



**May 2024 Centralized Screening Monitoring Team Case Blocks**  
*Published in July 2024*

During May 2024, the OIG’s Centralized Screening Monitoring Team monitored and closed 707 grievances (see table, *right*, for the rating distribution).

The OIG disputed 62 screening decisions, and the Centralized Screening Team agreed with the OIG in 60 of those cases. This resulted in the Centralized Screening Team referring an additional 30 allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit and an additional 25 allegations to the hiring authority for a local inquiry, for a total of 55 additional staff misconduct investigations or inquiries.

The OIG found the Centralized Screening Team made the incorrect decision in 57 cases, failed to identify every allegation within a complaint 31 times, and failed to identify the need for a clarification interview seven times.

This document presents four notable cases monitored and closed by the OIG during May 2024.

**The OIG’s Assessment of  
707 Grievances for May 2024**

Rating	No. of Grievances
Superior	0
Satisfactory	629
Poor	78

Note: 11% of the grievances our office monitored received a poor rating.

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

**OIG Case Number**  
24-0076146-CSMT

**Rating Assessment**  
**Poor**

**Incident Summary**

On January 17, 2024, a captain allegedly ignored a report by an incarcerated person that other incarcerated people planned to assault incarcerated persons at random in order to be moved to a different housing area. Shortly thereafter, the captain, a sergeant, and officers allegedly failed to protect three incarcerated persons when five other incarcerated people assaulted them because none of the custody staff were in the building, and the staff allegedly failed to respond until after the three incarcerated persons sustained serious injuries.

**Disposition**

The Centralized Screening Team identified a single allegation against other incarcerated persons planning an assault as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur. The OIG elevated the complaint to the Centralized Screening Team to address the allegations of custody staff failing to protect the incarcerated population by not being in the building.





The Centralized Screening Team agreed and referred the allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team identified a single allegation against other incarcerated persons planning an assault but did not identify an allegation against custody staff. The OIG raised concerns to the Centralized Screening Team on March 14, 2024, and followed up multiple times thereafter. The Centralized Screening Team delayed until May 3, 2024, when they finally agreed the allegations against the captain needed to be referred to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. On May 10, 2024, 65 days following their initial receipt of the complaint, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation for investigation. The Centralized Screening Team's final decision was proper, however, their delay in referring the complaint was unreasonable.

OIG Case Number  
24-0077269-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
Poor

### Incident Summary

Between July 1, 2023, and July 31, 2023, a counselor allegedly violated an incarcerated person's rights by transferring him without conducting a classification committee hearing. The incarcerated person alleged the counselor discriminated against incarcerated persons of a specific race by ordering their transfers. On February 12, 2024, officers allegedly assaulted the incarcerated person and falsely reported he kicked one of the officers. The incarcerated person alleged one of the officers purposely moved close to him, which caused the contact between the incarcerated person and the officer. Following the alleged assault, the incarcerated person's property went missing. On February 16, 2024, the incarcerated person alleged a lieutenant falsified documents, approved a falsified rules violation report, and falsely added an enemy to the incarcerated person's list of enemies. The incarcerated person alleged an investigative employee assigned to assist him falsified documents and failed to read documents to him.

The incarcerated person requested a restoration of credits which would allow him to transfer to an appropriate prison where he would not be in danger.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the assault and discrimination allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation and routed the property and transfer allegations back to the prison as routine issues. The OIG concurred with those routing decisions, however, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegation that a lieutenant falsified documents, approved



a falsified rules violation report, and added a false enemy to the incarcerated person's enemy list. The OIG elevated the complaint to the Centralized Screening Team to address the allegations regarding the lieutenant to which the Centralized Screening Team agreed and opened a new complaint to address the missed allegation.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department handled the screening and referral poorly. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify an allegation that a lieutenant falsified documents, approved a falsified rules violation report, and added a false enemy to the incarcerated person's enemy list. After the OIG's elevation to the Centralized Screening Team regarding the missed allegation, the Centralized Screening Team agreed to open a new complaint to address it.

OIG Case Number  
24-0078011-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
**Poor**

### Incident Summary

On March 12, 2024, an officer allegedly lied to an incarcerated person's supervisor, which resulted in the supervisor issuing the incarcerated person a rules violation report. The incarcerated person alleged the officer was aggressive, rude, and always yelled, which violated the incarcerated person's adaptive support needs to use slow and simple language and caused him to have anxiety attacks.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team initially referred the allegations the officer lied, yelled, and violated the incarcerated person's adaptive support needs to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The Office of Grievance disputed the decision, and a Centralized Screening Team supervisor amended the routing decision to a routine issue. Additionally, the Office of Grievance and the Centralized Screening Team supervisor both failed to document an explanation for the change in decision. The OIG did not concur with the allegation being changed from a local inquiry to routine because the change was inconsistent with prior referrals for the same allegation. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team management agreed to amend their decision to the original referral and referred the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team referred allegations that an officer lied, yelled, and violated an incarcerated person's adaptive support needs to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The OIG agreed with the initial decision. However, between the OIG's initial review and closure of the case,



the Office of Grievances disputed the referral to the hiring authority. A Centralized Screening Team supervisor made a poor choice to amend the initial decision and route the allegation to the prison to address as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur with the change in decision and elevated the case to the Centralized Screening Team which resulted in the allegation being referred to the hiring authority for a local inquiry as it was originally intended.

OIG Case Number  
24-0078747-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
**Poor**

### Incident Summary

Between July 26, 2023, and April 4, 2024, an officer allegedly retaliated against an incarcerated person for filing a grievance against the officer because he failed to open and close cell doors for the incarcerated person and acted unprofessionally. The officer allegedly confronted the incarcerated person about the grievance and said it “would have no effect” on him, implying the grievance process would be useless.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the retaliation allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry and routed the cell door issue back to the prison as a routine claim. The OIG concurred with the routine issue referral; however, the OIG did not agree with the Centralized Screening Team inappropriately referring the allegation that an officer retaliated against an incarcerated person for filing a prior grievance. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and referred the retaliation allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team incorrectly identified the allegation that an officer retaliated against an incarcerated person for filing a prior grievance for referral to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately amended their decision and referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.