



## August 2025 Centralized Screening Monitoring Team Case Blocks Published in September 2025

During August 2025, the OIG's Centralized Screening Monitoring Team monitored and closed 1,608 grievances. Of those grievances, the Centralized Screening Team and the OIG each determined 1,320 grievances did not contain any allegations of staff misconduct. The OIG determined the remaining 288 grievances contained allegations of staff misconduct. As of July 1, 2025, we stopped rating any case that did not contain an allegation of staff misconduct. We assessed the processing of grievances containing allegations of staff misconduct as follows:

**Table 1. The OIG's Assessment of 288 Grievances for August 2025**

Rating	Staff Misconduct Grievances Only	
	Number of Grievances	Percentage
<i>Adequate</i>	191	66
<i>Improvement Needed</i>	17	6
<i>Inadequate</i>	80	28
<b>Totals</b>	288	100

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

**Table 2. Cumulative Monthly Statistics From January Through July 2025**

Rating	Number and Percentage of Grievances							
	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August
<i>Adequate</i>	69	104	115	111	248	168	138	191
	54%	61.5%	63%	63%	78.75%	79%	76%	66%
<i>Improvement Needed</i>	13	16	17	10	15	7	7	17
	10%	9.5%	9%	5.5%	4.75%	3%	4%	6%
<i>Inadequate</i>	46	49	51	456	52	38	37	80
	36%	29%	28%	31.5%	16.5%	18%	20%	28%
<b>Staff Misconduct Grievances</b>	128	169	183	177	315	213	183	288
<b>Total Grievances Reviewed</b>	875	1,082	978	1,293	1,421	1,277	1,486	1,608

Note: Only complaints containing allegations of staff misconduct receive a rating.

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

This document presents nine notable cases monitored and closed by the OIG during August 2025.





OIG Case Number  
25-0107785-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

On March 24, 2025, an officer allegedly put his “erect penis” near an incarcerated person’s buttocks during a controlled use-of-force cell extraction. During a clarification interview, the incarcerated person stated the officer “was too close,” but the officer did not have an erect penis. The incarcerated person alleged the officer cut his clothes off and stripped him naked “in front of everybody,” did not cover him up, and touched his buttocks.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the complaint did not contain an allegation of staff misconduct. The OIG did not concur as the incarcerated person made an allegation of staff sexual misconduct, and the grievance records indicated neither prison staff nor the Centralized Screening Team interviewed the incarcerated person. Policy requires the incarcerated person to be interviewed within 48 hours of making an allegation of staff sexual misconduct and allegations of staff sexual misconduct be referred to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team upheld its decision, claiming the officer’s “described behavior” did not meet the threshold for staff sexual misconduct. Following a second elevation, the Centralized Screening Team’s management agreed they needed to at least interview the incarcerated person. Subsequent to the clarification interview, the Centralized Screening Team again upheld its decision of no staff misconduct.

### Case Rating

The department’s performance was *inadequate*. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team failed to consider the allegation an officer put his “erect penis” near an incarcerated person’s buttocks as staff sexual misconduct. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team declined to interview the incarcerated person and upheld its decision, claiming the “described behavior” did not meet the threshold for staff sexual misconduct. Following a second elevation, the Centralized Screening Team caused a significant delay in processing this complaint. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team made its initial decision on March 27, 2025. The OIG disputed the decision, which included elevating the decision to Centralized Screening Team management. The Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview and upheld its decision of no staff misconduct, on July 30, 2025, citing the incarcerated person only stated he felt the officer “was too close.” The Centralized Screening took a total of 85 business days to render a decision after the OIG’s initial dispute.



The OIG questioned the absence of information in the screener’s interview notes about the incarcerated person’s allegation the officer cut his clothes off and stripped him naked “in front of everybody,” did not cover him up, and touched his buttocks. The Centralized Screening Team responded that its interview notes did not include the “touching my ass” statement. The Centralized Screening Team also stated that there was an emergency at the prison that necessitated the strip search, and it was reasonable that staff may have been “touching” his buttocks to handcuff him. However, department policies and regulations do not permit the Centralized Screening Team to speculate as to the meaning of the incarcerated person’s comment. Once the Centralized Screening Team was made aware that the incarcerated person alleged staff “touched his ass”, the comment should have been considered as an allegation of staff misconduct. Instead, the Centralized Screening Team told the OIG that the incarcerated person did not describe “any overt behavior.”

OIG Case Number  
25-0117311-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

On July 5, 2025, an officer allegedly used unreasonable force on an incarcerated person by over-tightening the handcuffs on his wrist.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the complaint contained no allegations of staff misconduct. The OIG did not concur because department policy requires allegations of unreasonable force—including the improper use of restraints—be referred to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team maintained its position, claiming the restraints “are meant to be tight,” and the incarcerated person did not indicate he received injuries from the over-tightening of the restraints. The OIG elevated the allegation for a second review by the Centralized Screening Team administrators. However, the Centralized Screening Team’s management maintained their position that overtightening of restraints did not meet the threshold for unreasonable force criteria.

### Case Rating

The department’s performance was *inadequate*. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team determined an allegation that officers used unreasonable force on an incarcerated person by overtightening restraints was not an allegation of unreasonable force, claiming the incarcerated person’s allegation did not meet the threshold for staff misconduct. Following two elevation attempts by the OIG, the Centralized Screening Team administrators upheld their decision that the verbal allegation of unreasonable force was a routine issue and that the fact finder could suspend and elevate the allegation if he or she discovered any misconduct.



OIG Case Number  
25-0117337-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

On June 30, 2025, two officers allegedly watched adult films and other movies on a state computer instead of observing incarcerated people on suicide watch. On July 1, 2025, officers allegedly searched an incarcerated person's cell for the fifth or sixth time in seven days. A registered nurse allegedly entered a second incarcerated person's cell to give him contraband art supplies and called the first incarcerated person a racial slur. The incarcerated person alleged the registered nurse and the second incarcerated person played a guitar so loudly, the first incarcerated person could not sleep and complained to an officer, who allegedly looked into the second incarcerated person's cell and told them to quiet down.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation of racial discrimination towards the incarcerated person to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation and identified the art supply allegation as staff misconduct, but rejected the allegation as substantially duplicative of an allegation included in a prior grievance that had already been referred to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for overfamiliarity between the registered nurse and the second incarcerated person. The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation officers watched movies while on duty to the prison as a routine allegation of staff misconduct and routed the cell search and guitar playing allegations back to the prison as routine policy claims. The OIG concurred with all the screening decisions except for the decision to route as routine the allegation against the registered nurse for playing an incarcerated person's guitar in the incarcerated person's cell. Because the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit was already investigating the registered nurse for overly familiar behavior with the same incarcerated person, the Centralized Screening Team should have routed this additional allegation of overfamiliarity to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit to be included in that open investigation. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team decided to reject the guitar playing allegation as duplicative of the overfamiliarity investigation. The OIG disagreed with this decision since the claim's rejection meant the additional details would not be provided to the investigator assigned to the open investigation. Following a second elevation, the Centralized Screening Team's management reverted to its original decision to classify the allegation as a routine policy claim.

### Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. Specifically, while identifying one allegation against a registered nurse as duplicative of an allegation already referred to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for overfamiliarity with an incarcerated person, it failed to consider a second allegation against the registered nurse for engaging in additional overly familiar behavior with the same incarcerated person as an allegation of staff misconduct. Following two elevations by the OIG recommending the additional allegation of overfamiliarity be added to the previously opened



investigation, the Centralized Screening Team's management upheld its initial decision to route the allegation as a routine policy claim.

OIG Case Number  
25-0117790-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

On July 4, 2025, officers allegedly conducted a voyeuristic unclothed-body search of an incarcerated person in the administration building.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team requested a clarification interview with the incarcerated person to clarify the sexual misconduct allegation. The Centralized Screening Team then canceled the interview because the incarcerated person paroled and determined the allegation not to be staff sexual misconduct. The OIG did not concur because the Centralized Screening Team could still interview the individual on parole, and his parole had no bearing on his allegation of sexual misconduct prior to his release. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team upheld its original decision of no staff misconduct.

### Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. The Centralized Screening Team correctly identified the need to clarify the incarcerated person's vague allegation of staff sexual misconduct during an unclothed-body search. However, the Centralized Screening Team canceled the interview after the incarcerated person paroled and arbitrarily determined the allegation not to be staff misconduct. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team reported it canceled the clarification interview not because the incarcerated person paroled, but because the allegation did not meet the criteria for staff sexual misconduct. The Centralized Screening Team's explanation contradicted itself because it scheduled the clarification interview because the screener did not have sufficient information to make an appropriate screening decision. Yet it relied on the same limited information to then definitively determine the complaint did not meet the criteria for staff sexual misconduct.

OIG Case Number  
25-0118352-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

Between April 12, 2025, and July 8, 2025, staff allegedly failed to provide an incarcerated person's dentures following his transfer, resulting in his inability to eat and significant weight loss.



## Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the denture allegation back to the prison as routine policy claim. The OIG did not concur because the department consistently refers allegations regarding missing durable medical equipment as allegations of staff misconduct not on the Allegation Decision Index. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation to the prison as a routine allegation of staff misconduct.

## Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegation staff failed to provide or replace an incarcerated person's dentures as an allegation of staff misconduct. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team contacted health care staff to follow up with the incarcerated person and to get him replacement dentures and referred the allegation for routine review of staff misconduct. The department's incorrect documentation, and the Centralized Screening Team's failure to refer two staff misconduct grievances from the incarcerated person about his missing dentures appropriately, resulted in the incarcerated person receiving a "soft bite sized diet," for 122 days.

OIG Case Number  
25-0119052-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

## Incident Summary

On June 29, 2025, an officer allegedly refused to process an incarcerated person's legal mail and threatened to retaliate if the incarcerated person filed a staff misconduct complaint. On July 19, 2025, the officer allegedly allowed incarcerated people to go to other incarcerated peoples' cells to intimidate and threaten the incarcerated person.

## Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation an officer allowed incarcerated people into other incarcerated peoples' cells to threaten and intimidate them as a routine allegation of staff misconduct and the legal mail allegation as a routine policy claim. The OIG did not concur with the legal mail decision because it did not address the officer's threat against the incarcerated person if he filed a complaint regarding the legal mail, which is staff misconduct on the Allegation Decision Index. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

## Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify and address an allegation an officer refused to process an incarcerated person's legal mail and threatened to retaliate against the incarcerated



person, when the incarcerated person stated he would file a complaint against the officer. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the legal mail and related retaliation allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

OIG Case Number  
25-0120752-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

#### Incident Summary

On July 30, 2025, an incarcerated person alleged a nurse practitioner committed malpractice when they touched him during a medical appointment. During a clarification interview, the incarcerated person alleged he had an appointment for a colonoscopy, and the nurse practitioner had him undress, lay naked on the examination table, and the nurse practitioner touched his buttocks.

#### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the complaint did not contain an allegation of staff misconduct. The OIG did not concur because prison staff do not perform colonoscopies; therefore, the nurse practitioner should not have touched the incarcerated person's buttocks. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation against the nurse practitioner to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit as staff sexual misconduct.

#### Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team failed to consider an allegation a nurse practitioner had an incarcerated person get naked, lay on an examination table, and touched his buttocks as an allegation of staff sexual misconduct. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegation against the nurse practitioner to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

OIG Case Number  
25-0121723-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

#### Incident Summary

On June 5, 2025, two officers allegedly confiscated an incarcerated person's television and called the incarcerated person unprofessional and racist names. On June 6, 2025, one of the two officers allegedly threatened to pepper spray and "make an example out of" the incarcerated person, while calling him racist and profane names.





## Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegations as routine allegations of staff misconduct. The OIG did not concur because racial discrimination is staff misconduct on the Allegation Decision Index. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegations 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 allegations of officers making racist comments to an incarcerated person, and one of the officers also making threatening and unprofessional comments to the incarcerated person, as allegations of racial discrimination or threatening harm. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegations against both officers to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number  
25-0121802-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

## Incident Summary

On May 17, 2025, a lieutenant and two officers allegedly failed to intervene when medical staff at an outside hospital staff "assaulted and abused" an incarcerated person. On May 23, 2025, the lieutenant allegedly falsified a rules violation report against the incarcerated person. Between May 23, 2025, and August 8, 2025, staff allegedly housed the incarcerated person in restricted housing because of the falsified rules violation report. The incarcerated person alleged a second incarcerated person spat in his face during an escort, and staff did not allow him to wash the spit off. The incarcerated person requested a classification committee hearing and to be released from the restricted housing unit.

## Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the allegation against hospital staff to be outside the department's jurisdiction and routed the rules violation report allegation, the restricted housing unit allegation, and the allegation against another incarcerated person back to the prison as routine policy claims. The OIG disagreed with the routing decision of the rules violation report because the incarcerated person alleged the lieutenant knowingly falsified the report, which according to policy would need to be referred as staff misconduct on the Allegation Decision Index. The Centralized Screening Team also failed to identify the allegation the lieutenant and an officer witnessed unreasonable force by hospital staff and failed to intervene as allegations of any kind. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the lieutenant and officer's failure to intervene to the prison as a routine allegation of staff misconduct but still failed to address the lieutenant's alleged dishonesty.





## Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify allegations a lieutenant and two officers failed to intervene when medical staff at an outside hospital assaulted an incarcerated person and the lieutenant knowingly falsified a rules violation report against the incarcerated person as allegations at all. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the lieutenant's and officers' alleged failure to intervene to the prison as a routine allegation of staff misconduct. However, the Centralized Screening Team again failed to address the lieutenant's alleged dishonesty during the falsification of the rules violation report and continued processing the allegation a routine rules violation report dispute.