regarding the sexual misconduct allegation. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation against the officers and nurses for failing to respond and provide medical assistance to an incarcerated person actively engaged in self-harm to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

Case Rating

The department's performance was inadequate. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegation that officers and two nurses failed to respond and provide medical assistance to an incarcerated person actively engaged in self-injurious behavior as an allegation of staff misconduct on the Allegation Decision Index, consistent with past screening decisions. Subsequent to the OIG's elevation, the



Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegation against the officers and nurses to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number
25-0103983-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Adequate

Incident Summary

Between July 3, 2021, and February 5, 2025, a psychiatric technician allegedly threatened to rape an incarcerated person in his sleep, watched him while he showered, and made numerous inappropriate sexually harassing statements. On April 9, 2023, officers allegedly called the incarcerated person a pedophile. Between January 4, 2025, and February 5, 2025, two sergeants and multiple officers allegedly made inappropriate comments to the incarcerated person about his crimes and his personal information, attempted to extort money from the incarcerated person, and made sexually explicit remarks about raping the incarcerated person. On January 11, 2025, a second psychiatric technician allegedly made a statement about raping the incarcerated person. On January 13, 2025, the second psychiatric technician allegedly tried to discourage a sergeant from providing assistance to the incarcerated person based on his prior actions and commitment crimes. On January 17, 2025, a counselor allegedly stated, "he hasn't got raped in days", referring to the incarcerated person. Between January 22, 2025, and January 29, 2025, a physician allegedly commented to the incarcerated person about killing someone and made a sexually explicit statement towards the incarcerated person. On January 22, 2025, and February 4, 2025, two incarcerated people allegedly stated the incarcerated person had raped a child. On February 1, 2025, another officer allegedly insinuated the incarcerated person identified as a security threat group member and would be subject to an unclothed-body search.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred 39 allegations against custody and health care staff for staff sexual misconduct, making threats, extortion, and integrity to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit, routed one routine allegation of staff misconduct against an officer for indicating the incarcerated person was in a security threat group, and routed two allegations against other incarcerated people back to the prison as routine policy claims. The OIG concurred.

Case Rating

The department's performance was adequate. The Centralized Screening Team identified 42 claims within the complaint and the screener appropriately separated each claim for referral based on dates and subjects identified. The OIG commends the screener for their due diligence in identifying all the claims and referring them appropriately for what was a very a complex grievance involving multiple custody and health care staff.



OIG Case Number
25-0104441-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On February 9, 2025, three officers allegedly tackled an incarcerated person after the incarcerated person was told he could not use the restroom. On February 11, 2025, another officer allegedly used unreasonable force and dislocated the incarcerated person's shoulder. On February 12, 2025, a sergeant and four more officers allegedly grabbed an incarcerated person's injured arm and the back of his waist restraints to prevent him from sitting down, and one of the officers allegedly slammed the incarcerated person's face to the ground. Two nurses allegedly refused to assist the incarcerated person with his injuries, sending him to a hospital instead. On February 13, 2025, the incarcerated person requested staff investigate his prior complaint and provide video and audio recordings of the three unreasonable force incidents.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred two of three unreasonable force allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation and routed the medical allegation and requests for an investigation and video recordings back to the prison as routine healthcare and policy claims. While the OIG concurred with the decisions, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the third unreasonable force allegation. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the additional allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

Case Rating

The department's performance was inadequate. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify one of three distinct unreasonable force allegations and grouped the two they did identify into a single claim. After the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and referred the three unreasonable force allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.