

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

May 2008

Log No. / C.R. 1004755

On 9 April 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA, formerly known as the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred in the 10th District, in which a Chicago Police Department sergeant and police officer allegedly accidentally discharged a recovered weapon. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations against the sergeant in that he discharged a recovered weapon, and violated Rule 10 "Inattention to Duty" and Rule 6 "Disobedience to a direct order, whether written or oral." This recommendation was based on the accused sergeant's admission that he accidentally discharged the weapon and upon an Illinois State Police Forensics Division finding that the recovered weapon functioned properly and could not misfire on its own. IPRA recommended that the **accused sergeant receive a reprimand**. Based upon the sergeant's admission, IPRA recommended that the allegation of an inadvertent discharge against the accused police officer be **"UNFOUNDED."**

Log No. / C.R. 315128

On August 2005, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA, formerly known as the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred in the 16th District, in which an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer allegedly punched the body of a complainant, kicked, choked, verbally abused said complainant, threw beer cans at the complainant, unnecessarily displayed his weapon, attempted to prevent the complainant from calling 911, was intoxicated, and had unregistered weapons in his possession, and on a separate occasion punched the complainant. It is further alleged that the accused member kicked and verbally abused two fellow department members. Based on witness statements, physical evidence and a signed criminal complaint from the complainant, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the following allegations against the accused member: that he punched, kicked, choked, verbally abused and threw cans of beer at the complainant, attempted to prevent the complainant from contacting 911, displayed his weapon without justification, that the accused member kicked and verbally abused two fellow department members responding to calls for emergency assistance at the location of the incident, was in possession of unregistered firearms, was intoxicated and engaged in conduct bringing discredit and disrepute to the Department. Because there were no corroborating witness statements and material evidence to support the complainant's allegation that the accused member physically abused her on a separate occasion, IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** this allegation. Because the accused member admitted the misconduct and sought alcohol treatment on his own, IPRA recommended a **sixty (60) day suspension** for this accused member.

Log No. / C.R. 310387

On 01 January 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

May 2008

(IPRA, formerly known as the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred in the 21st District, in which an off-duty Chicago Police Department civilian member allegedly threw several items within a public lounge, threw several items in the direction of an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer, damaged property at said lounge which resulted in a arrest for Criminal Damage to Property, verbally abused a Department officer, disrupted business of the lounge, and falsely identified herself as a Chicago Police Department officer. It is further alleged that the Chicago Police Department officer present at this incident allegedly provided a false report. Based on corroborating witness statements and physical evidence, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the following allegations against the accused civilian member: that she threw several items within a public lounge, that the accused member threw items in the direction of a Chicago Police Department officer, that the accused caused property damage to the interior of said establishment, which resulted in her arrest and being charged with Criminal Damage to Property, that the accused verbally abused a private citizen, and that the accused falsely identified herself as a Chicago Police Department officer. Further, IPRA recommended that the allegation that the accused disrupted the business of the lounge and caused a loss in revenue be **"UNFOUNDED"** as this allegation went beyond the scope of IPRA's jurisdiction and needed to be addressed as a civil matter. Lastly, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation against the second accused member for providing a false report, because witness statements conflicted with the second accused's statements to IPRA. IPRA recommended a **thirty (30) day suspension for the accused civilian member and a fifteen (15) day suspension for the accused officer.**

Log No. / C.R. 306446

On 24 April 2005, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA, formerly known as the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred in the 11th District, in which two Chicago Police Department detention aides are alleged to have failed to have screened an individual for suitability for confinement, failed to follow guidelines for arrestee screening, failed to summon medical attention for the individual, failed to make fifteen (15) minute checks, and made a false entry in the inspection log. It is further alleged that a Chicago Police Department officer allegedly failed to screen an individual for suitability for confinement, failed to follow guidelines for arrestee screening, failed to summon medical attention for the individual, failed to make fifteen (15) minute checks, made a false entry in the inspection log, and left his duty assignment without proper relief or authorization. Finally, it is alleged that a Chicago Police Department sergeant failed to provide medical care to an individual; and that several Chicago Police Department officers physically mistreated and failed to provide medical care for said individual. Based on internal reports and admissions by the principal accused officer, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** allegations that the accused officer failed to screen the individual for suitability of confinement and that the accused officer failed to follow arrestee screening guidelines. Further,

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

May 2008

IPRA recommended to find the allegations that the accused officer failed to summon an ambulance for an individual, failed to make fifteen (15) minute checks on the detained individual, made a false entry in the inspection log, and that the accused left his duty assignment without proper relief or authorization, as **"UNFOUNDED,"** because the accused officer was given verbal authorization from a commanding officer to leave his tour of duty early, and the alleged incident occurred after the accused officer had already left his tour of duty. Further, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that the first accused detention aide, principal to the incident, failed to make fifteen (15) minute checks on the detained individual, made a false entry in the inspection log, and made a false report, because his statements conflicted with internal reports and material evidence. The remaining allegations were recommended to be **"UNFOUNDED,"** because corroborating witness statements indicated that the accused detention aide followed orders of the commanding officer to place the detainee in a cell, that the detention aide advised the commanding officer of the detainee's physical injuries, and that upon discovering the detainee's condition, he notified the commanding officer and requested that an ambulance be called. The allegations against the second accused detention aide were deemed as **"UNFOUNDED,"** because it was confirmed that these were not within the purview of his duty assignment on the day of the incident. The allegations against the remaining accused officers that they physically mistreated the detainee and failed to summon medical attention, were deemed as **"UNFOUNDED"** because witness statements and internal reports corroborated that the accused officers were not made aware of any physical injuries suffered by the detainee and had minimal contact with the detainee when he was transported to the 11th District lock-up. Finally, the allegation against the accused sergeant that he allegedly failed to summon an ambulance for the detained individual, was **"SUSTAINED"** as witness statements supported this allegation. PRA recommended a **fifteen (15) day suspension for the first accused detention aide, a sixteen (16) day suspension for the accused sergeant, and a fifteen (15) day suspension for the accused police officer.**

Log No. / C.R. No. 310490

On 06 January 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA, formerly known as the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred in the 12th District, in which a Chicago Police Department officer was alleged to have engaged in an unjustified physical and verbal altercation with two complainants and to have been intoxicated while off-duty. Based on corroborating witness statements and 911 audio recordings, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the following allegations against the accused member: that the accused member was intoxicated while off-duty, engaged in unjustified physical and verbal altercations with two complainants, engaged in conduct bringing discredit or disrepute to the Department, and provided a false report. IPRA recommended a **thirty (30) day suspension** for the accused officer.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

May 2008

Log No. / C.R. No. 1012744

On 19 December 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred in the 10th District, in which an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer allegedly harassed and verbally abused a fellow department member. Based on internal reports and corroborating witness statements, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the accused made harassing phone calls to and used derogatory language against a fellow department member, and that the misconduct brought discredit to the Department. IPRA recommended that the accused receive a **reprimand**.