



November 2025 Centralized Screening Monitoring Team Case Blocks Published in January 2026

During November 2025, the OIG's Centralized Screening Monitoring Team monitored and closed 1,234 grievances. Of those grievances, the Centralized Screening Team and the OIG each determined 1,047 grievances did not contain any allegations of staff misconduct. The OIG determined the remaining 187 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 187 Grievances for November 2025

Rating	Staff Misconduct Grievances Only	
	Number of Grievances	Percentage
Adequate	128	68.5
Improvement Needed	12	6.5
Inadequate	47	25.0
Totals	187	100.0

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

Table 2. Cumulative Monthly Statistics From January Through November 2025

Rating	Number and Percentage of Grievances										
	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.
Adequate	69	104	115	111	248	168	138	191	215	233	128
	54%	61.5%	63%	63%	78.75%	79%	76%	66%	75%	74%	68.5%
Improvement Needed	13	16	17	10	15	7	7	17	17	25	12
	10%	9.5%	9%	5.5%	4.75%	3%	4%	6%	6%	8%	6.5%
Inadequate	46	49	51	456	52	38	37	80	55	57	47
	36%	29%	28%	31.5%	16.5%	18%	20%	28%	19%	18%	25%
Staff Misconduct Grievances	128	169	183	177	315	213	183	288	287	315	187
Total Grievances Reviewed	875	1,082	978	1,293	1,421	1,277	1,486	1,608	1,578	1,888	1,234

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 November 2025.





OIG Case Number
25-0130450-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On October 17, 2025, a sergeant allegedly entered an incarcerated person's cell and grabbed her inappropriately. During a clarification interview, the incarcerated person alleged the sergeant grabbed her right arm and twisted it behind her back. During a second clarification interview, the incarcerated person stated the sergeant entered the cell, told her to turn around, and grabbed for her arm, which he missed. The sergeant allegedly grabbed for the incarcerated person's arm a second time but grabbed her breast. When the incarcerated person told a second sergeant the first sergeant had grabbed her breast, he allegedly implied she was lying and told her the allegation "would not go anywhere" if she reported it.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview and routed the unreasonable force allegation back to the prison as a routine policy claim. The OIG did not concur because allegations of unreasonable force require investigation by the Office of Internal Affairs. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a second clarification interview, upheld their original decision, and failed to address the allegation a second sergeant failed to process the incarcerated person's sexual misconduct allegation. After follow-up questions from the OIG, the Centralized Screening Team determined the allegation did not qualify as unreasonable force or dissuading the incarcerated person from reporting misconduct, which would require referral to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit, but referred the allegations to the prison as routine allegations of staff misconduct.

Case Rating

The department's performance was inadequate. After completing a clarification interview, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify an allegation of unreasonable force as staff misconduct of any kind. The screener's notes contained no statements by the incarcerated person, only the screener's paraphrasing of the interview, which implied an allegation of unreasonable force. Following the OIG's elevation regarding the content of the clarification interview, the Centralized Screening Team elected to conduct a second clarification interview and subsequently upheld their original decision. During the second clarification interview, the incarcerated person made a new allegation against a second sergeant, whom the incarcerated person allegedly told about the first sergeant touching her breast inappropriately, and who allegedly told her the allegation "would not go anywhere" if she reported it. Following additional questions by the OIG, the Centralized Screening Team determined the allegation did not qualify as unreasonable force or dissuading the incarcerated person from reporting misconduct but referred both allegations to the prison as routine allegations of staff misconduct. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team claimed the allegation was



not unreasonable force because the sergeant “did not even handcuff” the incarcerated person or throw her to the ground when she swatted at him, “which he could have.” We disagreed with this interpretation of the allegations and the decision not to refer the allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

OIG Case Number
25-0131169-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On October 21, 2025, an incarcerated person alleged, on two separate occasions, a sergeant asked her if she wanted to perform oral sex on him.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the sergeant’s alleged sexual harassment as “unprofessional comments by staff” as a routine allegation of staff misconduct. The OIG did not concur because department policy requires repeated verbal comments of a sexual nature be referred to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the alleged sexual harassment 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 consider the allegation a sergeant twice asked the incarcerated person if she wanted to perform oral sex on him as staff sexual harassment on the Allegation Decision Index, instead classifying the allegation only as “unprofessional comments” and referring it as staff misconduct not on the Allegation Decision Index. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team adopted the OIG’s recommendation to refer the staff sexual harassment to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number
25-0131380-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On October 22, 2025, an incarcerated person alleged transportation officers removed incarcerated people from a transportation bus and put firearms “to their heads and other body parts,” and put a firearm to his head and threateningly stated, “all I have to do is apply a little more pressure and your brains are decoration for Halloween!”



Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation officers threatened an incarcerated person with firearms back to the transportation unit as a routine policy claim. The OIG did not concur because the inappropriate use of a duty weapon and threatening to physically harm an incarcerated person are both types of misconduct listed on the Allegation Decision Index. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team upheld their original decision. Following a second elevation, the Centralized Screening Team's management referred the allegation against the transportation officers 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 officers put a gun to an incarcerated person's head and threatened to pull the trigger as staff misconduct at all. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team upheld their original decision after the incarcerated person declined to participate in a clarification interview, which the OIG believed to be unnecessary. Following a second elevation, the Centralized Screening Team's management adopted the OIG's recommendation to refer the allegations of an inappropriate display of a duty weapon and threats of physical harm to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

OIG Case Number
25-0131622-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On October 30, 2025, three sergeants and four officers allegedly turned off their body-worn cameras and beat up and "manhandled" an incarcerated person. The incarcerated person also requested additional linens due to cold temperatures.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team attempted a clarification interview, and when the incarcerated person refused to participate, routed the unreasonable force, body-worn-camera allegations, and linen request back to the prison as routine policy claims. The OIG did not concur because allegations of unreasonable force and body-worn-camera violations are staff misconduct on the Allegation Decision Index. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the unreasonable force and body-worn-camera allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.



Case Rating

The department's performance was inadequate. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team initially routed the allegations custody staff turned off their body-worn cameras "so they can keep their jobs," before beating and "manhandling" an incarcerated person as a routine policy claim, citing the allegations as too vague. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team adopted the OIG's recommendation to refer the allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.