



During July 2024, the OIG’s Centralized Screening Monitoring Team monitored and closed 435 grievances. The OIG assessed the 435 grievances as follows:

The OIG disputed 28 screening decisions, and the Centralized Screening Team agreed with the OIG in 24 of those cases. This resulted in the Centralized Screening Team referring an additional 13 allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit and an additional eight allegations to the hiring authority for a local inquiry, for a total of 21 additional staff misconduct investigations or inquiries.

Of the 435 cases closed this month, the OIG found the Centralized Screening Team made an incorrect decision in 30 cases, failed to identify every allegation within a complaint 28 times, and failed to identify the need for a clarification interview five times.

This document presents nine notable cases monitored and closed by the OIG during July 2024.

**The OIG’s Assessment of
435 Grievances for July 2024**

Rating	No. of Grievances
Superior	0
Satisfactory	394
Poor	41

Note: 9% 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
24-0079957-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On April 15, 2024, a third-party alleged an officer made an inappropriate comment about an incarcerated person’s confidential information and requested the incarcerated person be released.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the complaint did not contain an allegation of staff misconduct, but instead, reported the prison’s investigative services unit would conduct an investigation rather than a routine fact-finding. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted





a clarification interview and referred the complaint to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Prison staff failed to provide the Centralized Screening Team with sufficient information about the content of the complaint; however, the Centralized Screening Team maintained their screening decision of not identifying staff misconduct. The OIG elevated the decision back to the Centralized Screening Team, requested additional information including what specific concerns the third-party reported, what comments the officer allegedly made, the officer's name, and at which prison the incident occurred. On May 8, 2024, the OIG questioned the Centralized Screening Team's decision despite the lack of a clarification interview. The Centralized Screening Team significantly delayed the process by failing to agree to the need to conduct an interview until June 12, 2024, 35 days after the OIG first expressed a concern regarding a clarification interview. The Centralized Screening Team further delayed the complaint by failing to refer the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry until July 16, 2024, 33 days following the clarification interview on June 13, 2024, and 92 days from their initial receipt of the complaint on April 15, 2024.

OIG Case Number
24-0083066-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On June 6, 2024, an officer allegedly told an incarcerated person to place his hands behind his head and unnecessarily pulled his hair when the officer grabbed the incarcerated person's hand to place him in restraints.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the claim back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur. The Centralized Screening Team did not change their screening decision after the OIG elevated the dispute.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team identified the claim as a routine issue despite the claim meeting criteria on the Allegation Decision Index. The OIG elevated the case back to the Centralized Screening Team because an incarcerated person's allegation of excessive or unnecessary force was the



only requirement for referring the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. Centralized Screening Team management indicated the officer's actions were incidental to placing the incarcerated person in handcuffs and further stated once the officer became aware of grabbing the incarcerated person's hair, the officer immediately let go. Therefore, the Centralized Screening Team did not change their screening decision.

OIG Case Number
24-0083925-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On February 23, 2024, a sergeant allegedly falsified an incarcerated person's interview statements related to a prior grievance. On June 16, 2024, the Office of Appeals determined the prison inappropriately denied the incarcerated person's initial grievance and ordered the prison to open a new grievance to address the issue appropriately.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team initially routed a dishonesty allegation against a sergeant back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur. The OIG and the Office of Grievances both submitted an elevation to the Centralized Screening Team to refer the sergeant's dishonesty allegation as staff misconduct. The Centralized Screening Team agreed with the OIG's recommendation. The Centralized Screening Team ultimately amended their decision and referred the allegation regarding the sergeant's dishonesty to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit as staff misconduct.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify an allegation that a sergeant falsified an incarcerated person's interview statements related to a prior grievance, as an allegation of staff misconduct. Following the OIG's elevation, the Office of Grievances also submitted an elevation to the Centralized Screening Team to refer the dishonesty allegation against the sergeant as staff misconduct. The Centralized Screening Team disagreed with the Office of Grievance's request to amend the decision from a routine allegation. However, following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team agreed to amend their decision and referred the dishonesty allegation against the sergeant to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit as staff misconduct.



OIG Case Number
24-0083928-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On June 1, 2024, two officers allegedly used excessive force on an incarcerated person. On June 13, 2024, the incarcerated person alleged staff inappropriately denied him his medication.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the medication allegation back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG concurred. However, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the use-of-force allegation against two officers. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team took appropriate steps to amend their decision and referred the unidentified use-of-force allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team initially failed to identify a use-of-force allegation against two officers. The OIG elevated the case back to the Centralized Screening Team regarding the use-of-force allegation, after which the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. However, the Centralized Screening Team's initial screening decision of a single illegible request was incomplete and inappropriate.

OIG Case Number
24-0084356-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On May 2, 2024, a lieutenant and a sergeant allegedly threatened an incarcerated person with death if the incarcerated person did not withdraw his court filing.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation against the lieutenant and sergeant back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.



Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify as staff misconduct the allegation that a lieutenant and a sergeant threatened an incarcerated person with death, over filing a lawsuit with the court. The OIG elevated the decision back to the Centralized Screening Team and management amended their decision and referred the allegation against the lieutenant and sergeant to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number
24-0084616-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On June 5, 2024, officers allegedly used excessive force to extract an incarcerated person from his cell. The incarcerated person alleged he posed no threat, did not resist, and actively communicated with staff.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation of excessive force back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team agreed with OIG's recommendation and referred the excessive force allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team inappropriately routed an allegation of excessive force back to the prison as a routine claim, rather than referring the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. The OIG elevated the allegation back to the Centralized Screening Team and management amended their decision and appropriately referred the allegation for an investigation by the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number
24-0085360-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On May 25, 2024, three nurses allegedly failed to provide an incarcerated person proper medical care and made unprofessional comments. The first nurse allegedly



stated to the incarcerated person, “Stop smoking dope and I don’t have time for your theatrics.” The second nurse allegedly stated to the incarcerated person, “Inmates especially you trannies [sic] manipulate your way to the hospital by playing the system.” The third nurse allegedly stated to the incarcerated person, “You heard what my coworkers said, nothing is wrong with you, your [sic] not going to the hospital bottom line . . . there is no doctor, I am the doctor!”

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the discrimination allegation against a nurse to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit. Although the OIG concurred with that decision, the Centralized Screening Team initially failed to identify additional allegations against two nurses that they made inappropriate statements to the incarcerated person, denied medical care, and that the third nurse deviated from her scope of licensure. Following an elevation by the OIG, the Centralized Screening Team took appropriate steps to amend their decision and referred the allegations against the two nurses to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team’s initial decision inappropriately identified only one allegation of staff misconduct against a nurse. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify additional staff misconduct allegations against two other nurses that were directly related in time and scope with the allegation initially identified against the first nurse. Following an elevation by the OIG, the Centralized Screening Team took appropriate steps to amend their decision and referred the allegations that two additional nurses made inappropriate comments, denied medical care and the third nurse deviated from their scope of licensure to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number
24-0085495-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

Between July 1, 2024, and July 7, 2024, two medical staff members allegedly disrespected an incarcerated person by belittling his appearance and degraded him for walking with a brace and cane, by stating, “Go hobbling back to your cell and have people feeling sorry for you.”

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation against the two medical staff members to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The OIG concurred. However, the



Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the discriminatory insults the medical staff members allegedly made to the incarcerated person. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team took appropriate steps to amend their decision and referred the discrimination allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team's initial decision inappropriately failed to identify medical staff members allegedly made discriminatory insults to the incarcerated person. The OIG elevated the case back to the Centralized Screening Team and management amended their decision and appropriately referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number
24-0083247-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On April 29, 2024, a sergeant and officers allegedly broke an incarcerated person's jaw and fractured his collar bone. On June 7, 2024, the incarcerated person made a vague allegation of sexual misconduct. The incarcerated person also alleged staff failed to apply his earned milestone credits, requested a release date recalculation, a walker, a cane, X-rays, liquid nutritional supplements, and a referral for resentencing. During a clarification interview regarding the vague sexual misconduct claim, the incarcerated person alleged an officer made a derogatory comment about his sexuality.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the claims of the use-of-force, milestone credits, release date recalculation, referral for a resentencing, medical equipment, and X-rays to be duplicative of prior complaints, and routed all the claims back to the prison as routine issues. The OIG concurred; however, the Centralized Screening Team failed to address the incarcerated person's vague sexual misconduct allegation. Following the OIG's recommendation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview with the incarcerated person, and then referred the allegation that an officer made a derogatory comment about the incarcerated person's sexuality to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify and process the request for liquid nutritional supplements.



Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team initially failed to identify a vague allegation of sexual misconduct and the need to conduct a clarifying interview. Following the OIG's recommendation, the Centralized Screening Team completed a clarification interview, wherein the incarcerated person alleged an officer made a derogatory comment about the incarcerated person's sexuality. Subsequently, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the incarcerated person's request for liquid nutritional supplements and route the request back to the prison as a routine claim.