

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

February 2011

### *Log/C.R. No. 1002203*

On December 23, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident occurring in the 14th District, on December 23, 2006, involving twenty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officers A through T). It was alleged that off-duty Officer A, engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with his girlfriend; engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with his girlfriend; struck the complainant on the head and face with his gun; pointed his gun at the complainant; engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with the complainant; directed profanities at the complainant; threatened to shoot the complainant; was intoxicated; failed to maintain control of his weapon; failed to report the incident to a supervisor and/or the Department; provided a false report to IPRA; and brought discredit upon the Department. In addition, it was alleged that on-duty Officers B and C both failed to take proper police action; failed to notify a supervisor; had knowledge of police misconduct and failed to report it; failed to return or inventory property received from the complainant; submitted a false report; failed to generate a case report; and made false reports to IPRA. It is also alleged that on-duty Officers D through Q failed to take proper police action; failed to notify a supervisor; had knowledge of police misconduct and failed to report it; and failed to return or inventory property received from the complainant. It is further alleged that Officer P submitted a false report; and failed to generate a case report. It is further alleged that on-duty Officers R and S both failed to take proper police action; failed to notify a supervisor; had knowledge of police misconduct and failed to report it; failed to return or inventory property received from the complainant; and provided false reports to IPRA. In addition, it is alleged that off-duty Officer T had knowledge of police misconduct and failed to report it. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, photographs, and witnesses, IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that Officer A engaged in a verbal altercation with his girlfriend; and directed profanities at the complainant. Further, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer A engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with his girlfriend; struck the complainant on the head and face with his gun; pointed his weapon at complainant; engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with the complainant; threatened to shoot the complainant; was intoxicated; failed to maintain control of his weapon; failed to report the incident to a supervisor and/or the Department; provided a false statement to IPRA; and brought discredit upon the Department. Further, IPRA

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

February 2011

recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer B failed to take proper police action; failed to notify a supervisor; knew of police misconduct and failed to report it; failed to inventory evidence recovered from the complainant; submitted a false report; failed to generate a case report; and provided a false report to IPRA. Further, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer C failed to take proper police action; failed to notify a supervisor; knew of police misconduct and failed to report it; failed to inventory evidence recovered from the complainant; submitted a false report; failed to generate a case report; and provided a false report to IPRA. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that Officers D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, P, Q, and S failed to take proper police action; and had knowledge of misconduct and failed to report it. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that Officers D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, P, Q, and R failed to notify a supervisor. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that Officers D, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, N, P, Q, and S failed to return or inventory property received from the complainant. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that Officers E and M failed to return or inventory property received from the complainant. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that Officer P filed a false report; and failed to generate a case report. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that Officer S provided a false statement to IPRA. Further, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer R failed to provide proper police service; failed to notify a supervisor; had knowledge of police misconduct and failed to report it; failed to return or inventory property obtained from the complainant; and provided a false statement to IPRA. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that Officer O failed to take proper police action; failed to notify a supervisor; had knowledge of police conduct and failed to report it; and failed to return or inventory property received from the complainant. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that Officer T had knowledge of police misconduct and failed to report it. IPRA recommended **separation from the Department for Officer A, a sixty (60) day suspension for Officer B, a sixty (60) day suspension for Officer C, and a twenty (20) day suspension for Officer R.**

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

February 2011

### *Log/C.R. No. 1021926*

On November 22, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 6th District, on November 21, 2008. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer struck the complainant during a domestic altercation; damaged the complainant's cell phone by smashing it to prevent her from calling the police; and damaged the bathroom door by punching it with his fist. Based on statements from the accused officer, reports, audio recordings, and photographs, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the accused struck the complainant during a domestic altercation; and smashed the complainant's cell phone to prevent her from calling the police. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that the accused damaged the bathroom door by punching it with his fist. IPRA recommended a **three (3) day suspension for the accused officer.**

### *Log/C.R. No. 1003786*

On March 2, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding incidents occurring in the 8th District, on February 14, 2007, February 22, 2007, and March 1, 2007. It was alleged that on February 14, 2007, the accused, an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer, used his vehicle to block complainant's estranged husband's driveway to prevent him from leaving; and was intoxicated. It was further alleged that on February 22, 2007, the accused used profanity and referred to complainant by derogatory names; and caused his vehicle door to strike complainant's estranged husband, knocking him to the ground. It was alleged that on March 1, 2007, during a domestic altercation, the accused pulled the complainant's hair and struck and/or kicked her about the face and body; locked her inside her residence and prevented her from leaving; and was intoxicated. Based on statements from the accused officer, reports, audio recordings, photographs, and witness statements, IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that on February 14, 2007, the accused blocked the complainant's estranged husband's driveway with his vehicle to prevent him from leaving; and was intoxicated. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that on February 22, 2007, the accused used profanity and referred to the complainant using derogatory terms; and struck the complainant's estranged husband with his vehicle door, knocking him to the ground. Based on statements from the accused officer, reports, photographs, and

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

February 2011

witnesses, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that on March 1, 2007, the accused struck and kicked the complainant about her face; locked her inside her residence and prevented her from leaving; and was intoxicated. IPRA recommended a **thirty (30) day suspension for the accused officer.**

### *Log/C.R. No. 1009924*

On October 7, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 22nd District, on October 6, 2007. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer struck the complainant on the face with his hand/fist, and/or choked her, and/or struck her in the stomach; displayed his firearm while inside the house; caused a disturbance at/in the vicinity of Address 1 and surrounding area in the neighborhood; caused a disturbance at/in the vicinity of Address 2 by banging on doors; verbally abused the complainant's mother; and failed to properly secure his firearm. In addition, it was alleged that during the marriage of the accused and the complainant, the accused sprayed mace in the complainant's face and on her back and arms; verbally abused the complainant; physically abused the complainant on numerous dates and times; punched holes in the walls of the inside of the marital residence; broke several glass mirrors, and damaged doors and floors in the marital residence with his baton; and threw furniture out on the front lawn of the marital residence. Based on statements from the accused officer, reports, and witnesses, IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that the accused struck the complainant on the face with his hand/fist, and/or choked her, and/or struck her in the stomach; displayed his firearms while inside the house; caused a disturbance at/in the vicinity of Address 1 and surrounding area in the neighborhood; caused a disturbance at/in the vicinity of Address 2 by banging on doors; verbally abused the complainant's mother; sprayed mace in the complainant's face and on her back and arms during their marriage; verbally abused the complainant during their marriage; physically abused the complainant on numerous occasions during their marriage; punched holes in the walls of the inside of the marital residence; broke several glass mirrors and damaged doors and floors in the marital residence with his baton; and threw furniture out on the front lawn of the marital residence. Further, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that the accused failed to properly secure his firearm. IPRA recommended a **three (3) day suspension for the accused member.**

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

February 2011

### *Log/C.R. No. 1022600*

On December 21, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 18th District, on December 21, 2008, involving one Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant (Sergeant A), one CPD Lieutenant (Lieutenant B), and two CPD Officers (Officers C and D), all of whom were off-duty. It was alleged that Sergeant A discharged his pepper spray without justification; failed to make the required notifications after discharging his pepper spray; failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR); submitted a false report dated December 23, 2008; submitted a false statement dated March 18, 2009; provided a false statement dated May 1, 2009; and brought discredit upon the Department. In addition, it was alleged that Lieutenant B became aware of possible misconduct, failed to report the misconduct, and obtain a complaint register number; failed to ensure that the required notifications of a pepper spray discharge were made; failed to ensure that a TRR was completed on the pepper spray discharge; provided a false statement dated March 17, 2009; provided a false statement dated May 1, 2009; and brought discredit upon the Department. It was also alleged that Officer C became aware of possible misconduct and failed to report the misconduct; provided a false statement dated March 19, 2009; was inattentive to duty on May 1, 2009, when he failed to go to IPRA for a schedule statement; provided a false statement dated May 12, 2009; and brought discredit upon the Department. It was further alleged that Officer D became aware of possible misconduct and failed to report the misconduct as prescribed in General Order 93-3; provided a false statement dated April 24, 2009; provided a false statement dated May 1, 2009; and brought discredit upon the Department. Based on statements from the accused members, reports, video recordings, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Sergeant A discharged his pepper spray without justification; failed to make the required notifications after discharging his pepper spray; failed to complete a TRR; submitted a false report dated December 23, 2008; provided a false statement dated March 18, 2009; provided a false statement dated May 1, 2009; and brought discredit upon the Department. Further, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Lieutenant B became aware of possible misconduct and failed to report the misconduct and obtain a complaint register number; failed to ensure that the required notifications of a pepper spray discharge were made; failed to ensure that a TRR was completed on the pepper spray discharge; provided a false statement dated March 17, 2009; provided a false statement dated May 1, 2009;

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

February 2011

and brought discredit upon the Department. Further, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer C became aware of possible misconduct and failed to report the misconduct; provided a false statement dated March 19, 2009; was inattentive to duty on May 1, 2009, when he failed to go to IPRA for a schedule statement; provided a false statement on May 12, 2009; and brought discredit upon the Department. Further, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer D became aware of possible misconduct and failed to report the misconduct; provided a false statement dated April 24, 2009; provided a false statement dated May 1, 2009; and brought discredit upon the Department. IPRA recommended **separation from the Department for Sergeant A, separation from the Department for Lieutenant B, a thirty (30) day suspension for Officer C, and a thirty (30) day suspension for Officer D.**

### *Log/C.R. No. 1016176*

On May 1, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 9th District, on May 1, 2008, involving four on-duty Chicago Police Department officers (Officers A, B, C, and D). It was alleged that Officers A and B, in a vacant graveled lot, engaged in conduct unbecoming in that they suggested that the complainant do push-ups; physically maltreated the complainant in that they grabbed the complainant by his belt while he was doing push-ups and pushed him back down, causing him injury; failed to document their encounter in that they failed to complete a Contact Information Card regarding their contact with the complainant and his brother; engaged in improper verbal abuse against the complainant; failed to take appropriate action in that they did not assist the complainant with obtaining medical attention for the injury he sustained; witnessed misconduct and failed to report it; searched the interior of a vehicle without justification; and brought discredit upon the Department. It was also alleged that Officers C and D witnessed misconduct and failed to report it. The complainant also filed a lawsuit alleging that the officers told the complainant he had to do 50 push-ups or they would arrest him; ordered the complainant to shout out the count; dropped the complainant's body and face into the pavement as the other officers stood by and allowed these acts to occur without intervening. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, video recordings, and witnesses, IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that Officer A engaged in conduct unbecoming in that he suggested that the complainant do push-ups; grabbed the

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

February 2011

complainant by his belt while he was doing push-ups and pushed him back down, causing him injury; and engaged in improper verbal action against the complainant. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that Officer A failed to complete a Contact Information Card regarding his contact with the complainant and his brother. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that Officer A did not assist the complainant with obtaining medical attention for the injury that he sustained. Further, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer A witnessed misconduct and failed to report it; searched the interior of a vehicle without justification; and brought discredit upon the Department. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, video recordings, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer B engaged in conduct unbecoming in that he suggested that the complainant do push-ups in order to avoid arrest; grabbed the complainant by the belt while he was doing push-ups and pushed him back down, causing injury; and brought discredit upon the Department. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that Officer B failed to properly document the encounter in that he failed to complete a Contact Information Card regarding his contact with the complainant and his brother; and engaged in improper verbal action against the complainant. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that Officer B witnessed misconduct and failed to report it; and searched the interior of a vehicle without justification. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, video recording, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officers C and D witnessed misconduct and failed to report it. IPRA recommended that **Officer A receive a suspension of fifteen (15) days, Officer B receive a suspension of thirty (30) days, Officer C receive a suspension of seven (7) days, and Officer D receive a suspension of seven (7) days.**

### ***Log/C.R. No. 1025413***

On April 10, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 7th District, on April 4, 2009, involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officers A and B). It was alleged that Officer A discharged his weapon without justification; and failed to report the discharge. It was further alleged that Officer A provided a false statement to IPRA; and brought discredit upon the Department. In addition, it was alleged that Officer B witnessed the misconduct of Officer A and failed to report it. It was further alleged that Officer B

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

February 2011

provided a false statement to IPRA; and brought discredit upon the Department. Based on statements from the accused officers, reports, and witnesses, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer A discharged his weapon without justification; failed to report the discharge; provided a false statement to IPRA; and brought discredit upon the Department. Further, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer B witnessed the misconduct of Officer A and failed to report it; provided a false statement to IPRA; and brought discredit upon the Department. IPRA recommended the **separation of both Officer A and Officer B from the Department.**