



## December 2025 Centralized Screening Monitoring Team Case Blocks Published in February 2026

During December 2025, the OIG's Centralized Screening Monitoring Team monitored and closed 1,278 grievances. Of those grievances, the Centralized Screening Team of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and the OIG each determined 1,048 grievances did not contain any allegations of staff misconduct. The OIG determined the remaining 230 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 230 Grievances for December 2025**

Rating	Staff Misconduct Grievances Only	
	Number of Grievances	Percentage
Adequate	151	65.5
Improvement Needed	15	6.5
Inadequate	64	28
Totals	230	100

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

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

Rating	Number and Percentage of Grievances											
	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
Adequate	69	104	115	111	248	168	138	191	215	233	128	151
	54%	61.5%	63%	63%	78.75%	79%	76%	66%	75%	74%	68.5%	65.5%
Improvement Needed	13	16	17	10	15	7	7	17	17	25	12	15
	10%	9.5%	9%	5.5%	4.75%	3%	4%	6%	6%	8%	6.5%	6.5%
Inadequate	46	49	51	456	52	38	37	80	55	57	47	64
	36%	29%	28%	31.5%	16.5%	18%	20%	28%	19%	18%	25%	28%
Staff Misconduct Grievances	128	169	183	177	315	213	183	288	287	315	187	230
Total Grievances Reviewed	875	1,082	978	1,293	1,421	1,277	1,486	1,608	1,578	1,888	1,234	1,278

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 December 2025.





OIG Case Number  
25-0133534-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

On November 12, 2025, an incarcerated person alleged “someone” entered his cell and destroyed it, sexually harassed him, and told him to kill himself. During a clarification interview, the incarcerated person stated three officers made sexually inappropriate comments and told him to kill himself.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation someone told the incarcerated person to kill himself to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit and routed the cell destruction and sexual harassment allegations back to the prison as routine policy claims. Prior to the OIG’s review, the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit disputed the referral for investigation because the incarcerated person did not identify anyone specifically who told him to kill himself, and the Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation back to the prison as a routine policy claim. The OIG did not concur with the routine routing of the allegations involving sexual harassment and telling the incarcerated person to kill himself and recommended a clarification interview before rendering a final decision, to which the Centralized Screening Team agreed. Subsequently, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation that three officers made sexually inappropriate comments and told the incarcerated person to kill himself to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit.

### Case Rating

The department’s performance was inadequate. The allegation that someone told the incarcerated person to kill themselves qualifies as creating an opportunity or motive for an incarcerated person to harm themselves, which is listed on the department’s Allegation Decision Index as an allegation that must be referred to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit. The Centralized Screening Team’s initial decision to refer this allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit was appropriate. However, the Centralized Screening Team should have recognized the need to conduct a clarifying interview to determine who told the incarcerated person to kill themselves. The Centralized Screening Team should also have recognized the sexual harassment allegation was vague and conducted a clarifying interview instead of referring the allegation back to the prison as a routine policy claim.

After the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit disputed the referral of the allegation that someone told the incarcerated person to kill themselves due to the allegation’s vagueness, the Centralized Screening Team again did not recognize the need to conduct a clarifying interview and referred the allegation back to the prison as a routine policy claim. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team



conducted a clarification interview. Based on the additional clarifying information the incarcerated person provided during the interview, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the sexual harassment allegation and the allegation the officers told him to kill himself to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

**OIG Case Number**  
**25-0134156-CSMT**

**Rating Assessment**  
**Inadequate**

### Incident Summary

Between October 23, 2025, and November 23, 2025, a psychologist allegedly falsified an incarcerated person's mental health documents regarding overfamiliarity, and a psychiatrist allegedly retaliated against the incarcerated person for filing staff misconduct complaints by approving falsified mental health documents.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the complaint contained no allegations of staff misconduct. Prior to the OIG's review, the Health Care Grievance Office determined there were allegations of staff misconduct. Without filing a dispute to the Centralized Screening Team, health care staff referred allegations of falsifying documents, retaliation, and overfamiliarity to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. The OIG concurred.

### Case Rating

The department's performance was inadequate. The grievance alleged that the psychologist engaged in acts that qualify as dishonesty, overfamiliarity with an incarcerated person, and retaliation against an incarcerated person due to reporting staff misconduct. All three of these categories of misconduct are listed on the department's Allegation Decision Index as allegations that must be referred to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. The Centralized Screening Team's initial review of the grievance failed to identify these three allegations as staff misconduct listed on the Allegation Decision Index. However, the Health Care Grievance Office reviewed the grievance after the Centralized Screening Team and correctly identified the three allegations as staff misconduct listed on the Allegation Decision Index and re-referred the allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.



OIG Case Number  
25-0134485-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
**Inadequate**

### Incident Summary

The department received an allegation from a family member that on November 15, 2025, a sergeant allegedly called an incarcerated person a racial slur, specifically using the term “wetback.” When the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarifying interview directly with the incarcerated person, the incarcerated person alleged the sergeant made a comment about his property, to which he responded by asking, “Is it because I’m Mexican?” The incarcerated person then informed the Centralized Screening Team, “and that is when [the sergeant] said it.” When asked to clarify the specific statement with the slur in it, the incarcerated person answered, “Yeah, he just said it.”

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the complaint contained no allegations of staff misconduct because the incarcerated person only said “yeah, he just said it” during the clarifying interview and did not specifically state that the sergeant said the word “wetback.” The OIG did not concur with the Centralized Screening Team’s interpretation of the incarcerated person’s statements. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation as a routine allegation of staff misconduct.

### Case Rating

The department’s performance was inadequate. The allegation that the sergeant called an incarcerated person a racial slur qualifies as making insults to an incarcerated person pertaining to race, color, or national origin, which is listed on the department’s Allegation Decision Index as an allegation that must be referred to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit. The Centralized Screening Team appropriately conducted a clarification interview with the incarcerated person but failed to acknowledge when the interviewer referenced the racial slur to the incarcerated person, the incarcerated person answered, “yeah, he just said it” which supported the racial slur allegation. When the OIG inquired about the decision not to classify the allegation as racial discrimination, the Centralized Screening Team would not acknowledge the incarcerated person’s response was intended to confirm the sergeant’s alleged use of the racial slur. The Centralized Screening Team then referred the allegation of the sergeant’s use of a racial slur as a routine allegation of staff misconduct and indicated the assigned supervisor could suspend and elevate the allegation if it met the threshold for racial discrimination.



OIG Case Number  
25-0134860-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

On November 11, 2025, after an incarcerated person told officers he had safety concerns returning to his cell because his cellmate had several weapons there, the officers allegedly returned the incarcerated person to the cell without searching it. Before the officers removed the incarcerated person's restraints, the incarcerated person's cellmate allegedly stabbed him in the head and chest. When the incarcerated person returned from the hospital, two other officers allegedly issued him a rules violation report for possession of a deadly weapon.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the rules violation report allegation back to the prison as a routine policy claim but did not identify the allegation that officers ignored his safety concerns. The OIG concurred with the routing of the rules violation report allegation but elevated the failure to identify the ignored safety concerns allegation as an allegation of staff misconduct. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

### Case Rating

The department's performance was inadequate. Although the Centralized Screening Team correctly routed the rules violation report allegation, it failed to identify the allegation that officers endangered the incarcerated person's safety by putting him back in his cell with his cellmate after he reported feeling unsafe there because his cellmate had several weapons. The incarcerated person's cellmate later stabbed the incarcerated person in the head and chest. The allegation qualifies as endangering an incarcerated person by violation of departmental training policies and directives and as misconduct resulting in significant injury to an incarcerated person. Both of these categories of misconduct are listed on the department's Allegation Decision Index as allegations that must be referred to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. The Centralized Screening Team again failed to identify the allegation when it reviewed the grievance for reassignment to another prison because of the incarcerated person's transfer. After the OIG elevated the missed allegation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.