



During September 2024, the OIG’s Centralized Screening Monitoring Team monitored and closed 876 grievances. The OIG assessed the 876 grievances as follows:

The OIG disputed 31 screening decisions, and the Centralized Screening Team agreed with the OIG in 29 of those cases. This resulted in the Centralized Screening Team referring an additional 16 allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit and an additional 13 allegations to the hiring authority for a local inquiry, for a total of 29 additional staff misconduct investigations or inquiries.

The OIG found the Centralized Screening Team made an incorrect decision in 34 cases, failed to identify every allegation within a complaint 41 times, and failed to identify the need for a clarification interview five times.

This document presents 12 notable cases monitored and closed by the OIG during September 2024.

The OIG’s Assessment of 876 Grievances for September 2024

Rating	No. of Grievances
Superior	0
Satisfactory	821
Poor	55

Note: 6% 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
24-0087825-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On July 14, 2024, an officer allegedly harassed an incarcerated person. The incarcerated person requested prison staff review the officer’s body-worn-camera footage.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the incarcerated person’s vague allegation of harassment to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The OIG did not concur and recommended the Centralized Screening Team conduct a clarification interview with





the incarcerated person regarding the officer's alleged harassment. The Centralized Screening Team declined to conduct a clarification interview to obtain information as to how the officer harassed the incarcerated person and upheld their original referral to the hiring authority.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the need to conduct a clarification interview regarding the incarcerated person's vague allegation that an officer harassed him and referred the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. Following the OIG's recommendation for a clarification interview, the Centralized Screening Team declined to conduct an interview, claiming they referred the allegation as staff misconduct considering the allegation of harassment "at face value." The OIG did not agree with the Centralized Screening Team's decision, since "harassment" is on the Allegation Decision Index as requiring a referral to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit, not to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.

OIG Case Number
24-0088074-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On August 1, 2024, an incarcerated person requested medical equipment and to return to a mental health crisis bed. The incarcerated person also made vague references to sexual misconduct and medical malpractice. During a clarification interview, the incarcerated person alleged a lieutenant, a sergeant, two officers, and two nurses denied him medical treatment and caused him to feel suicidal, and the sergeant called him derogatory names and took his walker.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the medical and mental health requests and the incarcerated person's vague sexual misconduct and medical malpractice allegations back to the prison as routine claims. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview with the incarcerated person and subsequently referred the allegations against a sergeant and a nurse to their respective hiring authorities for local inquiries.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team initially failed to identify the need to conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person into the vague allegation of sexual harassment and medical malpractice



until after the OIG's recommendation to do so. After completing a clarification interview, the Centralized Screening Team correctly determined the allegation did not meet the criteria for sexual misconduct, but appropriately referred allegations of unprofessionalism, discourteous treatment, and noncompliance against nursing staff and a sergeant to their respective hiring authorities for local inquiries.

OIG Case Number
24-0088894-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On August 10, 2024, an incarcerated person alleged he feared for his safety from other incarcerated persons after investigative services unit staff instructed other incarcerated people to "get [him]," and requested to be housed in a single cell. During a clarification interview, the incarcerated person alleged that on January 12, 2024, investigative services unit staff gave his staff misconduct complaints to other incarcerated people and made the incarcerated person sign a compatibility agreement, despite his safety concerns.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the incarcerated person's safety concern claim and request for housing in a single cell back to the prison as routine issues. The OIG concurred. However, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegation against investigative services unit staff targeting the incarcerated person and failed to conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person regarding the vague allegation. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview and subsequently referred the allegation that investigative services unit staff gave the incarcerated person's grievances to other incarcerated people to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify an allegation against investigative services unit staff targeting the incarcerated person. The OIG recommended the Centralized Screening Team conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person to gather additional details for the vague allegation of staff misconduct. The Centralized Screening Team agreed and subsequently referred the allegation that investigative services unit staff provided an incarcerated person's grievances to other incarcerated persons, resulting in him being targeted by the incarcerated population, and referred the claim to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit as staff misconduct.



OIG Case Number
24-0089779-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

Between July 29, 2024, and August 7, 2024, officers allegedly lost an incarcerated person's property in retaliation against the incarcerated person for filing staff misconduct complaints against officers in the restricted housing unit.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the claim that officers retaliated against an incarcerated person for filing staff misconduct complaints back to the prison as routine. The OIG did not concur. Following an elevation by the OIG, 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 officers retaliated against an incarcerated person by losing his property because he had filed a grievance against restricted housing unit officers as a routine claim. The OIG elevated the decision back to the Centralized Screening Team and the Centralized Screening Team appropriately amended their decision and referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for a retaliation investigation.

OIG Case Number
24-0090003-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On July 1, 2024, July 3, 2024, and August 20, 2024, an office technician allegedly shared confidential complaint forms with officers whom the complaints were filed against. On July 3, 2024, an officer allegedly announced on the public address system in the housing unit that a complaint had been filed against him for allowing incarcerated persons out of their cells who should not have been released.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the claim regarding the office technician sharing confidential complaint forms with officers to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. Prior to the OIG's review, the hiring authority disagreed with the Centralized Screening Team and requested they reconsider the allegation as a higher level of staff misconduct. Subsequently, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the claim to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation. The OIG agreed with the hiring authority's assessment and the amended decision.



Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team initially referred the allegations that an office technician violated the incarcerated population's confidentiality and an officer tried to intimidate the incarcerated population from filing staff misconduct complaints to the hiring authority for a local inquiry despite the claim meeting criteria on the Allegation Decision Index. After the hiring authority's dispute, the Centralized Screening rereviewed the complaint, appropriately amended their decision, and referred the allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number
24-0090351-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On July 17, 2024, two nurses allegedly used unreasonable force when they placed an incarcerated person into a Hoyer lift to pick him up from the floor after he had experienced a seizure, causing an injury to his leg. The first nurse allegedly rammed the incarcerated person's wheelchair into the Hoyer lift. The second nurse observed the first nurse ram the incarcerated person's wheelchair into the Hoyer lift but failed to report the misconduct. The incarcerated person alleged staff acted in a retaliatory manner because of prior complaints he filed against medical staff.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the use-of-force allegation back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur and elevated the decision back to the Centralized Screening Team. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and referred the allegations of use of force, retaliation, and failure to report misconduct to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team incorrectly identified allegations that nurses used unreasonable force against an incarcerated person, failed to report the misconduct, and retaliated against him as routine issues. Additionally, the Centralized Screening Team failed to notify the hiring authority for the appropriate staff notifications regarding a use-of-force interview. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately amended their decision and referred the allegations concerning the use-of-force, retaliation, and failure to report misconduct allegations against the nurses to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.



OIG Case Number
24-0090521-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

Between March 1, 2024, and April 30, 2024, a contracted vendor employee allegedly retaliated against an incarcerated person by refusing to provide tablet assistance after the incarcerated person filed a complaint against the contracted vendor employee. On August 11, 2024, the Office of Appeals determined prison staff inappropriately rejected the incarcerated person's initial grievance and ordered the prison to open a new grievance to appropriately address the issue.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the incarcerated person's retaliation allegation against the contracted vendor employee 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 alleged retaliation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The department opened this grievance solely to address deficiencies in a prior grievance the incarcerated person submitted, which the department failed to completely and appropriately process.

However, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify that a contracted vendor employee retaliated against an incarcerated person for filing a complaint against the employee by refusing to assist the incarcerated person with tablet issues as an allegation of staff misconduct. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and referred the allegation of retaliation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

OIG Case Number
24-0090754-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On August 15, 2024, a male lieutenant allegedly degraded and humiliated an incarcerated person by subjecting her to an unclothed-body search. A captain allegedly retaliated against the incarcerated person by placing her in a holding cage for 24 hours after she asked for a grievance form. On August 27, 2024, the incarcerated person alleged a sergeant harassed the incarcerated person by stealing half of her property. During a clarification interview, the incarcerated person reported a female officer conducted the unclothed-body search ordered by the male lieutenant.



Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred an allegation against a lieutenant and captain to the hiring authority for a local inquiry and routed a property claim back to the prison as a routine issue. The Centralized Screening Team prematurely made a screening decision without knowing if a male lieutenant conducted an unclothed-body search on the female incarcerated person and failed to initiate a clarification interview regarding a retaliation allegation against the captain. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview and subsequently elected to not refer either allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team prematurely made a screening decision without knowing if a male lieutenant conducted an unclothed-body search on the female incarcerated person and failed to initiate a clarification interview with the incarcerated person regarding her claim that a captain placed the incarcerated person in a holding cage overnight as a form of retaliation. The OIG elevated the case back to the Centralized Screening Team regarding the need for a clarification interview and retaliation allegation, and they agreed. However, the Centralized Screening Team subsequently elected not to refer either allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit, claiming nothing indicated the captain moved the incarcerated person in retaliation and noting the locally designated investigator could “suspend and elevate” the allegation if they found evidence to the contrary.

OIG Case Number
24-0091559-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On January 10, 2024, an officer allegedly assaulted an incarcerated person, causing the incarcerated person to spit blood, which resulted in the incarcerated person receiving a rules violation report for battery on a peace officer. Between January 10, 2024, and September 3, 2024, staff allegedly failed to timely hold a disciplinary hearing and caused the incarcerated person’s release date to be pushed back pending the outcome of the disciplinary hearing.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed one disciplinary claim back to the prison as a routine issue, citing the allegation as duplicative of a prior grievance. The OIG did not concur, as the grievance the Centralized Screening Team cited detailed a rules violation report for an incident that occurred on May 14, 2024, not January 10, 2024. Additionally, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify a use-of-



force allegation that warranted a referral to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision causing a delay in notifying the prison to initiate use-of-force protocols.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify an allegation that an officer assaulted an incarcerated person to the point of causing him to spit up blood, only identifying a rules violation report allegation, which the Centralized Screening Team incorrectly cited as duplicative of a prior grievance. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately amended their decisions and referred the use-of-force allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit and processed the disciplinary claim for a routine fact-finding rather than rejecting it as duplicative to a prior grievance.

OIG Case Number
24-0092294-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

Between August 10, 2024, and August 21, 2024, an officer allegedly touched and grabbed an incarcerated person inappropriately during a clothed-body search. A second officer allegedly ignored the incarcerated person when he reported the first officer's sexual misconduct. The two officers' actions allegedly caused the incarcerated person to attempt suicide, which resulted in the incarcerated person being sent to the hospital. On August 28, 2024, the first officer allegedly caressed the incarcerated person's back while giggling. When the incarcerated person reported the officer's ongoing sexual misconduct, a lieutenant allegedly responded that he did not "give a sh*t." The incarcerated person reported fearing for his safety around the first officer and his colleagues.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the incarcerated person's allegation of staff sexual misconduct back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur. At the same time, prison staff interviewed the incarcerated person as required within 48 hours of a sexual misconduct allegation, and created a separate complaint record stemming from the same staff misconduct complaint form. Inconsistently, the Centralized Screening Team referred that record to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. Additionally, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify allegations within the complaint that a lieutenant and a second officer ignored the incarcerated person's reports of staff sexual misconduct against the first officer and that the first officer's sexual misconduct directly led to the incarcerated person's suicide attempt.



Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the two incidents of sexual misconduct, which caused the incarcerated person to attempt suicide and staff's failure to report sexual misconduct to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team incorrectly routed an allegation of staff sexual misconduct by an officer back to the prison as a routine claim. Simultaneously, as a direct result of an interview with the incarcerated person due to the sexual misconduct complaint, prison staff failed to follow correct processes and created a separate complaint record for the exact same complaint and referenced the existing written complaint which the Centralized Screening Team referred to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. This resulted in the Centralized Screening Team processing two records for the exact same complaint as an Office of Internal Affairs investigation and a routine fact-finding by the prison. Furthermore, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify, in three different reviews of the same complaint, allegations that a lieutenant and a second officer allegedly ignored the incarcerated person's reports of staff sexual misconduct against the first officer and that the first officer's sexual misconduct directly led to the incarcerated person's suicide attempt. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the two incidents of sexual misconduct which allegedly caused the incarcerated person to attempt suicide, and staff's failure to report sexual misconduct to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number
24-0092423-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On August 23, 2024, a manager allegedly humiliated a transgender incarcerated person and her cellmate by announcing, in front of a classroom with other incarcerated people present, the two cellmates were in a relationship and therefore, could not both be in the manager's art class. The incarcerated person alleged the manager made an incorrect assumption based on her gender identity, and as a result, denied the incarcerated person the opportunity to program but decided to allow the incarcerated person's cellmate to remain in the class. The incarcerated person alleged the manager's action to be discriminatory, and to have caused other incarcerated people to "talk about" the two cellmates and their alleged "relationship."

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation of the manager's discrimination toward the incarcerated person to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. Prior to the OIG's review, the assigned locally designated investigator requested



the Centralized Screening Team refer the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit consistent with their routing decision of the same complaint the incarcerated person's cellmate submitted. The Centralized Screening Team declined and upheld the decision for a local inquiry. The OIG did not concur. Following an elevation by the OIG, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegation of discrimination to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation of the manager's discrimination toward the incarcerated person to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. Prior to the OIG's review, the assigned locally designated investigator discovered the Centralized Screening Team referred the same complaint, the incarcerated person's cellmate submitted to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit and requested this complaint be routed in the same manner. The Centralized Screening Team declined to do so saying the two complaints contained "different information" which accounted for the different screening decisions. The OIG disagreed as the only notable difference in the complaints was the incarcerated person identified as transgender and her cellmate did not, and the manager denied the transgender incarcerated person's participation in the art class but allowed the cellmate to participate. The OIG found the Centralized Screening Team's decisions to consider the cellmate's complaint as discrimination, but not the transgender incarcerated person's complaint, to be contradictory. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegation of discrimination against the transgender incarcerated person to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

OIG Case Number
24-0089341-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Satisfactory

Incident Summary

On July 27, 2024, an optometrist allegedly called an incarcerated person a liar and told him to leave if he did not want to take an eye test. The optometrist allegedly refused to treat the incarcerated person after he questioned the optometrist's unprofessionalism.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview and subsequently referred the allegation against the optometrist to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The OIG concurred.



Case Rating

Overall, the department performed satisfactorily. The incarcerated person submitted a complaint that alleged an optometrist engaged in unprofessional and unethical behavior. The incarcerated person also alleged the optometrist used “improper” language and the optometrist had the incarcerated person leave when he questioned the optometrist about his unprofessional conduct. The Centralized Screening Team acknowledged the vague allegation and conducted a clarification interview. After completing a clarification interview, the Centralized Screening Team correctly referred the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.