



April–June 2026 Centralized Screening Monitoring Team Case Blocks Published in September 2026

In the second quarter of 2026, the OIG's Centralized Screening Monitoring Team monitored and closed 3,371 grievances. Of those grievances, the Centralized Screening Team and the OIG agreed that 2,672 of those grievances did not contain any allegations of staff misconduct. The OIG determined the remaining 699 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 699 Grievances for April Through June 2026

Rating	Staff Misconduct Grievances Only	
	Number of Grievances	Percentage
Adequate	549	78.5
Improvement Needed	34	5
Inadequate	116	16.5
Totals	699	100

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

Table 2. Cumulative Monthly Statistics for April Through June 2026

Rating	Number and Percentage of Grievances						
	January	February	March	April	May	June	Total
Adequate	116 (70%)	143 (73.5%)	165 (71%)	141 (73%)	199 (83%)	209 (78%)	973 (75%)
Improvement Needed	7 (4%)	17 (9%)	17 (7%)	11 (6%)	5 (2%)	18 (7%)	75 (6%)
Inadequate	43 (26%)	34 (17.5%)	51 (22%)	40 (21%)	35 (15%)	41 (15%)	244 (19%)
Staff Misconduct Grievances	166	194	233	192	239	268	1,292
Total Grievances Reviewed	1,320	1,260	1,432*	1,188	1,137	1,046	7,383

*Corrected typo of total number grievances reviewed based on non-staff misconduct grievances.

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

This document presents six notable cases monitored and closed by the OIG during the second quarter of 2026.





OIG Case Number
26-0143819-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

Between September 27, 2023, and August 26, 2025, a licensed clinical social worker allegedly offered to perform a sexual act on an incarcerated person.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team identified the allegation against the licensed clinical social worker as staff misconduct not on the allegation index. The OIG did not concur. After receiving the referral from the Centralized Screening Team, the prison's Office of Grievances disputed the referral on the basis that the allegation was duplicative of an earlier grievance. The Centralized Screening Team agreed with the prison's Office of Grievances and rejected the allegation as duplicative. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team opened a new grievance log number and referred the staff sexual misconduct allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. An allegation that staff solicited an incarcerated person for sex qualifies as staff sexual misconduct, which 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. We disagreed with the Centralized Screening Team's subsequent determination that the allegation was duplicative of the earlier grievance because the allegation was not duplicative; it had merely been transferred to the prison where the allegation originated. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team opened a new grievance log number and referred the staff sexual misconduct allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

OIG Case Number
26-0144475-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On March 12, 2026, an incarcerated person alleged a non-custody staff member threatened to sexually assault him.

Disposition

After the incarcerated person refused to participate in a clarification interview, the Centralized Screening Team determined the allegation did not qualify as staff misconduct because the incarcerated person did not identify the staff member. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.



Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. An allegation that a staff member threatened to sexually assault an incarcerated person qualifies as threatening an incarcerated person with an action that violates laws and policies, which 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's initial review of the grievance determined the allegation to be vague because the incarcerated person did not specifically identify the staff member, and therefore, did not qualify as an allegation of staff misconduct. We disagreed with this decision because the Centralized Screening Team regularly refers allegations of staff misconduct with an unknown subject for investigation or routine review. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation that an unknown, non-custody staff member threatened to sexually assault the incarcerated person to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

OIG Case Number
26-0146729-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On April 7, 2026, staff allegedly erroneously released an incarcerated person from suicide watch, resulting in him being attacked by two other incarcerated people. On April 8, 2026, a lieutenant allegedly threatened to have the incarcerated person assaulted for filing staff misconduct complaints and lawsuits. A captain allegedly told other incarcerated people that the incarcerated person was an informant because the incarcerated person had filed lawsuits and complaints against staff.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation regarding the lieutenant's unprofessional comment concerning the incarcerated person filing staff misconduct complaints to the prison as a routine allegation of staff misconduct. The Centralized Screening Team routed the captain's unprofessional comment concerning the incarcerated person's lawsuit and the incarcerated person's erroneous release from suicide watch as routine policy claims. The OIG concurred with the decision to route the allegation regarding the erroneous release from suicide watch as a routine policy claim. However, the OIG did not concur with the decision to route the allegation that the captain endangered the incarcerated person's safety by labeling him as an informant to other incarcerated people as a routine policy claim, or the decision to route the allegation that the lieutenant threatened and retaliated against the incarcerated person for reporting staff misconduct as a routine allegation of staff misconduct. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegations against the captain and lieutenant to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.



Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. An allegation that staff labeled an incarcerated person as an informant to other incarcerated people qualifies as endangering an incarcerated person's safety and creating a motive for an incarcerated person to be harmed by other incarcerated people, which are both 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 allegation that staff threatened and retaliated against an incarcerated person for reporting staff misconduct is also listed on the allegation decision index as a type of allegation that must be referred to the Office of Internal Affairs Investigation Unit. The Centralized Screening Team's initial screening decisions misclassified these allegations, which caused them to be routed to the prison instead of to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team referred both allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

OIG Case Number
26-0147242-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On March 27, 2026, and April 6, 2026, an officer allegedly opened an incarcerated person's cell door, allowing other incarcerated people into the cell to assault the incarcerated person.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation that an officer opened an incarcerated person's cell door, allowing other incarcerated people to enter and assault the incarcerated person back to the prison as a routine policy claim. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation of staff misconduct to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. An allegation that a control booth officer opened an incarcerated person's cell door purposefully to allow other incarcerated people to enter the cell and assault the incarcerated person qualifies as endangering an incarcerated person by violation of policy and creating an opportunity for an incarcerated person to harm another incarcerated person, which are both listed on the department's allegation decision index as a type of allegation that must be referred to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. Following the OIG's dispute and a dispute by prison staff, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation as a subsequent source to another grievance that the incarcerated person filed two days prior against the same officer, which was also disputed by prison staff and elevated to Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.



OIG Case Number
26-0147354-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

Between March 1, 2026, and April 19, 2026, a licensed clinical social worker allegedly shared graphic and explicit stories about his sex life with incarcerated people in group therapy.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the allegation against the licensed clinical social worker to be a routine policy claim. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team determined the allegation to be staff misconduct not on the allegation decision index. However, due to additional details provided by the incarcerated person after the fact, the department opened a grievance log, which the Centralized Screening Team referred to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. An allegation that staff repeatedly shared graphic and explicit stories about their sex life with incarcerated people qualifies as staff sexual harassment, which is listed on the department's 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's initial review of the grievance failed to identify the allegation as staff misconduct of any kind. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team determined the allegation to be staff misconduct not on the allegation decision index. However, after the department had already closed the complaint, the incarcerated person made additional allegations of sexual misconduct against the licensed clinical social worker, which the department referred to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit as staff misconduct listed on the allegation decision index.

OIG Case Number
26-0148116-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On August 1, 2023, one officer allegedly grabbed an incarcerated person's shirt and arm, shoved him to the ground, and punched him in the face while a second officer escorted him. A third officer allegedly grabbed the incarcerated person's shoulders and pulled his face away for the first officer to continue his strikes on the incarcerated person's face. The second officer allegedly stood by and witnessed the unreasonable force.



Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the unreasonable force allegations against the first and third officer to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. While the OIG concurred with that screening decision, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the second officer's role in witnessing the unreasonable force. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation against the second officer for failing to report the use of force to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. While the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the unreasonable force allegations against the first and third officers, it failed to identify the allegation that the second officer witnessed the alleged unreasonable force and failed to report it. An allegation that staff failed to report another staff member's use of force they witnessed is listed on the department's 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 that the prison did not initiate use-of-force review protocols based on the incarcerated person's allegation. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation against the second officer to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit and notified the prison of the OIG's recommendation to initiate use-of-force review protocols.