



**August 2024 Centralized Screening Monitoring Team Case Blocks**  
*Published in October 2024*

During August 2024, the OIG’s Centralized Screening Monitoring Team monitored and closed 702 grievances. The OIG assessed the 702 grievances as follows:

The OIG disputed 47 screening decisions, and the Centralized Screening Team agreed with the OIG in 44 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 10 allegations to the hiring authority for a local inquiry, for a total of 40 additional staff misconduct investigations or inquiries.

The OIG found the Centralized Screening Team made an incorrect decision in 25 cases, failed to identify every allegation within a complaint 30 times, and failed to identify the need for a clarification interview five times.

This document presents eight notable cases monitored and closed by the OIG during August 2024.

**The OIG’s Assessment of  
702 Grievances for August 2024**

Rating	No. of Grievances
Superior	0
Satisfactory	645
Poor	57

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  
24-0084241-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
**Poor**

**Incident Summary**

On May 20, 2024, officers allegedly subjected a male incarcerated person to an uncomfortable and unprofessional unclothed-body search in the dayroom, in the presence of female officers, and some officers allegedly had their body-worn cameras activated during the unclothed-body search. During a clarification interview on July 3, 2024, the incarcerated person alleged officers failed to use a privacy screen, female staff walked around during the unclothed-body searches, and some officers had their body-worn cameras turned on.





## Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the claim regarding the unclothed-body search back to the prison as routine. The OIG did not concur and elevated the routing decision back to the Centralized Screening Team. The OIG recommended the Centralized Screening Team conduct a clarification interview to gather additional details from the incarcerated person who submitted the complaint. The Centralized Screening Team agreed, and subsequently amended their decision, conducted a clarification interview, and referred the allegation of staff sexual misconduct to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

## Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify as staff misconduct the allegation that officers conducted unclothed-body searches of male incarcerated persons in the presence of female officers with body-worn cameras turned on. The Centralized Screening Team also failed to identify the need to conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person who submitted the complaint regarding the vague allegations of "uncomfortable and unprofessional" unclothed-body searches. Following the OIG's elevation and recommendation to conduct a clarification interview, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately amended their decision and referred the allegation against the officers to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for staff sexual misconduct.

OIG Case Number  
24-0086383-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
Poor

## Incident Summary

On June 6, 2024, an officer allegedly failed to wear a body-worn camera, and a second officer allegedly covered the lens and microphone of their body-worn camera during an encounter with an incarcerated person. The first officer then allegedly falsified the content of the conversation in a rules violation report against the incarcerated person. On July 1, 2024, a lieutenant allegedly violated the incarcerated person's due process rights by failing to ensure staff completed a mental health assessment with the incarcerated person prior to a disciplinary hearing.

## Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegations that an officer blocked her body-worn camera and falsified content in the rules violation report back to the prison as routine. The OIG did not concur. The Centralized Screening Team did not properly refer the body-worn-camera allegation and failed to identify the allegation that a second officer also violated body-worn-camera requirements. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview with the incarcerated person who submitted the complaint and added the missed allegation



and referred both body-worn-camera allegations against the first and the second officer to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team initially identified an allegation that an officer blocked her body-worn camera as a routine issue and failed to identify the allegation that a second officer failed to wear a body-worn camera as staff misconduct. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred both body-worn-camera allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs.

OIG Case Number  
24-0086394-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
Poor

### Incident Summary

On June 29, 2024, an officer allegedly tightened an incarcerated person's waist restraints causing the incarcerated person to turn his body away in pain, which led the restraint chain to rub across the officer's fingers. Following the incident, the officer allegedly issued the incarcerated person a rules violation report for battery on a peace officer that contained falsified details. The incarcerated person requested the rules violation report to be dismissed.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the claim regarding the request for the rules violation report to be dismissed back to the prison as routine. The OIG did not concur and elevated the grievance for reconsideration for staff misconduct against the officer for falsifying the rules violation report and improper use of restraints. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision, identified an additional claim for staff misconduct, and referred the allegation of falsifying a rules violation report and improper use of restraints to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify allegations that an officer tightened waist restraints causing pain to an incarcerated person and falsified the rules violation report. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately amended their decision and referred the improper use of restraints and falsification of a rules violation report allegation against the officer to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. However, the Centralized Screening Team initially failed to identify the allegation as staff misconduct.



OIG Case Number  
24-0086753-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
Poor

### Incident Summary

On July 2, 2024, following a verbal encounter, officers allegedly used unreasonable force when handcuffing an incarcerated person.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the unreasonable force allegation to be a routine matter after the incarcerated person refused to participate in a clarification interview and provide additional details. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team agreed prison staff failed to include the necessary details regarding the allegation, but upheld their decision not to process the unreasonable force allegation as staff misconduct due to the lack of specific details in the complaint.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Prison staff reporting the incarcerated person's verbal unreasonable force allegation failed to report specific details, including the incarcerated person's exact statement, names of staff involved, and details of the alleged incident, and the Centralized Screening Team failed to request those details from prison staff. Rather than requesting the information – which the OIG found in a rules violation report available in the department's database – from the prison, the Centralized Screening Team attempted to get the additional details from the incarcerated person during a clarification interview. When the incarcerated person refused to participate in the interview, the Centralized Screening Team inappropriately determined the use of unreasonable force allegation to be a routine matter. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team agreed prison staff failed to include the necessary details, but upheld their decision not to process the unreasonable force allegation as an allegation of staff misconduct, citing a lack of sufficient details.

OIG Case Number  
24-0087351-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
Poor

### Incident Summary

On July 11, 2024, an officer allegedly issued an incarcerated person a rules violation report in retaliation for the incarcerated person filing multiple staff misconduct complaints against the officer. On July 23, 2024, a lieutenant allegedly violated the incarcerated person's due process during the related disciplinary hearing by relying on insufficient evidence and not allowing the incarcerated person to present mitigating evidence.



## Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the incarcerated person's due process violation claim back to the prison as a routine issue. While the OIG concurred with that decision, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify an allegation of retaliation against the incarcerated person for filing staff misconduct complaints. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team inappropriately referred the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.

## Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team initially failed to identify an allegation of retaliation against the incarcerated person for filing staff misconduct complaints. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team arbitrarily determined the officer would not have retaliated against the incarcerated person because the department denied six complaints the incarcerated person previously filed against the officer. Contradictorily, the Centralized Screening Team opened a new grievance and referred the incarcerated person's retaliation allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry instead of the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

OIG Case Number  
24-0087833-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
**Poor**

## Incident Summary

On July 4, 2023, a physician allegedly denied an incarcerated person's request to hold a complaint interview in a confidential setting. The physician allegedly told the incarcerated person if he did not participate in the interview via speaker phone in the dayroom, in the presence of officers and other incarcerated persons, the physician would document the incarcerated person refused the interview. An officer allegedly made the incarcerated person get off the phone, preventing him from thoroughly explaining his concerns.

## Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the complaint contained no allegation of staff misconduct. Prior to the OIG's review, the healthcare grievance office disputed the decision, and the Centralized Screening Team then referred the allegation against the physician to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team upheld their decision to refer the allegation for a local inquiry, rather than referring the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.



## Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team determined the complaint contained no allegation of staff misconduct. Prior to the OIG's review, the healthcare grievance office disputed the decision, and the Centralized Screening Team then referred the allegation against the physician to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The OIG disputed the Centralized Screening Team's decision to refer an allegation that a physician required an incarcerated person to discuss a medical staff misconduct complaint on a speakerphone in the dayroom, rather than in a confidential setting, or be considered as refusing to participate in the interview. The Centralized Screening Team upheld their referral for a local inquiry, considering the physician's alleged behavior to be a "departure from standard of care," rather than disclosing confidential information or interfering with the reporting of staff misconduct. In addition, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegation that an officer made the incarcerated person terminate his speakerphone call with the physician, which prevented the incarcerated person from reporting all his concerns.

OIG Case Number  
24-0088281-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
**Satisfactory**

## Incident Summary

On August 5, 2024, an officer allegedly left his post in a housing unit so he could watch an incarcerated person on the yard. On August 6, 2024, the same officer allegedly left his post again to watch the incarcerated person and made comments about the incarcerated person's physique and tan lines. The incarcerated person alleged the officer prevented him from showering so the officer could watch him which made the incarcerated person uncomfortable.

## Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegations against the officer to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. While the OIG agreed with the decision, the OIG also identified the Centralized Screening Team referred a separate complaint, containing allegations of gender-based harassment involving the same officer and incarcerated person to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit on the same day. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team agreed to refer this complaint to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit as a subsequent source to the second complaint to prevent duplicative work and potential conflicting outcomes by an Office of Internal Affairs investigator and a locally designated investigator.



## Case Rating

Overall, the department performed satisfactorily. The Centralized Screening Team initially routed the claim back to the hiring authority for a local inquiry which would typically be the correct routing decision. However, the OIG identified multiple claims filed by the incarcerated person alleging various degrees of harassment by the same officer within days of one another. Based on the individual details included in the complaint forms, the Centralized Screening Team referred one complaint to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit and two complaints to the hiring authority for local inquiries. For efficiency and consistency, the OIG recommended the Centralized Screening Team refer all the related complaints to a single investigator. Subsequently, the Centralized Screening Team agreed to refer all three complaints to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit to eliminate duplicative and potentially conflicting investigations.

OIG Case Number  
24-0088904-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
**Poor**

## Incident Summary

On August 12, 2024, an incarcerated person alleged prison staff opened his legal mail outside of his presence and falsely blamed the post office.

## Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the mail allegation back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.

## Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team incorrectly identified a staff misconduct allegation that prison staff open an incarcerated person's legal mail as a routine issue. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and referred the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.