



**April 2025 Centralized Screening Monitoring Team Case Blocks**  
*Published in June 2025*

During April 2025, the OIG’s Centralized Screening Monitoring Team monitored and closed 1,293 grievances. Of those grievances, the Centralized Screening Team and the OIG each determined 1,116 grievances did not contain any allegations of staff misconduct.

The OIG assessed the remaining 177 grievances—containing allegations of staff misconduct—as follows:

**The OIG’s Assessment of 1,293 Grievances for April 2025**

Rating	All Closed Grievances		Staff Misconduct Grievances Only	
	Number of Grievances	Percentage	Number of Grievances	Percentage
<i>Adequate</i>	1,185	91.5	111	63
<i>Improvement Needed</i>	51	4	10	5.5
<i>Inadequate</i>	57	4.5	56	31.5
<i>Totals</i>	1,293	100	177	100

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

This document presents 11 notable cases monitored and closed by the OIG during April 2025.

OIG Case Number\*  
25-0105964-CSMT  
25-0106045-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

**Incident Summary**

On March 4, 2025, an incarcerated person alleged an officer continually discriminated against the Hispanic incarcerated population by refusing to issue chalk to mark their playing field, while providing chalk to other races to mark their playing fields. The officer allegedly spoke disdainfully to the Hispanic population, while showing respect to incarcerated people of other races.

**Disposition**

The Centralized Screening Team routed the discrimination allegation back to the prison as a routine policy claim. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG’s elevation, the





Centralized Screening Team added a second claim to address the allegation against the officer as a routine allegation of staff misconduct. The OIG did not concur and elevated the decision to the Centralized Screening Team’s administrators for consideration of referral to Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit as discrimination. The Centralized Screening Team upheld their decision of staff misconduct not on the Allegation Decision Index.

### Case Rating

Overall, the department performed inadequately. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegation that an officer treated the Hispanic incarcerated population different than incarcerated people of other races by refusing to issue them chalk to mark their playing fields and speaking unprofessionally to them as an allegation of racial discrimination. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team illogically added a claim that the officer treated Hispanic incarcerated persons with disdain and failed to afford them “the same liberties and Blacks and whites,” but referred the allegation as staff misconduct not on the Allegation Decision Index. The OIG made a second elevation to the Centralized Screening Team’s management recommending a referral to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit as an allegation of racial discrimination and noting at the time of review face-value screening still applied. Subsequently, the Centralized Screening Team reported the incarcerated person “failed to provide an example of discriminatory behavior with a racial component” and did “not indicate any specific discriminatory altercations or statements,” and the complaint did not meet the criteria for racial discrimination on the Allegation Decision Index, even at face value.

\* Two different incarcerated people submitted the exact same complaint. The OIG monitored and dispute both complaints, and the Centralized Screening Team treated both complaints the same. The summary, disposition, and case rating above apply to two distinct complaints.

OIG Case Number  
25-0105032-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
Inadequate

### Incident Summary

On January 10, 2025, a supervising cook allegedly retaliated against an incarcerated person for filing complaints against staff at another prison by issuing the incarcerated person a rules violation report for being under the influence at his work assignment. On February 10, 2025, an officer allegedly forcefully strapped the incarcerated person’s legs to a gurney so tightly the straps caused injuries to his legs. On February 17, 2025, the incarcerated person requested information regarding his resentencing, X-rays for his injuries, and audio and video footage from the unreasonable force incident.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the unreasonable force allegation as staff misconduct not on the Allegation Decision Index for a routine review and routed the



rules violation report allegation and request for information regarding resentencing back to the prison as routine policy claims. The OIG did not concur with the decision regarding the unreasonable force allegation and also found the Centralized Screening Team had failed to identify the incarcerated person's request for X-rays. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the unreasonable force allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit and routed the X-ray request back to the prison as a routine health care claim.

### Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team initially referred an unreasonable force allegation as staff misconduct not on the Allegation Decision Index for a routine review and failed to identify the incarcerated person's request for X-rays due to injuries allegedly sustained during the use-of-force incident. Since neither the Centralized Screening Team nor the Office of Grievances identified the allegation as an unreasonable force risk event, neither party initiated allegation interview protocols or made the appropriate notifications to facility staff. Subsequent to the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and referred the unreasonable force allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit and routed the X-ray request back to the prison as a routine health care claim.

OIG Case Number  
25-0105055-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

On February 19, 2025, officers allegedly conducted an unclothed body search on an incarcerated person at which time, the incarcerated person stated, "PREA, PREA, PREA, I'm filing a PREA."

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team determined the complaint did not contain an allegation of staff misconduct and failed to independently identify the need to conduct a clarifying interview with the incarcerated person. Following OIG elevation, the Centralized Screening Team attempted to conduct a clarifying interview. However, the incarcerated person was on suicide watch each of the three times the Centralized Screening Team attempted a clarifying interview. The Centralized Screening Team upheld their original determination without conducting a clarification interview.

### Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the need to conduct a clarifying interview with the incarcerated person and only attempted to conduct a clarifying interview upon the OIG's recommendation.



The incarcerated person was on suicide watch each of the three times the Centralized Screening team attempted to conduct a clarifying interview. Without sufficient information, the Centralized Screening Team upheld their original determination.

OIG Case Number  
25-0105599-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

Between January 14, 2025, and February 25, 2025, a librarian allegedly refused to provide an incarcerated person access to assistive devices required by the Americans with Disabilities Act and a local policy, refused to return his court documents, and failed to grant him priority legal user status. The librarian allegedly changed the library schedule and incorrectly called the incarcerated person in the afternoon instead of the morning. The librarian allegedly told a second incarcerated person the incarcerated person filed grievances against the librarian and asked the second incarcerated person to talk to the first incarcerated person because he “is taking it too far.”

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegation the librarian refused to provide the incarcerated person access to assistive devices as routine staff misconduct and routed the remaining allegations as a routine policy claim. The OIG concurred with the Centralized Screening Team’s routing decisions of the allegations they identified. However, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegations that the librarian discussed the incarcerated person’s complaints with a second incarcerated person, asked the second incarcerated person to talk to him about his complaint, and failed to return the incarcerated person’s court documents as staff misconduct. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegations the librarian disclosed confidential information and tried to prevent an incarcerated person from reporting misconduct to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation and referred the remaining allegation as a routine allegation of staff misconduct.

### Case Rating

The department’s performance was *inadequate*. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify allegations that a librarian disclosed one incarcerated person’s staff misconduct complaints against the librarian to a second incarcerated person and asked the second incarcerated person to talk to the first incarcerated because he “is taking it too far,” and failed to return the first incarcerated person’s court documents as staff misconduct. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and referred the code of silence and disclosure of confidential information allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation and referred the librarian’s alleged failure to return the incarcerated person’s court documents as a routine allegation of staff misconduct.



OIG Case Number  
25-0105980-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

On February 24, 2025, a teacher allegedly failed to intervene when incarcerated people made inappropriate comments about another incarcerated person's intimate body part. The teacher also allegedly threatened to discipline the incarcerated person after she immediately complained about the comments.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed an allegation against another incarcerated person back to the prison as a routine policy claim. The OIG did not concur. Following a dispute by the OIG, the Centralized Screening Team agreed an allegation of staff misconduct against the teacher existed. However, they claimed they could no longer document and process the allegation because the incarcerated person had paroled and her record was no longer active.

### Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegation against the teacher for failing to intervene and threatening to discipline the complaining incarcerated person. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team agreed the allegation against the teacher should be referred as an allegation of staff misconduct not on the Allegation Decision Index. However, the Centralized Screening Team reported they could no longer document and process the allegation because the incarcerated person had paroled and her record was no longer active. The Centralized Screening Team's failure to identify the allegation initially resulted in the allegation of staff misconduct going entirely unaddressed. Also, the department should review and investigate all allegations of staff misconduct directed towards an incarcerated person, even if the incarcerated person paroles or discharges from custody.

OIG Case Number  
25-0108078-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

On March 17, 2025, officers allegedly escorted an incarcerated person from her cell to the program office with her buttocks exposed.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation back to the prison as a routine policy claim. The OIG did not concur and recommended the Centralized Screening Team



conduct a clarification interview with the incarcerated person regarding the potential Prison Rape Elimination Act violation. Subsequently, the Centralized Screening Team opted not to conduct a clarification interview but referred the allegation as a routine allegation of staff misconduct.

### Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the need to conduct a clarification interview of this vague allegation of possible staff sexual misconduct. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team should have clarified whether the incarcerated person's naked buttocks were exposed or if she was wearing any undergarments, whether the incarcerated person made any requests to be covered up and whether the officers acted any such requests, and if the incarcerated person was naked, whether the escort officers were male or female and whether the officers escorted her past other male staff members. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team declined to conduct a clarification interview, and erroneously referred the possible staff sexual misconduct as an allegation of staff misconduct not on the Allegation Decision Index claiming it was unclear why the claimant was escorted out of her cell and that the claimant did not state the officers said or did anything sexual in nature during the escort.

OIG Case Number  
25-0108399-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

On February 3, 2025, officers allegedly discussed the contents of an incarcerated person's central file in front of other incarcerated people and answered questions other incarcerated people asked about his file, inciting violence against the incarcerated person.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation against officers back to the prison as a routine allegation of staff misconduct. The OIG did not concur.

### Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation that officers endangered an incarcerated person's safety by disclosing confidential information and answering questions about the information as a routine allegation of staff misconduct rather than to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. By the time the OIG elevated the screening decision, assigned prison staff had already completed the routine review. For this reason, the OIG notified the Centralized Screening Team of our disagreement and referred the allegation to our attorneys who monitor the quality of routine reviews.



OIG Case Number  
25-0108474-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

Between March 13, 2025, and April 1, 2025, an officer allegedly failed to pack all an incarcerated person's property, resulting in missing property items. A second officer allegedly confiscated an incarcerated person's television due to missing screws and being inoperable, to which the incarcerated person requested staff replace his television. On April 1, 2025, the incarcerated person alleged a third officer wore unauthorized sunglasses with cameras installed during unclothed body searches and reported his concerns to a fourth officer who failed to report it.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the property allegation back to the prison as a routine policy claim. The OIG concurred. However, the Centralized Screening Team failed to consider a vague allegation that an officer wore unauthorized sunglasses with cameras during an incarcerated person's unclothed body searches as staff sexual misconduct. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview and subsequently identified an allegation that an officer wore unauthorized sunglasses during the incarcerated person's unclothed body searches and reported his concerns to another officer who failed to report it. The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

### Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team routed an allegation that an officer wore unauthorized sunglasses with cameras during an incarcerated person's unclothed body searches for routine review and only conducted a clarification interview following a recommendation by the OIG. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team conducted a clarification interview and subsequently identified an allegation that an officer wore unauthorized sunglasses during the incarcerated person's unclothed body searches and reported his concerns to another officer who failed to report it. The Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for an investigation.

OIG Case Number  
25-0108477-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

On April 1, 2025, an incarcerated person alleged an officer told his cellmate to "check me," and threatened to send him to a facility where he had known enemy concerns. The



incarcerated person requested a committee hearing to request to remain in his current facility, or be transferred to another prison, due to safety concerns.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the transfer request back to the prison as a routine policy claim. While the OIG concurred, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegation the officer told the incarcerated person's cellmate to "check him," and threatened to send him to a facility where he had known enemies. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegations against the officer to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

### Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify an allegation that an officer told an incarcerated person's cellmate to "check him" and threatened to send him to a yard where he had known enemy concerns. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegation against the officer to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for investigation.

OIG Case Number  
25-0108193-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

Between January 15, 2025, and March 7, 2025, two officers allegedly harassed an incarcerated person by repeatedly "ransacking" his property and conducting unclothed body searches. On March 7, 2025, one of the officers allegedly took apart the incarcerated person's cane and failed to put it back together correctly. After the incarcerated person informed the officer he would be filing a complaint, the officer allegedly searched the incarcerated person's cell and planted evidence by moving medication from the incarcerated person's cellmate's bunk area to the incarcerated person's bunk area and issued the incarcerated person a rules violation report.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team referred the property, search, and planting evidence allegations back to the prison as routine policy claims. The OIG did not concur with the decision to refer the allegation that the officer planted evidence as a routine policy claim. Following the OIG's dispute, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation to the Office of the Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

### Case Rating

The department's performance was *inadequate*. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team failed to consider the allegation that an officer planted evidence as an allegation



of staff misconduct. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the allegation to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit as dishonesty. Notably, the Centralized Screening Team also agreed to attach to the dishonesty investigation another complaint from a second incarcerated person who allegedly witnessed the officers plant the contraband in the incarcerated person's bunk area.