



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

During October 2025, the OIG's Centralized Screening Monitoring Team monitored and closed 1,888 grievances. Of those grievances, the Centralized Screening Team of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and the OIG each determined 1,573 grievances did not contain any allegations of staff misconduct. The OIG determined the remaining 315 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 315 Grievances for October 2025

Rating	Staff Misconduct Grievances Only	
	Number of Grievances	Percentage
Adequate	233	74
Improvement Needed	25	8
Inadequate	57	18
Totals	315	100

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

Table 2. Cumulative Monthly Statistics From January Through October 2025

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

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 October 2025.



OIG Case Number
25-0121490-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On March 23, 2025, a lieutenant and a sergeant allegedly subjected an incarcerated person to an unclothed-body search which included lifting his genitals in front of an open door, which faced the yard. The incarcerated person alleged the lieutenant wanted to see his genitals for their own enjoyment.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation against the lieutenant and sergeant back to the prison as a routine policy claim. The OIG did not concur because the incarcerated person alleged the lieutenant and sergeant violated the procedures for conducting unclothed-body searches by failing to conduct the search in a professional manner and contends this is a sexual misconduct violation. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team responded the incarcerated person articulated that his unclothed body search was conducted inside of his cell and although he alleged the lieutenant wanted to see his genitals and did that for his own enjoyment, what he described was an appropriate search based on a missing tool. We disagreed with this justification since the incarcerated person alleged in his grievance that staff knew which incarcerated person had taken the missing tool and the missing tool had already been recovered before staff required him to submit to the unclothed body search. Following the OIG's second elevation to Centralized Screening Team management, the original decision was upheld.

Case Rating

The department's performance was inadequate. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team failed to consider the allegation a lieutenant and a sergeant subjected an incarcerated person to an unclothed-body search which included lifting his genitals in front of an open door to the yard as an allegation of staff misconduct. During our elevation of the case, the OIG referenced policy requiring "unclothed body searches shall be conducted in a safe manner and in an area that allows the [incarcerated person] to preserve some measure of dignity and self-respect," and defines staff sexual misconduct—in part—as an "invasion of privacy, beyond that reasonably necessary to maintain safety and security." The Centralized Screening Team's management upheld their original decision to route the matter as a routine policy claim.

OIG Case Number
25-0126897-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On July 14, 2025, an anonymous incarcerated person allegedly witnessed an officer use unreasonable force on a second incarcerated person during a medical emergency at noontime.



Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the complaint did not contain an allegation of staff misconduct because a report related to the officer discovering contraband midmorning indicated the officer did not use any force. The OIG did not concur as the report cited appeared entirely unrelated to a medical emergency at noon. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team conducted two clarification interviews and subsequently referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

Case Rating

The department's performance was inadequate. Specifically, following an anonymous report of an officer using unreasonable force against an unknown incarcerated person, prison staff provided the Centralized Screening Team with details from an incident report involving a contraband discovery around 9:45 a.m., in which, an officer reported using no force at all, rather than any details related to the allegation of unreasonable force during a medical emergency at 12:00 p.m. The Centralized Screening Team failed to notice the discrepancy between the anonymous complaint and the report provided by prison staff and failed to identify the need to conduct a clarification interview of the vague allegation of unreasonable force within the staff misconduct grievance. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview with the incarcerated person identified by prison staff as being involved in the contraband discovery, though they never asked or verified if he made the anonymous report. When the incarcerated person stated the officer did not use force during the contraband discovery, the screening analyst thanked him for his time. When the incarcerated person tried to say he saw an incident involving "another individual," the screening analyst interrupted, stating she had the information she needed and disconnected the call. Following the OIG's feedback about the interview—which we attended—the Centralized Screening Team conducted a second clarification interview with the same incarcerated person, who stated he witnessed another incarcerated person "acting irregular," and the officer tried to help but accidentally "messed up" the second incarcerated person's leg or ankle but did not act aggressively. The Centralized Screening Team did not ask if the incarcerated person knew the name of the second incarcerated person, but they referred the unreasonable force allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

OIG Case Number
25-0127642-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On September 22, 2025, a store supervisor allegedly told an incarcerated person, "We should go find some shade and make-out." The incarcerated person alleged this statement made him uncomfortable.



Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the alleged unprofessional statement made by the staff member as a routine allegation of staff misconduct. The OIG did not concur because the comment was that of a sexual nature and the staff member was already under investigation for another allegation of misconduct. The OIG recommended a referral to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit due to the sexual nature of the allegation, the complexity of the case, and because the same staff member was the subject of a pending investigation involving a potentially related allegation of misconduct. After our elevation, the Centralized Screening Team agreed and referred the alleged staff sexual misconduct allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

Case Rating

The department's performance was inadequate. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team failed to consider an alleged sexual comment made by a staff member to an incarcerated person as staff misconduct on the Allegation Decision Index. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number
25-0128403-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On October 3, 2025, an anonymous incarcerated person alleged officers allowed one incarcerated person to "choke out" a second incarcerated person on October 2, 2025, and allowed the incarcerated person to "choke out" other incarcerated people in the past. The anonymous incarcerated person alleged officers let the incarcerated person get away with assaulting other incarcerated people because he was an informant for the officers.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team did not render a screening decision. They made no notes or comments in the case record and sent their "decision" back to the prison with status of "do not resend." The OIG did not concur because the Centralized Screening Team did not document an actual decision and allegations of endangering the safety of incarcerated people constitutes staff misconduct on the allegation decision index. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team reported they could not process an anonymous written complaint as a grievance log record and could only process the allegation as a direct entry. The Centralized Screening Team did not direct the prison to submit the anonymous written complaint as a direct entry, essentially doing nothing with the allegation of staff misconduct. Following additional questions from the OIG, the Centralized Screening Team reported they originally determined the



complaint did not contain an allegation of staff misconduct, and that is why they did not create the appropriate record that would allow them to process the allegation. The Centralized Screening Team subsequently referred the allegation to the prison as a routine allegation of staff misconduct.

Case Rating

The department's performance was inadequate. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team failed to do anything with an allegation from an anonymous incarcerated person alleging officers allowed one incarcerated person to physically harm other incarcerated people because he acted as an informant for the officers. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team reported they could not process the anonymous written complaint as a grievance log record and could only process the allegation as a direct entry, a process traditionally used to review verbal or third-party allegations of staff misconduct. The Centralized Screening Team incorrectly reported they could not create the direct entry record, nor did they request the prison create the record, and also told the prison not to resend the complaint. Following additional questions from the OIG, the Centralized Screening Team reported they originally determined the complaint did not contain an allegation of staff misconduct, and therefore, did not create the appropriate record that would allow them to process the referral to the Office of Internal Affairs. Subsequently, the Centralized Screening Team rereviewed the complaint and corrected their data entry errors but incorrectly referred the allegation as a routine allegation of staff misconduct. The Centralized Screening Team cited a "lack of information," despite having a known date of occurrence, victim, incarcerated subject, and housing unit which would help identify officers regularly working in the unit and additional incarcerated witnesses.

OIG Case Number
25-0129783-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On September 4, 2024, two officers allegedly ignored an incarcerated person's report that another incarcerated person tried to stab him. A sergeant allegedly falsified the incarcerated person's compatibility documentation, issued him a rules violation report in retaliation for him not signing the compatibility document, and rehoused him in the restricted housing unit. On November 16, 2024, a lieutenant allegedly violated the incarcerated person's due process by not allowing questions during a disciplinary hearing, in order to cover up evidence of the prior assault.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegations officers ignored an incarcerated person's report of another incarcerated person trying to stab him, a sergeant fabricated documents, and a lieutenant covered up evidence as a routine policy claim. The OIG did not concur because the Office of Appeals had specifically directed a new complaint be



opened to address the staff misconduct allegations. Also, the allegations of endangering an incarcerated person's safety, fabricating documents, and covering up evidence of wrongdoing are all misconduct found on the Allegation Decision Index. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred all allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

Case Rating

The department's performance was inadequate. The department opened this grievance solely to address deficiencies in a prior grievance submitted by the incarcerated person, which both the Centralized Screening Team and department staff failed to process appropriately. However, the Centralized Screening Team again failed to process the new complaint correctly. The incarcerated person first submitted his grievance on January 5, 2025, in which the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify as allegations of staff misconduct that officers ignored an incarcerated person's report of another incarcerated person trying to stab him, a sergeant fabricated documents, and a lieutenant covered up evidence. The incarcerated person filed an appeal, and on May 10, 2025, the Office of Appeals directed the Centralized Screening Team to open a new grievance log to address the insufficient response provided to the incarcerated person for his January 5, 2025, complaint. On May 22, 2025, the Centralized Screening Team reviewed the incarcerated person's complaint again and failed to identify the allegations once again. The incarcerated person filed another appeal, and on October 6, 2025, the Office of Appeals ordered this complaint to be created to address the staff misconduct. For the third time, and despite clear directives from the Office of Appeals, the Centralized Screening Team again failed to process the incarcerated person's allegations as staff misconduct. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation, 296 days following their initial receipt of the complaint. Overall, the department reviewed this complaint five times; three times by the Centralized Screening Team and twice by the Office of Appeals; before an OIG dispute finally resulted in a correct screening decision.