OLEO2026-045

Executive Summary

Date of Incident	December 15, 2025
Location of Incident	N/A
Date of Complaint	February 4, 2026
Corresponding IIU Case Number	IIU2026-023
Allegation Types	Administrative Violation

On February 4, 2026, the Office of Law Enforcement Oversight (OLEO) received a complaint from an attorney alleging that a King County Sheriff's Office (Sheriff's Office) deputy failed to take appropriate action when her client reported an alleged violation of a Domestic Violation Protection Order (DVPO) by her ex-husband. As a part of its investigation, OLEO interviewed the complainant's client; interviewed the subject employee involved jointly with an IIU investigator; and reviewed Sheriff's Office reports and body-worn camera (BWC) footage.

OLEO finds that the allegation of Otherwise Fails to Meet Standards Set Forth by Law, Policy, Procedure, or Training is **Non-Sustained** against the subject employee.

Allegations and Findings

Sheriff's Office Personnel	Allegation	OLEO Descriptive Allegation	Finding
Deputy Dylan Centanino-Sweers	Otherwise Fails to Meet Standards Set Forth by Law, Policy, Procedure, or Training	*Administrative Violation*	Non-Sustained

Applicable Laws and GOM Policies[1]

1. GOM 3.00.020(4): Performance Standards
2. GOM 12.04.010: Deputies Obligations in Domestic Violence Calls
3. GOM 12.04.045: Violation of Court Orders, Incident Reports
4. GOM 12.04.055: Court Orders in Domestic Relations/Violence

[1] The General Orders Manual (GOM) contains policies of the Sheriff's Office. Policies applied are those that were in effect when the underlying incident giving rise to the complaint occurred.

Investigative Summary

Interviews

OLEO conducted interviews with:

1. [redacted] (witness)
2. Deputy Dylan Centanino-Sweers (subject employee)

Evidence

OLEO reviewed the following additional evidence:

1. Sheriff's Office reports from Case #C250059998
2. CAD[2] history for Police Event #K25338095
3. DVPO issued in King County Superior Court Case #25-2-18004-2 KNT
4. BWC footage from December 15, 2025 from Deputy Centanino-Sweers

Fact Summary

On August 5, 2025, [redacted] obtained a DVPO against her former partner, [redacted], from the King County Superior Court. The DVPO ordered [redacted] to, among other things, not have any contact or cyber harass [redacted], and to stay away from her residence and workplace. The DVPO was set to stay in effect for one year.

At the time of the alleged incident, [redacted] was employed at a daycare center in Snohomish County and lived in King County. When she arrived at work on December 15, 2025, [redacted]'s bosses showed her a negative Google review that someone had written about the daycare over the weekend. The review's author was named Jennifer W. It stated that a teacher matching [redacted]'s physical description regularly smoked marijuana in the daycare's parking lot in her blue Ford Bronco in front of the school. The Jennifer W account did not appear to have authored any other reviews on Google. Per [redacted], her employer believed the review was posted by [redacted] because the teacher and vehicle it described matched [redacted], and because they confirmed in their records that no parent named Jennifer W had ever been associated with the daycare. [redacted]'s bosses also told her that the daycare's licensing authority had contacted them inquiring about a complaint the licensing authority received alleging that the daycare was letting [redacted]'s boyfriend pick up her child from daycare.

That evening, near 5 p.m., [redacted] called the Sheriff's Office to report what she learned from her employer because she believed the reviews constituted a violation of the DVPO by [redacted].[3] Deputy Dylan Centanino-Sweers obtained and reviewed a copy of [redacted]'s DVPO and then called her back around 6 p.m. Their entire conversation was captured on his BWC. During the call, [redacted] described what her bosses told her about Jennifer W's Google review and why they believed it had been written by [redacted]. The two discussed other incidents in which [redacted] believed [redacted] had violated the DVPO before Deputy Centanino-Sweers asked if she could think of any reason why [redacted] would be attempting to harass her now. [redacted] responded that [redacted] was unhappy with their parenting plan and wanted her to lose custody of their shared daughter. Deputy

[2] Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) from the Sheriff's Office Communications Center.
[3] In her complaint, [redacted]'s attorney identified another instance in which she alleged different Sheriff's Office deputies failed to properly investigate [redacted]'s reports that [redacted] violated her DVPO. IIU investigated the other allegations separately under Case #IIU2026-024.

Centanino-Sweers then asked [redacted] if [redacted] had made any statements to her taking responsibility for the Google review, and she said no. When asked whether she had any other evidence that [redacted] had written the review or made the report to the daycare licensing authority, [redacted] told Deputy Centanino-Sweers that her employer could not find a Jennifer W affiliated with the daycare. At the end of the call, Deputy Centanino-Sweers told [redacted] that he would write an "information report" because he was not going to be able to establish probable cause to arrest [redacted], and agreed to text [redacted] the case number. The call ended after approximately 15 minutes.

At some point after the call, Deputy Centanino-Sweers attempted to call [redacted] once and he did not answer. In his written report, Deputy Centanino-Sweers stated that he reviewed screenshots of Jennifer W's review provided by [redacted] and believed they did not contain any indication that they were a violation of the DVPO. He subsequently labeled his report as for "information only" and did not refer the issue to the Prosecutor's Office for charging.

In his interview, Deputy Centanino-Sweers stated he did not conduct any follow-up investigation into the origin of the Google review because he did not believe had probable cause to request a search warrant and find the IP address[4] of its author. He further claimed that he did not recall why he did not contact the daycare licensing authority about the report but believed it was because it was late at night when he took [redacted]'s complaint. When asked why he did not attempt to contact [redacted] again, Deputy Centanino-Sweers responded that it was also because it was late at night.

Analysis

Otherwise Fails to Meet Standards Set Forth by Law, Policy, Procedure, or Training: Non-Sustained

The complaint alleged that Deputy Centanino-Sweers failed to properly respond to [redacted]'s allegation that [redacted] violated her DVPO against him. Washington law and GOM 12.04.010 require officers responding to domestic violence crimes to, among other things, "conduct a thorough investigation, which means an investigation that allows successful prosecution regardless of the victim's ability to testify." Pursuant to GOM 12.04.015, domestic violence crimes include alleged DVPO violations and stalking.

In this case, Detective Centanino-Sweers stated and wrote in his report that the only steps he took to investigate the alleged DVPO violation was reviewing the screenshots provided by [redacted] and calling [redacted] once. Deputy Centanino-Sweers acknowledged in his interview that he likely should have made another attempt to contact [redacted], and stated that trying to locate the other party is usually the "number one" step in investigating an alleged DVPO violation. OLEO did not give significant weight to the deputy's explanation that he did not try to contact [redacted] again because it was late at night. The BWC recording of his phone call with [redacted] showed that he hung up around 6:12 p.m. The deputy also did not submit his written report until the following day at 8:40 p.m. He therefore had sufficient opportunity to attempt to contact [redacted] again at a reasonable time.

However, there is not enough evidence in this case to show that Deputy Centanino-Sweers could have uncovered enough evidence to successfully prosecute [redacted] even if he had tried harder to contact him. For example, the only information that the deputy had about the author of the Google review was that the name "Jennifer W" was not associated with a parent at the daycare, and that they

[4] An IP address (Internet Protocol address) is a unique string of numbers assigned to every device connected to a network.

were familiar with [redacted]'s appearance and car. Absent any specific information tying [redacted] to the review, this was likely insufficient to support a warrant for the author's IP address. [redacted] also stated that the daycare licensing authority did not give her employer any information about who made the false report against them. For this reason, OLEO finds that the allegation of Otherwise Fails to Meet Standards Set Forth by Law, Policy, Procedure, or Training is **Non-Sustained.**

-R. McPhail
Ryan McPhail
Investigations Monitor

7/23/2026
Date