



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

During October 2024, the OIG’s Centralized Screening Monitoring Team monitored and closed 1,144 grievances. The OIG assessed the 1,144 grievances as follows:

The OIG disputed 50 screening decisions, and the Centralized Screening Team agreed with the OIG in 49 of those cases. This resulted in the Centralized Screening Team referring an additional 28 allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit and an additional 15 allegations to the hiring authority for a local inquiry, for a total of 43 additional staff misconduct investigations or inquiries.

The OIG found the Centralized Screening Team made an incorrect decision in 36 cases, failed to identify every allegation within a complaint 52 times, failed to identify the need for a clarification interview seven times, and opened 27 new grievances solely to correct a mistake they made in a prior screening decision.

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

**The OIG’s Assessment of  
1,144 Grievances for  
October 2024**

Rating	No. of Grievances
Superior	1
Satisfactory	1,054
Poor	89

Note: 8% 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  
24-0092359-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
**Poor**

**Incident Summary**

On September 3, 2024, a mailroom supervisor allegedly issued a counseling memorandum to an incarcerated person in retaliation for filing staff misconduct grievances against her.

**Disposition**

The Centralized Screening Team referred the retaliation allegation against the mailroom supervisor back to the prison as routine. The OIG did not concur and





elevated the decision for reconsideration as an allegation of staff misconduct that warranted a referral to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. The Centralized Screening Team agreed.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team routed an allegation that a mailroom supervisor issued a rules counseling memorandum to an incarcerated person in retaliation for filing a staff misconduct grievance against her back to the prison as a routine mail issue rather than an allegation of staff misconduct. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team agreed to refer the retaliation allegation against the mailroom supervisor to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

OIG Case Number  
24-0092817-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
Poor

### Incident Summary

On May 31, 2024, an officer allegedly opened an incarcerated person's legal mail outside of his presence. On June 4, 2024, the same officer allegedly issued a falsified rules violation report to the incarcerated person to cover up the legal mail violation.

On June 12, 2024, the incarcerated person filed a grievance which the prison rejected. The incarcerated person filed an appeal and on September 19, 2024, the Office of Appeals determined prison staff inappropriately rejected the incarcerated person's initial grievance and ordered the Office of Grievances to open a new grievance to address the issue appropriately.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the rules violation report allegation 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 the officer falsified the rules violation report to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation and referred the legal mail violation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Office of Grievance opened the grievance solely to address deficiencies in a prior grievance the incarcerated person submitted, which the Centralized Screening Team failed to initially process appropriately. However, the Centralized Screening Team failed to process the grievance appropriately for a second time.



Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team processed the grievance as a routine rules violation report dispute and failed to identify the allegations that an officer violated legal mail policies and issued the incarcerated person a falsified rules violation report to cover up the legal mail policies violation. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and referred the alleged falsified report to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit and referred the legal mail allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.

OIG Case Number  
24-0092857-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
Poor

#### Incident Summary

On September 12, 2024, a teacher allegedly tapped an incarcerated person's head three times with a roll of papers.

#### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team initially referred the allegation against the teacher back to the prison as routine. The OIG did not concur. After the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and added the complaint as directly related to an already opened local inquiry, possibly containing additional information the investigator should be aware of.

#### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the teacher's alleged actions as staff misconduct and routed the allegation back to the prison as a routine issue. Additionally, the Centralized Screening Team created the case based on an interview prison staff conducted with the incarcerated person regarding a prior grievance he submitted with the same allegation, which the Centralized Screening Team also determined was routine. The department unnecessarily created a second case for the same allegation. After the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and added the complaint as a part of an already opened local inquiry.

OIG Case Number  
24-0092926-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
Poor

#### Incident Summary

On August 28, 2024, an officer allegedly falsified a rules violation report against an incarcerated person for unauthorized window coverings. The incarcerated person



requested a review of the officer's body-worn-camera recording and for the rules violation report to be dismissed.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation that an officer falsified a rules violation report back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur. After the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team upheld their decision to route the allegation as a routine issue. Following the OIG's second elevation, the Centralized Screening Team properly categorized the allegation as dishonesty and referred it to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify an allegation that an officer falsified a rules violation report as an allegation of staff misconduct. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team reported the senior hearing officer reduced the rules violation report to a counseling memorandum and illogically stated that while the officer may have misdocumented details in his report, his recollection was "not completely untrue." Following the OIG's second elevation, citing the Centralized Screening Team's own admission that the officer submitted an inaccurate report, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegations of dishonesty to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

OIG Case Number  
24-0093051-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
**Poor**

### Incident Summary

On September 12, 2024, an incarcerated person alleged staff sexually assaulted him and a lieutenant, and a sergeant condoned the abuse.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the sexual assault allegation back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur. After the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team upheld their routine decision regarding the alleged staff sexual misconduct and did not refer the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team identified a sexual misconduct allegation as a routine issue despite the allegation meeting criteria on the Allegation Decision Index. After the OIG's elevation, the Centralized



Screening Team did not change their screening decision. However, the Centralized Screening Team agreed documentation indicated a health care provider and an investigative services unit officer previously failed to report the alleged sexual misconduct and opened a new case detailing staff misconduct not against an incarcerated person for the hiring authority to review for disciplinary action.

OIG Case Number  
24-0093460-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
**Satisfactory**

### Incident Summary

Between April 16, 2024, and June 20, 2024, an officer allegedly falsified an incarcerated person's property card, and when the incarcerated person filed a staff misconduct complaint, the officer lied to the sergeant conducting the routine fact-finding when she interviewed the officer about confiscating the incarcerated person's television. On August 24, 2024, after a sergeant reprimanded the officer for confiscating a second television from the incarcerated person, the officer allegedly retaliated against the incarcerated person by removing the television from his property box for a second time. On August 28, 2024, after learning the incarcerated person had returned to the prison, the officer allegedly broke the incarcerated person's television in retaliation. The incarcerated person requested the department replace his television.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the retaliation and falsification of documents allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation. The OIG concurred.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed satisfactorily. The incarcerated person submitted a grievance that was multiple pages and included several dates along with specific details regarding the retaliation and falsification allegations. The Centralized Screening Team conducted a thorough review of the grievance and appropriately routed the allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number  
24-0094026-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
**Poor**

### Incident Summary

On October 1, 2024, an incarcerated person alleged a sergeant touched the incarcerated person's genitals inappropriately during a search and confiscated his pill bottle from his groin area, which contained his keep-on-person medications and



a battery. An officer allegedly cursed at the incarcerated person and used a racial epithet toward him.

### Disposition

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

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. The Centralized Screening Team incorrectly identified an allegation that a sergeant allegedly touched an incarcerated person's genitals inappropriately during a search as a routine issue. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team agreed to amend the decision and referred the allegation against the sergeant to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for staff sexual misconduct.

OIG Case Number  
24-0093700-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
**Superior**

### Incident Summary

On October 1, 2024, an officer allegedly threatened to physically assault an incarcerated person as he attempted to collect witness information.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the alleged threat of assault to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation. The OIG concurred.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed in a superior manner. The department's collaborative and timely efforts to complete a clarifying interview with an incarcerated person for an allegation that contained minimal information and did not present any immediate safety concerns helped eliminate additional negative staff interaction. This approach streamlined the Centralized Screening Team's process and generated an appropriate referral to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.