



During November 2024, the OIG’s Centralized Screening Monitoring Team monitored and closed 1,014 grievances. The OIG assessed the 1,014 grievances as follows:

The OIG disputed 42 screening decisions, and the Centralized Screening Team agreed with the OIG in 40 of those cases. This resulted in the Centralized Screening Team referring an additional 27 allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit and an additional 12 allegations to the hiring authority for a local inquiry, for a total of 39 additional staff misconduct investigations or inquiries.

The OIG found the Centralized Screening Team made an incorrect decision in 60 cases, failed to identify every allegation within a complaint 69 times, failed to identify the need for a clarification interview seven times, and opened 30 new grievances solely to correct a mistake they made in a prior screening decision.

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

The OIG’s Assessment of 1,014 Grievances for November 2024

Rating	No. of Grievances
Superior	0
Satisfactory	926
Poor	88

Note: 8.5% 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
24-0093226-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Satisfactory

Incident Summary

On August 23, 2024, an officer allegedly assaulted an incarcerated person and broke her thumb, a lieutenant allegedly falsified a rules violation report to cover up the officer’s misconduct, and a nurse allegedly failed to provide medical care and falsely placed the incarcerated person on suicide watch. On August 26, 2024, a nurse allegedly failed to provide the incarcerated person an inhaler. On August 27, 2024, two other officers allegedly denied the incarcerated medical treatment and access to her inhaler stating, “You can breathe because you are talking.” Subsequently, the





incarcerated person allegedly had a seizure, fell, and hit her head while the officers stood and watched.

Note: The summary is based on the details provided during a clarification interview with the incarcerated person, as she submitted a vague written complaint.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team initiated a clarification interview with the incarcerated person and subsequently referred the incarcerated person's allegations that an officer used unreasonable force, a lieutenant falsified a report, and a nurse denied medical treatment to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation. The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation that a nurse denied the incarcerated person's inhaler to the hiring authority for a local inquiry and routed the incarcerated person's suicide watch placement allegation back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG concurred.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed satisfactorily. The Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview with the incarcerated person which resulted in the screener referring allegations of force, dishonesty, code of silence, and other misconduct to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit and referring another allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.

OIG Case Number
24-0094357-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

Between September 26, 2024, and September 27, 2024, two officers allegedly lied about an incarcerated person going to court when a sergeant ordered officers to pack the incarcerated person's property for a transfer. During the transport, one officer allegedly drove recklessly by swerving in and out of traffic, speeding, braking hard, making an illegal U-turn, smoking, drinking, and using his mobile phone. The officer allegedly solicited a sex worker when he stopped the transport vehicle at a gas station.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the incarcerated person's allegation of the officer's reckless driving to the hiring authority for local inquiry and routed the transfer allegation back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur with the Centralized Screening Team's referral of an officer's reckless driving for a local inquiry. Further, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegation that the officer also solicited a sex worker while on duty. Following the OIG's elevation, the



Centralized Screening Team upheld their original screening decision. Following the OIG's second elevation, the Centralized Screening Team's management referred the allegation that an officer drove recklessly and solicited a sex worker while on duty to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for further investigation.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team incorrectly referred the incarcerated person's allegation that an officer drove recklessly to the hiring authority for a local inquiry, despite negligent or reckless driving being on the Allegation Decision Index. The Centralized Screening Team also failed to identify the allegation that an officer solicited a sex worker while on duty. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team inappropriately upheld their original decision, claiming the incarcerated person could not have seen the transport vehicle's speedometer, a winding road would have caused the incarcerated person to move around, and the incarcerated person did not sustain any injuries to support the officer driving recklessly. The Centralized Screening Team still did not address the allegation that the officer solicited a sex worker while on duty. Following the OIG's second elevation, the Centralized Screening Team's management referred the allegations that the officer drove recklessly and solicited a sex worker while on duty to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number
24-0094672-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On September 27, 2024, an officer allegedly denied an incarcerated person's request to return to his housing unit to use the bathroom due to temperatures over 100 degrees making it impossible for him to sit on the metal toilets in the yard, until a sergeant and a second officer intervened. The incarcerated person alleged other incarcerated people defecated in the outdoor showers. On September 30, 2024, a third officer allegedly denied repeated requests from multiple incarcerated people to return to their housing unit to use the bathroom due to temperatures over 100 degrees. The temperature made it impossible for the incarcerated people to sit on the metal toilets in the yard, which resulted in multiple incarcerated people defecating in the outdoor showers. On October 7, 2024, the incarcerated person allegedly told a captain about the ongoing bathroom issues and that incarcerated people were defecating in the outdoor showers, but the captain allegedly failed to address the problems.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation that officers were not allowing incarcerated people access to a usable toilet which created an unsanitary environment because the incarcerated people were defecating in the showers, to



the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The locally designated investigator disputed the referral, and the Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur. Following 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 failed to respond and proceeded with the routine decision.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation that officers were not allowing incarcerated people access to a usable toilet which created an unsanitary environment because incarcerated people were defecating in the showers, to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. Prior to the OIG's review, the locally designated investigator disputed the referral, and the Centralized Screening Team routed the claim back to the prison as a routine issue without sufficient explanation. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team upheld their decision to route the allegation as a routine issue citing the allegation was a routine policy issue. The Centralized Screening Team responded that allowing incarcerated people to request access to the building to use the bathroom would create an unreasonable "free-for-all." However, departmental policy already allows for access to buildings during heat alerts which staff would have activated on the days in question based on recorded temperatures. The Centralized Screening Team failed to respond to the OIG's second elevation and proceeded with a routine decision.

OIG Case Number
24-0095484-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On October 21, 2024, a sergeant allegedly grabbed and twisted an incarcerated person's wrist and arm to apply handcuffs prior to asking for consent, which irritated the incarcerated person's preexisting wrist injury.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the incarcerated person's allegation that a sergeant used unreasonable force back to the prison as a routine issue. The OIG did not concur and recommended the Centralized Screening Team conduct a clarification interview to address the incarcerated person's vague unreasonable force allegation. Subsequently, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview and appropriately referred the 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 failed to identify an incarcerated person's vague allegation that a sergeant used unreasonable force and routed the complaint as a routine issue. The Centralized Screening Team inappropriately relied on a statement from the sergeant who allegedly used force against the incarcerated person that said "at no point" did the sergeant use force. The OIG questioned the Centralized Screening Team's reliance on the sergeant's version of events over the incarcerated person's noting that the Centralized Screening Team should assess complaints submitted at this prison based on face value rather than merit. The OIG recommended that the Centralized Screening Team conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person to address his vague unreasonable force allegation. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted the clarification interview with the incarcerated person, amended their decision, and appropriately routed the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

OIG Case Number
24-0095725-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On October 23, 2024, a third party alleged an officer denied an incarcerated person's access to meals, yard, canteen, and his trust account. The officer allegedly acted overly familiar with the incarcerated person telling him she was going through a divorce and communicated with him in areas where others could not witness the two.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the incarcerated person's complaint did not contain an allegation of staff misconduct and considered additional details the prison's reporting party provided rather than the actual allegations. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team attempted to conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person, but he refused to participate. Subsequently, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation that staff denied the incarcerated person access to meals to the hiring authority for a local inquiry.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team determined the allegations that an officer engaged in overfamiliarity with the incarcerated person and denied him meals not to be staff misconduct. Further, the Centralized Screening Team appeared to inappropriately consider information prison staff provided with the complaint when making their screening decision instead of screening the complaint itself. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized



Screening Team attempted to conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person, but he refused to participate.

Subsequently, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation that an unknown staff member denied the incarcerated person meals to the hiring authority for a local inquiry and upheld their original decision, based on the information provided by prison staff, that the allegation of overfamiliarity did not rise to the level of staff misconduct because the named employee did not work at the prison.

OIG Case Number
24-0096655-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Poor

Incident Summary

On November 5, 2024, a vision-impaired incarcerated person alleged an officer harassed him daily by slamming his cell door, making inappropriate comments toward him, and accusing him of faking his blindness and not needing his wheelchair or tapping cane.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation against the officer to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit as discrimination.

Case Rating

Overall, the department performed poorly. While the Centralized Screening Team identified an allegation of staff misconduct, they failed to identify the misconduct as being on the Allegation Decision Index and inappropriately referred the allegation to the hiring authority for a local inquiry. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team agreed to refer the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for discrimination based on the incarcerated person's disability.