



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

During September 2025, the OIG's Centralized Screening Monitoring Team monitored and closed 1,578 grievances. Of those grievances, the Centralized Screening Team and the OIG each determined 1,291 grievances did not contain any allegations of staff misconduct. The OIG determined the remaining 287 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 287 Grievances for September 2025

Rating	Staff Misconduct Grievances Only	
	Number of Grievances	Percentage
Adequate	215	75
Improvement Needed	17	6
Inadequate	55	19
Totals	287	100

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

Table 2. Cumulative Monthly Statistics From January Through September 2025

Rating	Number and Percentage of Grievances								
	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September
Adequate	69	104	115	111	248	168	138	191	215
	54%	61.5%	63%	63%	78.75%	79%	76%	66%	75%
Improvement Needed	13	16	17	10	15	7	7	17	17
	10%	9.5%	9%	5.5%	4.75%	3%	4%	6%	6%
Inadequate	46	49	51	456	52	38	37	80	55
	36%	29%	28%	31.5%	16.5%	18%	20%	28%	19%
Staff Misconduct Grievances	128	169	183	177	315	213	183	288	287
Total Grievances Reviewed	875	1,082	978	1,293	1,421	1,277	1,486	1,608	1,578

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 four notable cases monitored and closed by the OIG during September 2025.



OIG Case Number
25-0118701-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

Between May 16, 2025, and June 7, 2025, an officer allegedly sexually assaulted an incarcerated person. On June 11, 2025, the officer and a second officer allegedly intentionally allowed incarcerated people into the incarcerated person's cell to threaten him for filing a complaint about the first officer's alleged sexual misconduct. The incarcerated person requested a transfer.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the sexual assault allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation and routed the retaliation allegation and the transfer request back to the prison as routine policy claims. The OIG concurred with all the screening decisions except for the decision to treat the retaliation allegations as a routine policy claim because department policy requires allegations of retaliation for filing grievances be referred to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit, and the Centralized Screening Team failed to clarify the vague allegation before rendering a decision of no staff misconduct. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team attempted a clarification interview and then upheld their original screening decision.

Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team failed to consider the allegation of retaliation for filing grievances as staff misconduct and did not identify the need for a clarification interview about the vague allegation until the OIG recommended a clarification interview. Between August 14, 2025, when the incarcerated person declined to provide any further, specific details, and September 9, 2025, the Centralized Screening Team failed to update their records to reflect the attempted clarification interview and refusal by the incarcerated person and failed to communicate their final screening decision to the OIG. After multiple follow-up inquiries, the Centralized Screening Team reported they upheld their original decision based on the incarcerated person failing to provide any further details to support the alleged retaliation. However, as of October 22, 2025, the Centralized Screening Team failed to update the complaint record to reflect the clarification interview attempt and refusal – the basis for upholding their original decision.



OIG Case Number
25-0122184-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On July 14, 2025, an incarcerated person alleged officers subjected him to an unclothed body search in view of other incarcerated people, which included the use of a canine that sniffed his naked buttocks, and two of the officers allegedly made sexually inappropriate comments during the unclothed body search.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit, which later disputed the referral and recommended the allegation be sent to the prison as a routine allegation of staff misconduct. Following the dispute, the Centralized Screening Team instead routed the allegation back to the prison as a routine policy claim. The OIG did not concur because department policy defines sexual harassment as "repeated verbal comments or gestures," and the incarcerated person made allegations regarding multiple sexual comments. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the officers' unprofessional conduct as a routine allegation of staff misconduct.

Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. On July 18, 2025, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegation officers made sexually inappropriate comments to an incarcerated person during an unclothed body search to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation. On August 20, 2025, after the Office of Internal Affairs disputed the referral and recommended the allegation be referred as staff misconduct not on the Allegation Decision Index, the Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation back to the prison as a routine policy claim, not involving staff misconduct. The Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit did not document its reasons for the dispute in the department's databases. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team elected to refer the allegation as a routine allegation of staff misconduct on August 28, 2025. The Centralized Screening Team declined the OIG's recommendation to clarify the comments with the incarcerated person and did not provide the reasons for the dispute or the change in its decision but indicated that although incarcerated person alleged multiple comments were made, they occurred during a single incident.

On October 22, 2025, the Centralized Screening Team informed the OIG that, following a subsequent dispute from the prison's Office of Grievances, they opened a new grievance record on September 24, 2025, and referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit as staff sexual misconduct, as they had originally done 68 days prior.



OIG Case Number
25-0123657-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On August 19, 2025, two officers allegedly performed unclothed body searches of thirteen incarcerated males in front of a female officer.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation back to the prison as a routine policy claim. The OIG did not concur because cross-gender unclothed body searches violate department policy, barring exigent circumstances. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team upheld its original decision. Following a second elevation, the Centralized Screening Team's management elected to conduct a clarification interview, but after discovering the incarcerated person had been released from custody, they again upheld the original screening decision.

Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. Specifically, the Centralized Screening failed to consider two officers conducting unclothed body searches of thirteen males in front of a female officer as staff misconduct nor did they recognize the need to conduct a clarification interview regarding the female officer's conduct and location during the unclothed body searches. Following two elevations by the OIG, the Centralized Screening Team elected to conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person. When prison staff informed the Centralized Screening Team the incarcerated person had been released from custody, it again upheld its original screening decision. . The Centralized Screening Team initially reviewed the incarcerated person's complaint on September 3, 2025, but failed to recognize the need to obtain additional details surrounding the female officer's presence during the unclothed body searches. On September 19, 2025, the Centralized Screening Team determined there was a need to conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person, however, the incarcerated person had already been released by the department on September 3, 2025.

OIG Case Number
25-0124744-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On August 4, 2025, a female officer allegedly performed an unclothed body search of a male incarcerated person in violation of policy. A second officer allegedly confiscated the incarcerated person's property. During a clarification interview, the incarcerated person stated he was wearing boxers while the female officer searched his clothing.



Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the unclothed body search and property allegations back to the prison as routine policy claims. The OIG concurred with the decision to route the property allegation as a routine policy claim, but did not concur with the decision to route the unclothed body search allegation as a routine policy claim because department policy does not allow for cross-gender unclothed body searches, except in exigent circumstances. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview regarding the unclothed body search violations. Subsequently, the Centralized Screening Team upheld its original decision. Based on the clarification interview, the OIG concurred.

Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the unclothed body search allegation as staff sexual misconduct or the need to conduct a clarification interview of a vague allegation of staff sexual misconduct and only conducted a clarification interview following a dispute by the OIG. Based on the information provided during the clarification interview, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately upheld its original decision.