

REPORT OF INVESTIGATION
DIG COMPLAINT NUMBER: 2026-0253

Date: June 11, 2026
To: City of Columbus Civilian Police Review Board
From: City of Columbus Department of the Inspector General

I. Summary

On March 18, 2026, the City of Columbus Department of the Inspector General (Columbus DIG) received an allegation of excessive force by a Columbus Division of Police (CPD) officer.¹ The complaint stemmed from an incident on March 17, 2026. The complainant alleged 1) an officer used excessive force by slamming her to the ground.

The Columbus DIG's investigation consisted of a review of the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) Event Chronology Report, a review of the Use of Force Report submitted by the focus officer for the incident, a review of the Body Worn Camera (BWC) footage from the incident, an interview with the focus officer, interviews with the witness officers, and a review of CPD policies and procedures.

Regarding allegation one, the investigation found the complainant was initially non-compliant, but she eventually followed orders that were given by sworn personnel. The officer stated the complainant was resistive and planted her foot when he was moving her; however, prior to physical contact with the complainant the officer stated, "Dude, I'm going to drop her," and "Alright, you know what? Fuck this." Given the totality of the circumstances and a preponderance of the evidence, force was used on the complainant for a retaliatory or punitive purpose, not resistive behavior, as the stated decision to use force had been made before any physical resistive behavior. CPD policy states, "Sworn personnel shall not use any force for a retaliatory or punitive purpose."² Therefore, it is recommended this allegation be closed with a finding of "sustained."³

¹ Hotline complaint received March 18, 2026

² CPD Directive 2.10 – Use of Force II.A.4.

³ CPD Directive 1-01 Rules of Conduct, 1.19 Use of Force

II. Complaint Information

Date of Incident: March 17, 2026
Date of Complaint: March 18, 2026
Total Days of Complaint: 86 Days
FOP Extension Granted: N/A
Type of Complaint: Force

III. Complainant's Information: Mary Henley (Ms. Henley)

IV. Officer(s) Information and Allegation(s)

Officer Name and Badge

Police Officer Alexander Valesky, Badge #3314, 4 years of service, Focus
Police Officer Zachary Moistner, Badge #3506, 2 years of service, Witness
Police Officer Roscoe Blackburn, Badge #3205, 5 years of service, Witness
Police Officer Zachary Dralle, Badge #2782, 4 years of service, Witness

Allegation 1: The complainant alleged an officer used excessive force by slamming her to the ground.

V. Analysis and Findings

On March 18, 2026, the Columbus DIG received an allegation of excessive force by a CPD officer. The complainant, Ms. Henley, alleged 1) an officer used excessive force by slamming her to the ground. Multiple attempts to interview Ms. Henley were made but were unsuccessful.⁴

The Columbus DIG reviewed the CAD Event Chronology Report for the incident.⁵ Officers were dispatched to 3170 Cleveland Ave. for a report of a person with a gun. A description of the subject was given as, "WEARING PINK SHIRT AND SWEATPANTS." (Ms. Henley matched this description on the day of the incident.)

The Columbus DIG reviewed the Use of Force Report prepared by Officer Valesky for the incident. The narrative states:

"On 03/17/2026 at approximately 6:48PM Officer Valesky, wearing the uniform of the day and driving marked CPD cruiser #21 as unit #21, was dispatched to 3170 Cleveland Ave #A11 at the Cambridge Apartments on a call for domestic violence. Officers made contact with a known Caller/Victim who stated that the suspect, Ms. Mary E. Henley, had been on Facebook Live threatening to shoot her and to harm her nine-month-old child. The Victim stated to Officers that Ms. Henley was known to carry a firearm, had a history of showing up to her location to fight her, and had previously

⁴ Contacts attempts were made on March 19, 2026, March 20, 2026, and March 23, 2026

⁵ CAD Event Chronology Report - P260186362 | 10-33 Person with a Gun

threatened to shoot her and the child in the past. Officers had advised the Victim that if the Suspect was to show up, to not open the door and to call 911. The Victim had shown Officers a screen recording of Ms. Henley on Facebook Live driving in a vehicle. Officers also observed messages from Ms. Henley stating that she was going to “pull-up” to the Victims location and to not call the police. Officers cleared the run to take a report at approximately 7:09PM. At approximately 7:17PM Officers were dispatched back to 3170 Cleveland Ave, #A11 by the Columbus Police radio room stating that the original caller from the previous domestic violence run, stated that Ms. Henley was at the location with a firearm. While Officers were in route the dispatched run was updated to a burglary in progress which stated that Ms. Henley was attempting to kick in the door of the Victim’s apartment. Officer Valesky and other Officers responded back to Cambridge Apartments using their cruiser lights and sirens. Dispatch relayed to responding Officers that the Suspect (who Officers knew to be Ms. Henley) was a female black, wearing a pink shirt and sweatpants. Dispatch relayed to Officers that Suspect was walking back to her vehicle, which was either a tan Lincoln or Ford. As Officers pulled into the Cambridge Apartments parking lot, they observed a tan Lincoln SUV back out of a parking spot at a high rate of speed and began to drive towards incoming Officers. Officer Valesky recognized the driver to be Ms. Henley based off the Facebook Live video that the Victim had shown Officers on the previous run. Officers stopped their vehicles and began to conduct a high risk stop, based on the previous run stating that Ms. Henley was coming with the intention to shoot the Victim, the high probability that she was armed, and possibility that she had just committed an aggravated burglary. Officer Valesky exited his vehicle and immediately gave a loud verbal command for Ms. Henley and the other occupant of the vehicle to put their hands out the window, which they did not comply with. Officer Valesky then moved from his patrol car to the front of a black GMC SUV that was stopped in the roadway, to gain a better vantage point of Ms. Henley. Officer Valesky gave Ms. Henley a command to put her hands out of the window, which she then complied with. Officer Dralle #2782 then gave loud verbal commands to Ms. Henley to exit the vehicle and face away from Officers. Ms. Henley then exited the vehicle but failed to comply with the command to face away from Officers. Ms. Henley then began looking in various directions, which Officer Valesky recognized as a pre-indicator for a Suspect looking for an avenue of escape. Ms. Henley was shouting, “I ain’t got no weapons, we ain’t got no weapons.” This again caused Officer Valesky to believe that Ms. Henley was going to attempt to flee the scene and had a weapon. Officer Valesky then gave Ms. Henley more commands to face away from Officers. As Ms. Henley finally faced away from Officers, Ms. Henley dropped her hands towards her waistline. This action made Officer Valesky believe she may be reaching toward a weapon concealed in her waistline or on her person. Officer Valesky decided to approach to secure Ms. Henley to prevent her from fleeing the scene or gaining access to a weapon on her or in her vehicle. As Officer Valesky began his approach Officer Dralle gave Ms. Henley a command to walk backwards towards Officers. Officer Valesky approached Ms. Henley while holstering his firearm and physically took control of both of Ms. Henley’s arms. As Officer Valesky began to place Ms. Henley’s arms behind her back, Officer Valesky felt Ms. Henley begin to physically tense her arms while aggressively stating, “don’t grab me, don’t grab me.” Officer Valesky continued to attempt to keep control of Ms. Henley’s arms to place her into handcuffs. Officer Valesky then clasped Ms.

Henley's hands together behind her back and attempted to walk Ms. Henley back towards his cruiser and past approaching Officers. At this time, Officers were still actively conducting a high-risk vehicle stop due to Ms. Henley's vehicle still containing one front-seat occupant, who was in immediate reach of Ms. Henley's driver seat and possibly having access to a firearm. As Officers continued to approach Ms. Henley's vehicle, Officer Z. Moistner #3506 began to walk past Officer Valesky with his firearm drawn and focused on the passenger, who was still unsecured. At this time, Ms. Henley turned her body towards Officer Moistner in an attempt to face him. Due to Ms. Henley's turbulent behavior while attempting to face Officer Moistner and Officer Valesky, the proximity of Officer Moistner's drawn firearm, and the rapidly evolving high-risk traffic stop, Officer Valesky then attempted to walk Ms. Henley away from the immediate area of the high-risk vehicle stop and past Officer Moistner. Officer Valesky felt Ms. Henley plant her left foot in the ground in what he believed was an attempt to stay next to Officer Moistner. At this point, due to the need to place Ms. Henley in handcuffs as quickly as possible and remove her from the immediate area, Officer Valesky physically displaced Ms. Henley's head and upper body with an open hand, while tripping Ms. Henley's foot and physically placing her on the ground. Ms. Henley was placed in a prone handcuffing position and detained without further incident. Due to the ongoing felony stop occurring at the vehicle, Officer Valesky immediately got Ms. Henley off of the ground and moved her back further away from the ongoing incident and to a more secure/safe area where Ms. Henley could be completely patted down/checked for weapons and secured safely in a cruiser. Officer Valesky immediately requested a supervisor to conduct an interview. The Victim provided a witness statement that was uploaded into the report."

The Columbus DIG reviewed the BWC footage for the incident.⁶ The BWC footage is consistent with the Use of Force Report prepared by Officer Valesky, with these additions. Officer Dralle was the officer primarily giving orders, with the occasional order voiced by other officers on scene. Ms. Henley was also quite vocal during the incident, and there are instances where she and the officers spoke over each other. Ms. Henley was slow to comply with orders, often being told at least twice before she would comply. As Ms. Henley was verbally declaring, "I ain't got no weapons," Officer Valesky stated, "Dude, I'm going to drop her." As Officer Dralle gave Ms. Henley a command to walk backwards, Officer Valesky stated, "Alright, you know what? Fuck this." As Ms. Henley complied and walked backwards, Officer Valesky moved forward, took control of Ms. Henley by grabbing her hands, took some steps back, turned her, and took her to the ground. In addition, it is not possible based on BWC footage reviewed to determine if Ms. Henley planted her foot as described in the Use of Force Report.

The Columbus DIG completed an interview with Officer Valesky.⁷ Officer Valesky's statement was consistent with his Use of Force Report. When asked if he felt frustrated about Ms. Henley's failure to comply fully with orders, Officer Valesky stated, "I don't know if I'd say frustrated, but I would like her to listen to make everything safe." When asked what he meant when he said, "Dude, I'm going to drop her," Officer Valesky stated

⁶ Officer Valesky's BWC footage 18617AJ | Officer Moistner's BWC footage 18653G9 | Officer Blackburn's BWC footage 1864UCX | Officer Dralle's BWC footage 1864YH2

⁷ Officer Interview Valesky May 21, 2026

he didn't recall saying that. When asked what he meant when he said, "Alright, you know what? Fuck this," Officer Valesky stated, "She wasn't complying initially, so I pushed out from the car, as she decided she's gonna start walking backwards. Before I said that was when I had already made the decision that we were going to move up." When asked how close Officer Moistner was to Ms. Henley, Officer Valesky responded five to six feet.

The Columbus DIG completed an interview with Officer Moistner.⁸ Officer Moistner's statement was consistent with his BWC footage. Officer Moistner described the interaction between Officer Valesky and Ms. Henley. Officer Moistner said Ms. Henley was "screaming and hollering" as Officer Valesky was going to place her in handcuffs. She turned away, and Officer Valesky placed her on the ground. When asked how far away Ms. Henley was from him, Officer Moistner replied, "Probably arm's length away."

The Columbus DIG completed an interview with Officer Blackburn.⁹ Officer Blackburn's statement was consistent with his BWC footage. Officer Blackburn was on the other side of the vehicle (his BWC could not see the interaction between Officer Valesky and Ms. Henley) and stated that over the top of the vehicle, he could see Ms. Henley's head briefly and then gone (referring to Ms. Henley being taken to the ground).

Officer Dralle was involved in a critical incident and was unavailable for interview.

VI. Conclusion

Allegation 1: Officer Valesky, #3314

The complainant alleged an officer used excessive force by slamming her to the ground. The investigation found the complainant was initially non-compliant, but she eventually followed orders that were given by sworn personnel. The officer stated the complainant was resistive and planted her foot when he was moving her; however, prior to physical contact with the complainant the officer stated, "Dude, I'm going to drop her," and "Alright, you know what? Fuck this." Given the totality of the circumstances and a preponderance of the evidence, force was used on the complainant for a retaliatory or punitive purpose, not resistive behavior, as the stated decision to use force had been made before any physical resistive behavior. CPD policy states, "Sworn personnel shall not use any force for a retaliatory or punitive purpose."¹⁰ Therefore, it is recommended this allegation be closed with a finding of "sustained."¹¹

VII. Evidence

a. Interviewed

- i. Officer Valesky – Focus
- ii. Officer Moistner – Witness
- iii. Officer Blackburn – Witness

b. Documents

- i. Hotline complaint received March 18, 2026

⁸ Officer Interview Moistner May 29, 2026

⁹ Officer Interview Blackburn June 4, 2026

¹⁰ CPD Directive 2.10 – Use of Force II.A.4.

¹¹ CPD Directive 1-01 Rules of Conduct, 1.19 Use of Force

- ii. CPD Directive 2.10 – Use of Force II.A.4.
- iii. CPD Directive 1-01 Rules of Conduct, 1.19 Use of Force
- iv. CAD Event Chronology Report - P260186362
- v. Officer Valesky's BWC footage 18617AJ
- vi. Officer Moistner's BWC footage 18653G9
- vii. Officer Blackburn's BWC footage 1864UCX
- viii. Officer Dralle's BWC footage 1864YH2
- ix. Officer Interview Valesky May 21, 2026
- x. Officer Interview Moistner May 29, 2026
- xi. Officer Interview Blackburn June 4, 2026

VIII. Recommendation by Inspector General

The Columbus DIG investigated the complainant's allegations. Based on my review of the investigation and supporting documents, I concur with the findings, conclusions and recommendations. Also, it is recommended that the investigation report be forwarded to the Chief of Police, Columbus Division of Police for review and disciplinary action in accordance with CPD policies and procedures, and the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the City of Columbus and Fraternal Order of Police Capital City Lodge No. 9.

This investigation report is now being submitted to the Civilian Police Review Board for your review and evaluation of the investigation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Jacqueline M. Hendricks June 11, 2026
 Inspector General Signature and Date

Civilian Police Review Board Recommendation(s): Agree Alternative Findings

Civilian Police Review Board Comments:

Civilian Police Review Board Chairperson Signature and Date

Disposition of Citizen Complaint Allegations' Findings

- **Administration Closure:** The complaint was closed for reasons such as a noninvolved CPD Officer, a duplicate complaint, or insufficient information to investigate the complaint, etc.
- **Exonerated:** The investigation found evidence that the alleged incident(s) happened, and the incident(s) are supported by CPD policies, procedures and/or laws.
- **Not Sustained / Inconclusive:** The investigation revealed insufficient evidence to determine that the alleged incident occurred.
- **Sustained:** The investigation found evidence that substantiated the complainant's allegation and the alleged incident violated CPD policies, procedures and/or law.
- **Unfounded:** The investigation found no evidence that substantiated the complainant's allegation.
- **Withdrawn:** The complainant withdrew their complaint.