



June 2024 Centralized Screening Monitoring Team Case Blocks
Published in August 2024

During June 2024, the OIG’s Centralized Screening Monitoring Team monitored and closed 634 grievances. The OIG assessed the 634 grievances as follows:

The OIG disputed 30 screening decisions, and the Centralized Screening Team agreed with the OIG in 28 of those cases. This resulted in the Centralized Screening Team referring an additional 10 allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit and an additional 10 allegations to the hiring authority for a local inquiry, for a total of 20 additional staff misconduct investigations or inquiries.

The OIG found the Centralized Screening Team made the incorrect decision in 32 cases, failed to identify every allegation within a complaint 26 times, and failed to identify the need for a clarification interview seven times.

This document presents six notable cases monitored and closed by the OIG during June 2024.

**The OIG’s Assessment of
634 Grievances for June 2024**

Rating	No. of Grievances
<i>Superior</i>	0
<i>Satisfactory</i>	572
<i>Poor</i>	62

Note: 10% 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
24-0078129-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On July 11, 2023, an incarcerated person alleged an associate warden and two officers planted a knife in their mattress.

Disposition

In July 2023, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation that an associate warden and two officers planted a knife in an incarcerated person’s mattress to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. A department strike team reevaluated the Centralized Screening Team’s decision in January 2024 due to a backlog of local inquiries pending completion. The strike team routed the allegation back to the prison as a routine allegation because no one allegedly witnessed the associate warden’s alleged misconduct. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team management referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit as staff misconduct.





Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. A department strike team reevaluated the Centralized Screening Team's decision and routed the allegation back to the prison as a routine allegation rather than an allegation of staff misconduct. The department sent a response to the incarcerated person on February 23, 2024, which advised the incarcerated person some issues regarding staff had to remain confidential. The response also failed to address the incarcerated person's allegation that an associate warden and two officers planted a knife in the incarcerated person's mattress. The OIG elevated the decision to Centralized Screening Team management to which they agreed their original decision and reevaluated decision were incorrect and referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation into staff misconduct.

OIG Case Number
24-0079467-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On March 22, 2024, five officers allegedly shared an incarcerated person's confidential information with other incarcerated people. On April 11, 2024, a sixth officer allegedly called the incarcerated person a rapist, and said the incarcerated person raped his cellmate, while the officer was talking to another incarcerated person. On April 11, 2024, one of the five officers allegedly turned off his body-worn camera when he disclosed the incarcerated person's confidential information to other incarcerated people and made "indirect comments" toward the incarcerated person. A second of the five officers allegedly retaliated against the incarcerated person for filing a grievance by provoking violence between the incarcerated person and other incarcerated people. The incarcerated person alleged other incarcerated people talked about his personal information, which the incarcerated people could only know if officers told them. The incarcerated person requested video-recorded footage for all the incidents.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation that an officer made comments about the incarcerated person's confidential information to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The OIG did not concur. The Centralized Screening Team also failed to identify multiple allegations of staff misconduct against multiple officers, which resulted in the failure to appropriately refer the allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team opened a new grievance in which they referred three integrity allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation. The Centralized Screening Team also routed the allegation that other incarcerated people discussed the incarcerated person's



confidential information and his request for video-recorded footage back to the prison as routine issues.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team identified only a single allegation against one officer for disclosing an incarcerated person's confidential information to other incarcerated people, and inappropriately routed the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify multiple allegations against multiple officers, including that the officers shared confidential information about an incarcerated person, they endangered the incarcerated person's safety, and an officer turned off their body-worn camera. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team opened a new grievance and appropriately referred three integrity allegations for investigation and routed the allegation that other incarcerated people talked about the incarcerated person's confidential information and his request for video-recorded footage back to the prison as routine issues.

OIG Case Number
24-0080142-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On April 26, 2024, an officer allegedly dropped food on the floor and placed the food back onto an incarcerated person's food tray. The same officer allegedly failed to provide the incarcerated person a grievance form on four occasions.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the food handling and grievance form allegations back to the prison as routine issues. The OIG concurred with the food handling allegation being routed as routine. The OIG elevated the grievance form decision back to the Centralized Screening Team for reconsideration as an allegation of staff misconduct because the officer interfered with the incarcerated person's ability to report staff misconduct. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team maintained their original decision.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team failed to consider the allegation that an officer interfered with the incarcerated person's ability to report staff misconduct by repeatedly refusing to provide him with grievance forms as staff misconduct which warranted a referral to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. The OIG elevated the decision back to the Centralized Screening Team; however, they maintained their decision the alleged staff misconduct



was only a routine grievance request issue. The Centralized Screening Team cited information obtained after they made their initial decision, wherein the officer reported the housing unit was “out of a few different supplies for a couple of days,” but they had since received all necessary supplies and issued them to the incarcerated population when available. Neither the officer nor the Centralized Screening Team actually confirmed the “supplies” included grievances forms, nor did they specifically speak to this incarcerated person’s allegation, and only stated staff issued items to the incarcerated population when they were available.

OIG Case Number
24-0083322-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On June 9, 2024, an incarcerated person alleged administrators unjustifiably denied the lower-level incarcerated population’s programming needs by housing higher-level mental health incarcerated people on the yard and only accommodating that population. The incarcerated person alleged the combined programs caused a negative effect on his mental health and programming efforts.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the classification allegation back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG concurred; however, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the incarcerated person disclosed a mental health risk to personal safety and failed to immediately notify the hiring authority.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the incarcerated person disclosed a mental health risk to personal safety and failed to immediately notify the hiring authority. The OIG monitored four grievances out of a mass filing at the same prison where the Centralized Screening Team detected and referred a mental health risk for three of the grievances. Based on the grievances containing the same language, the Centralized Screening Team had no reason to treat one complaint different from the others. Following the OIG’s notification, the Centralized Screening Team failed to submit a mental health notification to alert the prison that the incarcerated person was at mental health risk to personal safety, which resulted in the Centralized Screening Team’s inconsistent screening of similar grievances filed at the same prison.



OIG Case Number
24-0083366-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On June 7, 2022, a sergeant, an officer, and a library assistant allegedly retaliated against an incarcerated person for filing prior grievances by not allowing him to use law library resources and services. On June 10, 2024, the Office of Appeals ordered a new grievance log number be opened to properly address the allegation, complete interviews, and provide a substantive response to the incarcerated person.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the law library resources allegation back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur and elevated the routine decision regarding the incarcerated person's retaliation allegations against staff back to the Centralized Screening Team. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and referred the allegations of retaliation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team initially failed to properly identify the allegations that staff retaliated against an incarcerated person by not allowing him to utilize law library resources, as staff misconduct. The OIG elevated the allegation back to the Centralized Screening Team and management amended their decisions and referred the retaliation allegations against the sergeant, officer, and library assistant to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number
24-0083637-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On June 13, 2024, an incarcerated person alleged prison staff harassed, bullied, and abused him. The incarcerated person made vague allegations that he was being touched, grabbed, and requested help.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegations of staff misconduct to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team agreed with the OIG's recommendation to conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person who submitted the grievance to obtain additional details.



Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team inappropriately routed vague allegations that prison staff harassed, abused, and bullied an incarcerated person to the hiring authority for a local inquiry instead of conducting a clarification interview with the incarcerated person to obtain additional details. Further, despite identifying the complaint contained a risk to the incarcerated person's safety, the Centralized Screening Team failed to notify the hiring authority of said risk, as required by departmental policy. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team attempted to conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person, but he refused to participate. Based on the incarcerated person's refusal to provide additional details, the OIG agreed with the Centralized Screening Team's decision to uphold the referral of the allegation for a local inquiry.