



**January–March 2026 Centralized Screening Monitoring Team Case Blocks**  
*Published in May 2026*

In the first quarter (January through March) of 2026, the OIG’s Centralized Screening Monitoring Team monitored and closed 4,009 grievances. Of those grievances, the Centralized Screening Team and the OIG each determined 3,416 grievances did not contain any allegations of staff misconduct. The OIG determined the remaining 593 grievances contained allegations of staff misconduct. We assessed the processing of those grievances containing allegations of staff misconduct as follows:

**Table 1. The OIG’s Assessment of 593 Grievances for January Through March 2026**

| Rating                    | Staff Misconduct Grievances Only |            |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|------------|
|                           | Number of Grievances             | Percentage |
| <i>Adequate</i>           | 424                              | 71.5       |
| <i>Improvement Needed</i> | 41                               | 7          |
| <i>Inadequate</i>         | 128                              | 21.5       |
| <b>Totals</b>             | <b>593</b>                       | <b>100</b> |

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

**Table 2. Cumulative Monthly Statistics for January Through March 2026**

| Rating                             | Number and Percentage of Grievances |              |              |              |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                                    | Jan.                                | Feb.         | Mar.         | Total        |
| <i>Adequate</i>                    | 116                                 | 143          | 165          | 424          |
|                                    | 70%                                 | 73.5%        | 71%          | 71.5%        |
| <i>Improvement Needed</i>          | 7                                   | 17           | 17           | 41           |
|                                    | 4%                                  | 9%           | 7%           | 7%           |
| <i>Inadequate</i>                  | 43                                  | 34           | 51           | 128          |
|                                    | 26%                                 | 17.5%        | 22%          | 21.5%        |
| <b>Staff Misconduct Grievances</b> | <b>166</b>                          | <b>194</b>   | <b>233</b>   | <b>593</b>   |
| <b>Total Grievances Reviewed</b>   | <b>1,320</b>                        | <b>1,260</b> | <b>1,429</b> | <b>4,009</b> |

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 seven notable cases monitored and closed by the OIG during the first quarter of 2026.





OIG Case Number  
25-0134839-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

On December 4, 2025, an incarcerated person alleged that in August or September 2025, she witnessed officers on two different occasions take two other incarcerated people into a closet with spit hoods over their heads. The incarcerated person alleged the officers then beat the two incarcerated people.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the complaint contained no allegations of staff misconduct. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview with one of the alleged victims and referred the allegation of unreasonable force to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. The Centralized Screening Team also processed a granted appeal stemming from a separate grievance the second alleged victim previously filed alleging staff subjected him to unreasonable force and referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

### Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. An allegation of unreasonable force is listed on the Allegation Decision Index as a type of allegation that must be referred to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. The Centralized Screening Team also failed to identify the need to conduct clarification interviews with two incarcerated people regarding allegations of unreasonable force made on their behalf. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview and referred two unreasonable force allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

Before receiving the December 4, 2025, complaint from the uninvolved complainant, the Centralized Screening Team processed a complaint the second alleged victim submitted on September 22, 2025, but failed to identify his allegation that custody staff used unreasonable force as an allegation of staff misconduct. The incarcerated person appealed the Centralized Screening Team's handling of his complaint on October 7, 2025, which the Office of Appeals granted on December 5, 2025, citing the unaddressed unreasonable force allegation. However, as of December 31, 2025, neither the prison nor the Centralized Screening Team had opened a new log number to address the granted appeal as an allegation of unreasonable force. As a result of the Centralized Screening Team's incorrect screening decisions, the incarcerated person can no longer be interviewed regarding the allegations of misconduct, as he died between the time he filed his appeal and the time the Office of Appeals granted the appeal. On December 31, 2025, prior to a decision response from the Centralized Screening Team, the OIG recommended the department preserve all video evidence related to incident, which they did the same day.



OIG Case Number  
26-0136352-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

On December 12, 2025, an officer allegedly mocked and laughed at an incarcerated transgender person as she described her medical procedures and then tried to position himself to see her genitals during a urology appointment. When the incarcerated person requested to file a complaint against the officer, staff allegedly denied the incarcerated person canteen access, which caused her to feel suicidal.

### Disposition

Following a dispute by the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit regarding a referral for investigation under a prior grievance log number, the Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation against the officer back to the prison as a routine policy claim. The OIG did not concur. The Centralized Screening Team's amended screening decision letter stated the allegation would be referred as staff misconduct not on the Allegation Decision Index—not as a routine allegation of staff misconduct. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation that the officer mocked the incarcerated person and tried to look at her genitals during a medical examination as a routine allegation of staff misconduct.

### Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation back to the prison as a routine policy claim, indicating that the grievance did not contain an allegation of staff misconduct. However, the grievance identified behavior that qualifies as staff misconduct under the department's policy that should have been referred to the prison as a routine allegation of staff misconduct. The Centralized Screening Team's amended screening decision letter also stated the allegation would be referred as staff misconduct not on the Allegation Decision Index. After the OIG questioned the screening discrepancy, the Centralized Screening Team corrected its mistake and referred the allegation to the prison as a routine allegation of staff misconduct.



OIG Case Number  
26-0136842-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

On December 22, 2025, an incarcerated person alleged, “My life is in danger; I want to be transferred to another institution.” During a clarification interview, the incarcerated person alleged staff endangered his life by issuing him rules violation reports. The incarcerated person also alleged staff pepper sprayed and beat him up “a few years ago,” while he tried to self-harm.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the transfer request back to the prison as a routine policy claim. The OIG concurred. However, the Centralized Screening Team did not initially conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person to identify the name of the person who had been placing his life in danger and what the person had been doing to endanger him. Following the OIG’s dispute, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview, at which point the incarcerated person clarified that staff placed his life in danger by issuing him rules violation reports and he was pepper sprayed and beat up by staff “a few years ago” when he tried to self-harm. The Centralized Screening Team determined the incarcerated person’s life was not in danger based on staff issuing him rules violation reports but referred the unreasonable force allegation regarding staff actions when the incarcerated person tried to self-harm to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit. The OIG concurred.

### Case Rating

The department’s performance was *inadequate*. The Centralized Screening Team should have recognized the need to conduct a clarification interview to obtain more information about the incarcerated person’s allegation that his life was in danger before rendering a decision that the complaint did not contain an allegation of staff misconduct. Following the OIG’s dispute, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview. Based on the additional clarifying information, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the unreasonable force allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit.



OIG Case Number  
26-0137362-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

On January 1, 2026, a third party alleged custody staff tortured an incarcerated person with artificial intelligence; threatened to molest the incarcerated person's grandson; threatened to "neutralize" the incarcerated person, his mother, and his grandson; harassed the incarcerated person while he showered; and regularly pretended to masturbate when the incarcerated person used the toilet. During a clarification interview, the incarcerated person alleged custody staff commented that he should kill himself and kill his mom, made sexually inappropriate comments about his grandson, and pretended to masturbate when he showered and used the toilet. The incarcerated person stated his journal contains dates and times of custody staff's behavior going back six months.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the allegation of torture by artificial intelligence to be "possibly" duplicative of prior grievances. The OIG did not concur because the Centralized Screening Team did not specify which grievances the allegation duplicated and did not address the alleged threats towards the incarcerated person and his family or the allegations of sexual harassment. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview and subsequently referred the allegations that custody staff threatened the incarcerated person and his family and pretended to masturbate to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

### Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. The allegation that custody staff threatened to "neutralize" an incarcerated person qualifies as a threat to assault the incarcerated person, and the comments about the incarcerated person's family members, while not involving the incarcerated person, are directly related in time and scope to the threat against the incarcerated person. The allegation that custody staff pretended to masturbate when the incarcerated person showered and used the toilet qualifies as sexual harassment. Threatening to harm an incarcerated person and staff sexual harassment are both 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 should also have recognized the allegations provided by the third party were vague and conducted a clarification interview with the incarcerated person prior to rendering their initial screening decision. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview and referred the alleged threat to harm the incarcerated person, related comments about his family, and sexual harassment to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit in accordance with policy.



OIG Case Number  
26-0138358-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

On January 2, 2026, an officer allegedly spoke rudely to an incarcerated person when he asked why staff recalled incarcerated people from the exercise yard. The incarcerated person alleged the officer routinely acted disrespectfully and issued rules violation reports if incarcerated people asked questions about programming. The incarcerated person alleged the officer caused violence between incarcerated people by announcing over the public address system that she would not run programming because a specific incarcerated person would not “lock it down” and other incarcerated people needed to “take care of” the individual if they “wanted their program.”

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the officer’s allegedly rude comments back to the prison as a routine policy claim. The OIG concurred with that decision. However, the Centralized Screening Team did not identify the allegations the officer incited violence between incarcerated people and issued rules violation reports frivolously as allegations of staff misconduct. Following the OIG’s dispute, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation against the officer for inciting violence to the prison as a routine allegation of staff misconduct.

### Case Rating

The department’s performance was *inadequate*. The allegation that an officer publicly announced that incarcerated people needed to “take care of” a specific incarcerated person “if they wanted their program” qualifies as creating a motive or opportunity for harm. This type of allegation 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. Following the OIG’s dispute, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation as staff misconduct not on the allegation decision index contrary to the department’s policy requiring allegations that staff created a motive or opportunity for harm to be referred to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.



OIG Case Number  
26-0143273-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

On March 2, 2026, an officer who allegedly had not activated his body-worn camera acted aggressively and in an agitated manner towards an incarcerated person after disagreeing with the incarcerated person about the length of time the incarcerated person had spent on a telephone call. The officer also allegedly damaged the incarcerated person's ear buds during a cell search.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegations as routine policy claims. The OIG did not concur because the Centralized Screening Team did not identify an allegation that the officer failed to have his body-worn camera turned on as staff misconduct on the Allegation Decision Index. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team opened a new grievance and referred the body-worn camera allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

### Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. The allegation that an officer failed to turn on his body-worn camera while interacting with an incarcerated person qualifies as failing to comply with body-worn camera activation requirements. This type of allegation 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 review of the grievance failed to identify the allegation at all. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the body-worn camera allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.



OIG Case Number  
26-0143503-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

On February 14, 2026, an officer allegedly spoke aggressively to an incarcerated person after he asked the officer to turn the fans off because they were blowing trash around the dining hall. On February 20, 2026, the officer allegedly ignored the incarcerated person's concerns about dirty mops. On February 21, 2026, when the incarcerated person, an African American, asked the officer for work gloves, the officer allegedly made an inappropriate racial comment.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed a work-conduct allegation back to the prison as a routine policy claim. The OIG did not concur because the Centralized Screening Team failed to address the allegation of racial discrimination. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegations against the officer to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

### Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. The allegation that an officer made a racially derogatory comment to an incarcerated person qualifies as racial discrimination. This type of allegation 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 review of the grievance failed to identify the allegation as staff misconduct. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team referred the alleged racial discrimination to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.