



July 2025 Centralized Screening Monitoring Team Case Blocks
Published in September 2025

During July 2025, the OIG's Centralized Screening Monitoring Team monitored and closed 1,486 grievances. Of those grievances, the Centralized Screening Team and the OIG each determined 1303 grievances did not contain any allegations of staff misconduct. The OIG determined the remaining 183 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 183 Grievances for July 2025

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

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 five notable cases monitored and closed by the OIG during July 2025.



OIG Case Number
25-0116357-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On June 20, 2025, a sergeant allegedly advised an incarcerated person she would be moving to a different housing unit, and the incarcerated person told the sergeant there was documentation regarding a fight she had with a second incarcerated person in the same unit, and she would not move. The sergeant allegedly told the incarcerated person she would ignore the separation document and issued the incarcerated person a rules violation report for refusing to accept assigned housing and a second rules violation report for being in the shower at the same time as another incarcerated person. The sergeant allegedly issued the rules violation reports in retaliation for the incarcerated person filing a grievance against the sergeant, harassed transgender incarcerated people, and used another incarcerated person to attack any incarcerated people who filed staff complaints against the sergeant. During a clarification interview, the incarcerated person alleged the sergeant threatened to house her in a unit with the incarcerated person she previously identified as an enemy, threatened to write false rules violation reports, and told other incarcerated people she had HIV. The sergeant used a third incarcerated person to assault a fourth incarcerated person who filed a complaint against the sergeant.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the ignored safety concerns and disciplinary allegations back to the prison as routine policy claims. The OIG did not concur because the incarcerated person made allegations regarding retaliation and using an incarcerated person to assault other incarcerated people, which the Centralized Screening Team failed to clarify prior to rendering a screening decision. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview and subsequently referred the allegations of retaliation, dishonesty, and conspiring to assault incarcerated people for filing complaints to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation under a new grievance log number.

Case Rating

The department's performance was inadequate. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team failed to independently identify the need to conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person about vague allegations of retaliation, harassment of transgender incarcerated people, falsifying documents, and using another incarcerated person to assault other incarcerated people and only conducted the interview upon the OIG's recommendation. Following the clarification interview, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately routed the allegations of retaliation, dishonesty, and using an incarcerated person to assault another incarcerated person to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.



OIG Case Number
25-0116571-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On June 23, 2025, an officer and other staff allegedly shook their heads aggressively at an incarcerated person. The incarcerated person alleged kitchen staff served him small food portions, and he can hear staff and other incarcerated persons making pornography in other cells. The incarcerated person made an allegation that he had been sexually assaulted. During a clarification interview, the incarcerated person alleged, while under sedation, staff and other incarcerated people sexually assaulted him with broomsticks and fire extinguishers.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegations staff shook their heads at the incarcerated person, served small food portions, and participated in pornography back to the prison as routine policy claims. The OIG did not concur with the pornography allegation, as staff creating pornography with incarcerated persons would be staff sexual misconduct warranting a referral to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit, and the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the vague sexual assault allegation. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview and subsequently referred the pornography and sexual assault allegations 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 consider the allegation staff and other incarcerated people participated in pornography to be an allegation of staff sexual misconduct and failed to identify the need to conduct a clarification interview regarding a vague sexual assault allegation, only conducting the interview following a recommendation by the OIG. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the pornography and sexual assault allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

OIG Case Number
25-0116748-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On June 24, 2025, a male officer allegedly refused to exit work change during an unclothed-body search of a transgender, female incarcerated person, after a female officer twice requested him to leave. The male officer allegedly stated, "I'm not going



anywhere, I'm not listed as male," and "gawked" at the naked incarcerated person causing her to feel degraded. Both officers allegedly refused to provide the male officer's name when the incarcerated person requested it to file a complaint.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the unclothed-body search and refusal to identify the officer as a routine allegation of staff misconduct. The OIG did not concur because department policy does not allow for cross-gender unclothed-body searches except in an emergency. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the alleged sexual misconduct, and failure to provide the officer's name as directly related in time and scope, 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 a male officer refused to leave the area while a female officer conducted an unclothed-body search of a transgender, female incarcerated person and "gawked" at the naked incarcerated person as an allegation of staff sexual misconduct. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the staff sexual misconduct to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit, along with the officers' refusal to provide the male officer's name as directly related in time and scope to the sexual misconduct.

OIG Case Number
25-0117719-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

Between May 1, 2025, and June 26, 2025, two officers allegedly placed the incarcerated population on lockdown, resulting in suspension of telephone and visiting privileges. An incarcerated person alleged one of the two officers gave away his mail or threw it in the trash, both officers discriminated against black incarcerated people for using the grievance process, and both officers spoke about him in Spanish. During a clarification interview, the incarcerated person alleged the first officer stared at and tried to agitate black incarcerated people, the second officer yelled directives at black incarcerated people over the intercom, and a third officer told the first officer—in Spanish—he did not like the incarcerated person.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the lockdown, mail, and discrimination allegations back to the prison as routine policy claims. The OIG did not concur with the decision to route the discrimination allegation as a routine policy claim. Policy required



allegations of racial discrimination be referred to the Office Internal Affairs' Allegations Investigation Unit and for the Centralized Screening Team to conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person if they believed the allegation to be vague. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview, and subsequently upheld their routine decision, citing insufficient information to support racial discrimination, to which the OIG concurred.

Case Rating

The department's performance was inadequate. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the need to conduct a clarification interview regarding a vague allegation of racial discrimination and only conducted the interview following a recommendation by the OIG. Subsequently, the Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation of discrimination back to the prison, citing insufficient information. Based on the information obtained during the clarification interview, the OIG concurred with the decision regarding insufficient information to support racial discrimination.

OIG Case Number
25-0118075-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Adequate

Incident Summary

Between March 3, 2025, and May 18, 2025, a sergeant allegedly failed to address an incarcerated person's safety concerns, putting him at risk of being harmed by other incarcerated people. An investigator allegedly began to fall asleep while interviewing the incarcerated person about his safety concerns and allegedly told the incarcerated person's enemies what the incarcerated person said about them. The incarcerated person allegedly had to claim feeling suicidal to be safely rehoused, and when mental health staff did not believe him, the incarcerated person alleged he had to start cutting himself.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred allegations of disregarding an incarcerated person's safety concerns, falling asleep during an interview, sharing information with other incarcerated people, and causing the incarcerated person to self-harm to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation. The OIG concurred.

Case Rating

The department's performance was adequate.