



During January 2025, the OIG’s Centralized Screening Monitoring Team monitored and closed 875 grievances. The OIG assessed the 875 grievances as follows:

The OIG disputed 51 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 24 allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit, and an additional 16 allegations for review as allegations of staff misconduct not on the Allegation Decision Index, for a total of 40 additional staff misconduct investigations or reviews (another three cases the OIG monitored were disputed by departmental staff and referred as staff misconduct, prior to the OIG’s review).

The OIG found the Centralized Screening Team made an incorrect decision in 42 cases, failed to identify every allegation within a complaint 61 times, failed to identify the need for a clarification interview nine times, and opened 19 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 January 2025.

**The OIG’s Assessment of
875 Grievances for January 2025**

Rating	No. of Grievances
Adequate	774
Improvement Needed	47
Inadequate	54

Note: 5% of the grievances our office monitored received an *improvement needed* rating, and 6% received an *inadequate* rating.

Source: Analysis prepared by staff of the Office of the Inspector General.

OIG Case Number
24-0098496-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On November 22, 2024, a sergeant allegedly told an incarcerated person, “I denied one of your 602’s and it’s funny you called the bosses to get me in trouble... you’re going back to the building you’re not going to the restricted housing unit.” On November 24, 2024, an incarcerated person alleged an officer and the sergeant informed other incarcerated people the incarcerated person “[gave] up information”





and implied staff searched the other incarcerated people's cells as a result. The incarcerated person alleged a second sergeant and a nurse knew about the sergeant and officer's actions.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the complaint did not contain an allegation of staff misconduct. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegations against two sergeants, an officer, and a nurse to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

Case Rating

Overall, the department's performance was inadequate. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team identified the allegations that a sergeant and an officer told other incarcerated people staff searched their cells because an incarcerated person "[gave] up information" after the incarcerated person tried to get the sergeant "in trouble," as routine claims. The Centralized Screening Team also failed to identify allegations that a second sergeant and a nurse witnessed the first sergeant and officer's actions and failed to intervene. Subsequent to the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegations against both sergeants, the officer, and the nurse to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

OIG Case Number
25-0100222-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Improvement Needed

Incident Summary

On October 13, 2024, an incarcerated person appealed a grievance decision to reject his allegation that between June 24, 2020, and April 13, 2022, a high-ranking prison official allowed investigative services unit officers to correspond with a confidential incarcerated informant via a mobile phone, advised the informant how to prevent officers from discovering his mobile phone, awarded privileges in exchange for information on other incarcerated people, and covered up the informant's illegal activities. On December 20, 2024, the Office of Appeals ordered a new grievance log number to be opened to address the allegations previously rejected.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the incarcerated person's allegations against the high-ranking prison official and an investigative services unit officer to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation. The OIG concurred.

Case Rating

Overall, the OIG identified deficiencies in the department's performance. While the Centralized Screening Team made the correct screening decision in this case, the



department opened this grievance solely to address deficiencies in a prior grievance the incarcerated person submitted, which the Centralized Screening Team failed to correctly screen.

OIG Case Number
25-0100912-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On December 30, 2024, an incarcerated person alleged staff and cellmates sexually assaulted him while he slept. During a clarification interview, the incarcerated person clarified he did not state that staff or cellmates sexually assaulted him but when he awoke hours later, he had signs that something happened. The incarcerated person alleged he knew he had been sexually assaulted because his rectum “felt weird” and he experienced discomfort when he bent down.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the complaint did not contain an allegation of staff misconduct. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview with the incarcerated person who submitted the complaint and subsequently upheld their original decision. Following the OIG’s second elevation, the Centralized Screening Team’s management requested the hiring authority initiate Prison Elimination Rape Act protocols and gather additional details, including when and where the allegation occurred.

Case Rating

Overall, the department’s performance was inadequate. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the need for a clarification interview with the incarcerated person to address a vague allegation of sexual misconduct, failed to identify a risk event that was not life threatening, and failed to make the required notifications. Notably, prison staff documented they did not intend to initiate Prison Rape Elimination Act protocols, and the Centralized Screening Team failed to address this, despite an allegation that staff and incarcerated people had sexually assaulted the incarcerated person in his sleep. Following the OIG’s first elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview with the incarcerated person who submitted the complaint. However, the Centralized Screening Team failed to conduct a thorough clarification interview as they did not ask the incarcerated person when or where the assault allegedly occurred which would have allowed for confirmation by review of video recording and body-worn-camera footage. Subsequently, the Centralized Screening Team upheld their original decision. Following the OIG’ second elevation with concerns that both prison staff and the Centralized Screening Team decided not to investigate an allegation of sexual assault by staff and/or other incarcerated people, the Centralized Screening Team’s management requested the



hiring authority initiate Prison Elimination Rape Act protocols and gather additional details, including when and where the assault allegedly occurred.

OIG Case Number
25-0101340-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On January 6, 2025, an officer allegedly physically moved a disoriented and noncompliant incarcerated person from a transport vehicle to his wheelchair. When a second officer notified a sergeant that the second officer needed to write an incident report for the activity he witnessed, the sergeant allegedly told the second officer the incident “was not a use of force due to [incarcerated person] was not able to be removed from the vehicle otherwise due to his medical state.”

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the complaint did not contain an allegation of staff misconduct. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegations of unnecessary force and failure to report force to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

Case Rating

Overall, the department’s performance was inadequate. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegations that an officer physically moved a disoriented and noncompliant incarcerated person from a transport vehicle to the incarcerated person’s wheelchair was a use-of-force incident and failed to identify the allegation that a sergeant inappropriately advised a second officer not to report the incident. Following the OIG’s dispute, the Centralized Screening Team referred both allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number
25-0101601-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

Between January 6, 2025, and January 14, 2025, staff allegedly failed to place incarcerated people’s complaint forms into the housing unit collection box for pickup by Office of Grievance staff. During a clarification interview, the incarcerated person alleged she placed her grievance on her cell front and someone took it; however, the incarcerated person confirmed with grievance staff that the complaint went missing. The incarcerated person alleged it had happened a couple of times before.



Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the complaint did not contain an allegation of staff misconduct. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview with the incarcerated person. Based on information obtained during the interview, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

Case Rating

Overall, the department's performance was inadequate. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify an allegation that staff interfered with incarcerated people's ability to report staff misconduct. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview and subsequently referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

OIG Case Number
25-0101617-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On December 15, 2024, officers allegedly placed an incarcerated person in a holding cell for seven hours and failed to provide the incarcerated person with a list of his property. Between December 15, 2024, and January 8, 2025, officers allegedly lost the incarcerated person's property following a housing move to another facility, and the incarcerated person requested staff refund his lost property.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the property allegation and the allegation that officers placed the incarcerated person in a holding cell for seven hours back to the prison as a routine policy issue. Following the prison's Office of Grievances dispute, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation that officers placed an incarcerated person in a holding cell for seven hours as a routine allegation of staff misconduct.

Case Rating

Overall, the department's performance was inadequate. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegation that officers placed an incarcerated person in a holding cell for seven hours as an allegation of staff misconduct. Prior to the OIG's review, the prison's Office of Grievances disputed the routine decision, and the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision to appropriately refer the



allegation against the officers as a routine allegation of staff misconduct. The OIG agreed with the Office of Grievance's dispute but did not elevate the concern since the Centralized Screening Team had already corrected the decision.

OIG Case Number
25-0102022-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On January 14, 2025, an incarcerated person alleged a "goblin" made an inappropriate sexual comment to him. On January 15, 2025, in an interview with a psychologist, the incarcerated person clarified his allegation stating an officer made a sexually inappropriate comment to the incarcerated person when he requested to use the telephone.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the complaint did not contain an allegation of staff misconduct. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the officer's alleged sexually inappropriate comment to the incarcerated person as a routine allegation of staff misconduct.

Case Rating

Overall, the department's performance was inadequate. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team only determined the allegation that a "goblin" made a sexually inappropriate comment to the incarcerated person was not an allegation of staff misconduct. However, the Centralized Screening Team failed to acknowledge the incarcerated person's clarification of his original allegation that an officer made the sexually inappropriate comment at all, and only rendered a decision regarding the incarcerated person's original statement about a "goblin." Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegation against the officer as a routine allegation of staff misconduct. Notably, the Centralized Screening Team used contradictory language in documenting their initial screening decision by indicating they referred the allegation for "Routine Review," which implied an allegation of staff misconduct not on the allegation decision index, when the Centralized Screening Team had determined the allegation not to be an allegation of staff misconduct at all.



OIG Case Number
25-0102025-CSMT

Rating Assessment
Inadequate

Incident Summary

On January 17, 2025, after an incarcerated person purposefully broke his television, three officers allegedly entered the incarcerated person's cell and forced him into handcuffs, causing bruises and cuts to his chest and back, and bruising on his wrists.

Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the complaint did not contain an allegation of staff misconduct. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the unreasonable force allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

Case Rating

Overall, the department's performance was inadequate. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team failed to consider the allegation that three officers forced an incarcerated person into handcuffs, causing bruises and cuts to his chest and back, and bruising on his wrists, to be an allegation of unreasonable force. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.