

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1057766

Notification Date: October 14, 2012

Location: 18th District

Complaint: Physical Altercation

Summary: In an incident involving two off-duty CPD Officers (Officer A and Complainant/Officer B), it was alleged that Officer A directed profanities at Complainant/Officer B, pushed, choked and struck Complainant/Officer B in the head and face. Officer A is also alleged to have left the scene of the incident and failing to report it to the Department. Finally, Officer A is alleged to have brought discredit upon the Department when he engaged in a verbal and physical altercation. Complainant/Officer B is alleged to have directed profanities towards Officer A and punched Officer A in the face. Complainant/Officer B is also alleged to have brought discredit upon the department by engaging in a verbal altercation.

Finding:

Officer A: During mediation, Officer A agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension** for the allegations that Officer A pushed and punched Complainant/Officer B, leaving the scene and failing to report the incident to the Department, and bringing discredit upon the Department by engaging in a verbal and physical altercation; "**NOT SUSTAINED**" for the allegations that he directed profanities at Complainant/Officer B and choked Complainant/Officer B.

Complainant/Officer B: Based on statements from the accused Officer, the Complainant/Officer B, witnesses and department reports/records, IPRA recommended the following: a finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegations that Complainant/Officer B directed profanities towards Officer A, and for bringing discredit upon the Department by engaging in a verbal altercation; "**NOT SUSTAINED**" for the allegation that punched Officer A in the face.

Log/C.R. No. 1027978

Notification Date: July 6, 2009

Location: 6th District

Complaint: Physical Altercation

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers (Officer A and Officer B) and an off-duty CPD Officer (Officer C), it was alleged that, while the two on-duty officers were conducting an investigation, Officer C interfered with that investigation. It was also alleged that Officer C directed profanities at Officer A, pushed, punched and struck Officer A with his elbows. Also, it was alleged that Officer C resisted arrest and was found guilty in Court of two counts of Resisting/Obstructing a Peace Officer. Finally, it is alleged that Officer C brought discredit upon the department by interfering with Officer A's and B's investigation, pushing and directing profanities at Officer A and resisting arrest. Officer A is alleged to have slapped and directed profanities at Officer C. Officer B is alleged to have discharged OC spray at Officer C.

Finding: Based on statements from the Officers and witnesses, department reports/records, photographs, medical records, and court documents, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that Officer A directed profanities at Officer C; **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that Officer A slapped Officer C.

Officer B: A finding of **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that Officer B discharged OC spray at Officer C.

Officer C: A finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of **Separation** for the allegations that Officer C interfered with a police investigation, pushed and directed profanities at Officer A, resisted arrest, was found guilty of two counts of Resisting/Obstructing a peace officer, and brought discredit upon the Department by interfering with a police investigation, pushing and directing profanities and resisting arrest; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that Officer C punched and struck Officer A with his elbows.

Log/C.R. No. 1032768

Notification Date: December 26, 2009

Location: 2nd District

Complaint: Accidental Firearm Discharge

Summary: An off-duty CPD Officer was alleged to have accidentally discharged her firearm.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officer and a witness, department reports, and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” for the allegation that the Officer accidentally discharged her weapon and a penalty of **Violation Noted**.

Log/C.R. No. 1065812

Notification Date: October 30, 2013

Location: 18th District

Complaint: Unnecessary Physical Contact

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers (Officer A and Officer B), it was alleged, while on a prisoner detail, Officer A and Officer B engaged in a verbal and physical altercation with each other, thereby bringing discredit to the Department.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officers and witnesses, and a radio transmission IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegation that Officer A engaged in a verbal and physical altercation thereby bringing discredit to the Department.

Officer B: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegation that Officer B engaged in a verbal and physical altercation thereby bringing discredit to the Department.

Log/C.R. No. 1058767

Notification Date: December 2, 2012

Location: Burbank, IL

Complaint: Domestic incident

Summary: In an incident involving an off-duty CPD Officer and a Complainant, it was alleged that Officer engaged in a physical and verbal altercation with the Complainant, bit Complainant’s arm, and several counts of failing to secure his firearm, including when the Complainant retrieved his firearm from an unlocked motorcycle compartment, when the Complainant attempted to hide his firearm,

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

and when a witness retrieved the firearm from the ground during the altercation between the Officer and Complainant.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officer, a witness, the accused Officer's disciplinary history, department reports/records, and 911 calls, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer: A finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of **Separation** for the allegations that the Officer failed to secure his firearm; "**NO AFFIDAVIT**" for the allegations that Officer engaged in an unjustified verbal and physical altercation with Complainant and bit the Complainant's arm.

Log/C.R. No. 1058001

Notification Date: October 24, 2012

Location: 25th District

Complaint: Firearm Discharge

Summary: An off-duty CPD Officer was alleged to have failed to report that he discharged his firearm, failed to immediately identify himself as a police officer, failed to submit a report regarding the discharge of his firearm, impeded the investigation when he falsely reported that he did not discharge his firearm, and failed to properly secure his firearm after it discharged and malfunctioned. It is also alleged that the Officer provided several counts of false statements, including telling the first responding officers that he had discharged his firearm, telling the sergeant that he did not discharge his firearm, stating he never spoke to an uniformed sergeant, informing every officer that he spoke with that he discharged his firearm, and stating that he made a timely notification of the discharge of his firearm to the Department. Finally, it is alleged that the Officer brought discredit upon the Department regarding the circumstances of the discharge of his weapon.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officer and witnesses, department reports/records, photographs, and a video, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer: A finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of **Separation** for the allegations that the Officer failed to report that he discharged his firearm, impeded the investigation when he falsely reported that he did not discharge his firearm, provided false statements, and brought

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

discredit upon the Department regarding the circumstances of the discharge of his weapon; **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he failed to immediately identify himself as a police officer, failed to submit a report regarding the discharge of his firearm in a timely manner and failed to properly secure his firearm after he discharged it and it malfunctioned.

Log/C.R. No. 1057907

Notification Date: October 21, 2012

Location: 19th District

Complaint: Firearm Discharge

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers, it was alleged that Officer A accidentally discharged Officer B's firearm inside the roll call room. It is also alleged that Officer B failed to secure his firearm.

Finding: During mediation, the Officers agreed to accept IPRA's findings regarding the following:

Officer A: **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegation of accidentally discharging a firearm and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension**.

Officer B: **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegation of failing to secure his firearm and a penalty of a **Reprimand**.

Log/C.R. No. 1058936

Notification Date: December 10, 2012

Location: 3rd District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers (Officer A and Officer B), an on-duty CPD Sergeant and a Complainant, it was alleged that, while responding to a domestic dispute, Officer A and B directed profanities at the Complainant, grabbed, yanked and twisted Complainant's arm behind his back. It was further alleged that the Sergeant failed to register a complaint against Officers A and B on behalf of the Complainant.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Findings: Based on statements from the accused Officers, Sergeant, and Complainant, department reports/records, and medical records, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that profanities were directed at the Complainant; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he grabbed, yanked and twisted Complainant's arm behind his back.

Officer B: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that profanities were directed at the Complainant; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he grabbed, yanked and twisted Complainant's arm behind his back.

Sergeant : During mediation, the Sergeant agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **Violation Noted.** for the allegation of failing to register a complaint against Officers A and B on behalf of the Complainant.

Log/C.R. No. 1030064

Notification Date: September 12, 2009

Location: 1st District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving an off-duty Sergeant and a Complainant, it was alleged that Sergeant boarded a CTA bus and punched Complainant in his face, directed profanities at Complainant, failed to identify himself as a Department member and brought discredit upon the department. It was further alleged that Officer A made a false report in a statement to IPRA when he indicated that the Complainant did not want to sign a criminal complaint.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Sergeant, Officer, Complainant, witnesses, department records/reports, video, photographs, and medical records, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that he made a false report in a statement to IPRA.

Sergeant: A finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of **Separation** for the allegations that he punched the Complainant about his face, directed profanities at Complainant, and as a result of his actions

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

brought discredit upon the Department; **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that he failed to identify himself as a department member.

Log/C.R. No. 1036745

Notification Date: May 30, 2010

Location: 7th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving six on-duty CPD members, (Officers A, B, C, D, E, F), a Sergeant, and Complainant, it was alleged that Officers A, B, C, D, E, and F searched the Complainant's vehicle without justification, handcuffed Complainant too tightly, slammed Complainant's head against the Department vehicle, and directed profanities at Complainant. It was also alleged that Officer A and B refused to provide their names and star numbers. It was further alleged that the Sergeant failed to file a complaint on behalf of the Complainant and refused to identify himself upon request.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officers, Sergeant, witness, Complainant, department records/reports, medical records, and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he searched the Complainant's vehicle without justification, handcuffed Complainant too tightly, slammed Complainant's head into the Department vehicle, directed profanities at Complainant, and refused to provide his name and star number upon request.

Officer B: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he searched the Complainant's vehicle without justification, slammed Complainant's head into the Department vehicle, handcuffed Complainant too tightly, directed profanities at Complainant, and refused to provide his name and star number upon request.

Officer C: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he searched the Complainant's vehicle without justification, slammed Complainant's head into the Department vehicle handcuffed Complainant too tightly, and directed profanities at Complainant.

Officer D: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he searched the Complainant's vehicle without justification, slammed

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Complainant's head into the Department vehicle, handcuffed Complainant too tightly, and directed profanities at Complainant.

Officer F: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that he searched the Complainant's vehicle without justification; **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he slammed Complainant's head into the Department vehicle, handcuffed Complainant too tightly, and directed profanities at Complainant.

Officer E: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that he searched the Complainant's vehicle without justification; **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegations that he slammed Complainant's head into the Department vehicle, handcuffed Complainant too tightly, and directed profanities at Complainant.

Sergeant: A finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **Reprimand** for the allegations that he failed to file a complaint on behalf of the Complainant and refused to identify himself upon request.

Log/C.R. No. 1056514

Notification Date: August 22, 2012

Location: 18th District

Complaint: Improper Search of a person

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers (Officer A and Officer B), a Detention Aide and a Subject, it was alleged that the accused Officers and Detention Aide were inattentive to duty in that they failed to properly search the Subject which resulted in the Subject attempting to hang himself while in lock-up.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officers, Detention Aide, witnesses; department records/reports, medical records, and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that the Officer failed to properly search the subject.

Officer B: **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that the Officer failed to properly search the subject.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Detention Aide: A finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegation that he was inattentive to duty in that he failed to properly search the Subject which resulted in the Subject attempting to hang himself while in lock-up.

Log/C.R. No. 1031565

Notification Date: November 4, 2009

Location: 8th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving four on-duty CPD Officers, (Officer A, Officer B, Officer C, and Officer D), and Complainant, it was alleged that Officer A struck Complainant about the head and body with a baton, choked Complainant with a baton, hit Complainant on her face with his hand, directed profanities toward the Complainant, failed to arrest an offender for child abduction, failed to complete a case report properly documenting the child abduction assignment, and failed to return the child to the Complainant/custodial parent, took and failed to inventory or return Complainant's cellular phone, and as a result brought discredit upon the Department. It is also alleged that Officers B, C, and D struck Complainant about her head and body with a baton, failed to arrest the offender for child abduction, failed to complete a case report properly documenting the child abduction assignment, and failed to return the child to the Complainant/custodial parent, and took and failed to return or inventory Complainant's cell phone.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officers, witness, Complainant; department records/reports, and medical records, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he struck Complainant about her head and body with a baton, choked Complainant with a baton, directed profanities toward the Complainant and brought discredit upon the Department; **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that he took and failed to return or inventory Complainant's cell phone; **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that he hit the Complainant on her face with his hand; **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension** for the allegations that he failed to arrest the offender for child abduction and failed to return the child to the Complainant/custodial parent; and failed to complete a case report properly documenting the child abduction assignment.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Officer B: A finding of “**UNFOUNDED**” for the allegations that he struck Complainant about her head and body with a baton, and failed to return or inventory Complainant’s cell phone; “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension** for the allegations that he failed to arrest the offender for child abduction, failed to return the child to the Complainant/custodial parent; and failed to complete a case report properly documenting the child abduction assignment.

Officer C: A finding of “**NOT SUSTAINED**” for the allegation that he struck Complainant about her head and body with a baton; “**UNFOUNDED**” for the allegation that he failed to return or inventory Complainant’s cell phone; “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension** for the allegations that he failed to arrest the offender for child abduction, failed to return the child to the Complainant/custodial parent; and failed to complete a case report documenting the child abduction assignment.

Officer D: A finding of “**NOT SUSTAINED**” for the allegation that he struck Complainant about her head and body with a baton; “**UNFOUNDED**” for the allegation that he failed to return or inventory Complainant’s cell phone; “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension** for the allegations that he failed to arrest the offender for child abduction, failed to return the child to the Complainant/custodial parent; and failed to complete a case report properly documenting the child abduction assignment.

Log/C.R. No. 1033791

Notification Date: February 9, 2010

Location: 1st & 2nd District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving four on-duty CPD Officers (Officer A, B, C, and D) a Sergeant, Complainant/Victim 1, Victim 2 and Victim 3 and Unknown Officers, it was alleged that Officer A and Officer B unreasonable seized and detained the Complainant/Victim 1 and submitted a false report when they stated that they transported the Complainant/Victim1. It is alleged that Officer C unreasonably seized, detained and improperly searched Victim 2, and took and failed to inventory Victim 3’s money. It is further alleged that Unknown Officers stripped search and choked Victim 2, broke Complainant/Victim 1’s wristwatch while detaining him and broke a flat

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

screen television and damaged Victim 3's apartment. The Sergeant is alleged to have directed that Complainant/Victim 1 be unreasonably detained while Victim 3's apartment was searched, authorized that Victim 2 be stripped search, took and failed to inventory Victim 3's money, failed to take before and after photographs while executing a search warrant, and several counts of being inattentive to duty, including being inattentive to duty because he failed to use a canine team or justify not using a canine team, failed to designate a search team that received training in using digital cameras, failed to ensure that the point of entry was secured in a reasonable manner, and failed to review the completed sketch of the premises. It is also alleged that the Sergeant failed to make every effort to leave the premises in the same condition as originally found

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officers, witnesses, Complainant/Victim 1, Victims' 2 and 3; department records/reports, and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he unreasonably seized and detained the Complainant/Victim1 and submitted a false report that he transported Complainant/Victim 1.

Officer B: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he unreasonably seized and detained the Complainant/Victim 1 and submitted a false report that he transported Complainant/Victim 1.

Officer C: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he unreasonably seized, detained and improperly searched Victim 2, and took and failed to inventory Victim 3's money.

Unknown Officers: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that the Unknown Officers stripped search and choked Victim 2, broke Complainant/Victim 1's wristwatch while detaining him, broke a flat screen television and damaged Victim 3's apartment.

Sergeant: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension** for the allegations that he directed that Complainant/Victim 1 be unreasonably detained while Victim 3's apartment was searched, failed to take before and after photographs when he executed a search warrant, was inattentive to duty in that he failed to use a canine team or justify not using a canine team, failed to review the completed sketch of the premises and failed to make every effort to leave the

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

premises in the same condition; **“UNFOUNDED”** for the allegation that he was inattentive to duty in that he failed to ensure that the point of entry was secured in a reasonable manner; **“NOT SUSTAINED”** for the allegations that he took and failed to inventory Victim 3’s money, authorized that Victim 2 be stripped searched, and was inattentive to duty in that he failed to designate a search team member who had received Department training in the use of digital cameras.

Log/C.R. No. 1020292

Notification Date: September 24, 2008

Location: 25th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving thirteen on-duty CPD members, (Officers A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M), a Lieutenant, Sergeant, and two Complainants/Victims (Victim 1 and Victim 2); it was alleged that the Lieutenant and Sergeant entered Victim 2’s residence without permission or a search warrant, damaged the front door, were inattentive to duty when they failed to ensure that Officer L completed a Tactical Response Report (TRR), were aware of police misconduct and failed to report it, provided IPRA with a false statement, and brought discredit upon the Department. It is also alleged that Officer A handcuffed Victim 2 without justification, damaged the front door, entered Victim 2’s residence without permission or a search warrant, was inattentive to duty when he failed to ensure the search warrant team executed the search warrant at the correct address and was aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department. It is further alleged that Officers B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, and L placed their knee on Victim 1’s back without justification, punched Victim 1 on his face and stomach, damaged the front door of Victim 2’s residence, entered Victim 2’s residence without permission or a search warrant and handcuffed Victim 2 without justification. Also, it is alleged that Officers G, H, J, K, and L were aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department; Officer I brought discredit upon the Department; Officer L was inattentive to duty because he failed to complete a TRR; Officer L, J, and K provided false statements to IPRA. It is further alleged that Officer M handcuffed Victim 2 without justification, damaged the front door of Victim 2’s residence, entered Victim 2’s residence without permission or a search warrant

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

and was aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused officers, a witness, Victim 1, Victim 2, a paramedic, department records/reports, medical records, and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Lieutenant: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that he provided a false statement to IPRA; **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that he damaged the front door of Victim 2's residence and that he was aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department; **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of **Reprimand** for the allegations that searched Victim 2's residence without permission or a search warrant, was inattentive to duty when he failed to ensure that Officer L completed a TRR and bringing discredit upon the Department because he entered Victim 2's residence without permission or a search warrant and failed to ensure that Officer L completed a TRR.

Sergeant: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that he provided a false statement to IPRA; **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that he was aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department; **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of **Reprimand** for the allegations that he entered Victim 2's residence without permission or a search warrant, damaged the front door to Victim 2's residence, failed to ensure that Officer L completed a TRR, and bringing discredit upon the Department.

Officer A: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he provided a false statement to IPRA and that he entered Victim 2's residence without permission or a search warrant; **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he handcuffed Victim 2 without justification, damaged Victim 2's front door, and was aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department; **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of **Violation Noted** for the allegation that he was inattentive to duty in that he failed to ensure that the search warrant team executed the search warrant at the correct address.

Officer B: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he placed his knee on Victim 1's back without justification, punched Victim 1 on his face and stomach and damaged the front door of Victim 2's residence; **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that he entered Victim 2's residence without permission or a search warrant;

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

“NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that he handcuffed Victim 2 without justification.

Officer C: A finding of **“UNFOUNDED”** for the allegations that he placed his knee on Victim 1’s back without justification, punched Victim 1 on his face and stomach and damaged the front door of Victim 2’s residence; **“EXONERATED”** for the allegation that he entered Victim 2’s residence without permission or a search warrant; **“NOT SUSTAINED”** for the allegation that he handcuffed Victim 2 without justification.

Officer D: A finding of **“UNFOUNDED”** for all the allegations that he placed his knee on Victim 1’s back without justification, punched Victim 1 on the face and stomach, entered Victim 2’s residence without permission or a search warrant, damaged Victim 2’s front door, and handcuffed Victim 2 without justification.

Officer E: A finding of **“UNFOUNDED”** for all the allegations that he placed his knee on Victim 1’s back without justification, punched Victim 1 on the face and stomach, entered Victim 2’s residence without permission or a search warrant, damaged Victim 2’s front door, and handcuffed Victim 2 without justification.

Officer F: A finding of **“UNFOUNDED”** for all the allegations that he placed his knee on Victim 1’s back without justification, punched Victim 1 on the face and stomach, entered Victim 2’s residence without permission or a search warrant, damaged Victim 2’s front door, and handcuffed Victim 2 without justification.

Officer G and H: A finding of **“UNFOUNDED”** for the allegations that he placed his knee on Victim 1’s back without justification, punched Victim 1 on his face and stomach, damaged the front door of Victim 2’s residence, and handcuffed Victim 2 without justification; **“NOT SUSTAINED”** for the allegations that he entered Victim 2’s residence without permission or a search warrant and he was aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department.

Officer H: A finding of **“UNFOUNDED”** for the allegations that he placed his knee on Victim 1’s back without justification, punched Victim 1 on his face and stomach, damaged the front door of Victim 2’s residence, and handcuffed Victim 2 without justification; **“NOT SUSTAINED”** for the allegations that he entered Victim 2’s residence

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

without permission or a search warrant and he was aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department.

Officer I: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he placed his knee on Victim 1's back without justification, punched Victim 1 on his face and stomach, damaged the front door of Victim 2's residence, and handcuffed Victim 2 without justification; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that he brought discredit to the Department; **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of **Violation Noted** for the allegation that he entered Victim 2's residence without permission or a search warrant.

Officer J: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he placed his knee on Victim 1's back without justification, punched Victim 1 on his face and stomach, entered Victim 2's residence without permission or a search warrant and handcuffed Victim 2 without justification; **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that he damaged the front door of Victim 2's residence,; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he was aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department and provided a false statement to IPRA.

Officer K: A finding of **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that he placed his knee on Victim 1's back without justification; **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he punched Victim 1 on his face and stomach, damaged the front door of Victim 2's residence, and handcuffed Victim 2 without justification; **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of **Violation Noted** for the allegation that he entered Victim 2's residence without permission or a search warrant; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he was aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department and provided a false statement to IPRA.

Officer L: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he placed his knee on Victim 1's back, punched Victim 1 on his stomach, damaged the front door of Victim 2's residence, entered Victim 2's residence without permission or a search warrant and handcuffed Victim 2 without justification; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he punched Victim 1 in his face, was aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department, and provided a false statement to IPRA; **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of **Reprimand** for the allegation that he was inattentive to duty in that he failed to complete a TRR.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Officer M: A finding of “**UNFOUNDED**” for the allegations that he handcuffed Victim 2 without justification, entered Victim 2’s residence without permission or a search warrant, and damaged Victim 2’s front door. .

Log/C.R. No. 1028193

Notification Date: July 14, 2009

Location: Elgin, Illinois

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving forty-four on-duty CPD members (Officers A- Z and A1 – R1), a Lieutenant, a Sergeant, three Detectives (Detective 1, 2, and 3) and Victim, it was alleged that Officers A, B, C, D, L, U, V, W, X and the Lieutenant violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy. It is also alleged that Officer E, F, G, H, I, J, K, M, N, O, P, Q, R, S, Y, Z, A1, B1, C1, D1, E1, F1, G1, H1, I1, J1, K1, L1, M1, N1, O1, P1, Q1, R1, the Sergeant, Detective 1, Detective 2, and Detective 3 violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy, left their duty assignments without authorization, and failed to notify the OEMC that they were responding as assist units. Finally, it is alleged that Officer T violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy, left his duty assignments without authorization, failed to notify the OEMC that he was responding as an assist unit, violated Chicago Police Department’s use of deadly force policy by shooting the Victim without justification, and violated a Chicago Police Department General Order by failing to remain on the scene to report to the watch commander after discharging his weapon.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officers, witness, Victim; department records/reports, medical records, court documents, video, and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Lieutenant: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of **2-day Suspension** for the allegation Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy.

Sergeant: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension** for the allegations that he violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy, left his duty assignments without authorization, and failed to notify the OEMC that he was responding as an assist unit.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Officer A: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of **Violation Noted** for the allegation that he violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy.

Officer B, C, L, U, V,W and X: A finding of “**UNFOUNDED**” for the allegation that they violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy.

Officer D: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension** for the allegation that he violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy.

Officer E, F, K, M, N, O,A1, B1, C1, D1, E1, F1, I1, J1, K1 and R1 : A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension** for the allegations that they violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy, left their duty assignments without authorization, and failed to notify the OEMC that they were responding as assist units.

Officer G, H, I, J, O, P, Q, R, S, H1, L1, M1, N1, O1, and P1, Q1: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegations that they violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy, left their duty assignments without authorization, and failed to notify the OEMC that they were responding as assist units.

Detective 1, 2, and 3: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegations that they violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy, left their duty assignments without authorization, and failed to notify the OEMC that they were responding as assist units.

Officer Y and Z: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **Violation Noted** for the allegations that they violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy, left their duty assignments without authorization, and failed to notify the OEMC that they were responding as assist units.

Officer T: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension** for the allegations that he violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy, left his duty assignments without authorization, failed to notify the OEMC that he was responding as an assist unit, violated Chicago Police Department’s use of deadly force policy by shooting the Victim without justification, and violated a

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Chicago Police Department General Order by failing to remain on the scene to report to the watch commander after discharging his weapon.

Log/C.R. No. 1034643

Notification Date: March 16, 2010

Location: N/A

Complaint: Domestic Incident

Summary: In an incident involving an off-duty CPD officer and Complainant, it was alleged that the Officer pushed Complainant against a wall and then kicked and struck her on the back, legs, and head. It was also alleged that the Officer pushed Complainant to the ground and head butted her. Allegations also include breaking household items and throwing shoes at the Complainant. Also alleged was that on multiple occasions, Officer made personal contact, had numerous telephone conversations, and sent numerous texts to Complainant in violation of an Order of Protection. It was also alleged that Officer was inattentive to duty when he engaged in excessive personal telephone use while on duty, on multiple occasions threatened to call immigration, use resources and influences to have her deported and used her non-citizenship status to control, manipulate, and prevent her from taking their daughters outside without him. Also, it is alleged that he took Complainant's items without justification, filed a false report and had her arrested for domestic battery, erased photographs from her SIM card and failed to return the SIM card, took Complainant's money and failed to return it, and on several occasions physically, mentally, and emotionally abused her, his daughters, her son and her sisters' children. Finally, it is alleged that Officer had Complainant falsely arrested for theft.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officer and Complainant; department records/reports, court documents, and telephone records, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer: A finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **15-day Suspension** for the allegations that on multiple occasions he made personal contact with the Complainant in violation of an Order of Protection, had numerous telephone conversations with the Complainant in violation of an Order of Protection, sent numerous text messages to the Complainant in violation of an Order of Protection and was inattentive to duty because he engaged in excessive personal

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

telephone use while on-duty; **"NOT SUSTAINED "** for the allegations that he pushed Complainant against a wall and then kicked and struck her on the back, legs, and head pushed Complainant to the ground, head butted, broke household items and threw shoes at the Complainant, took Complainant's items without justification, filed a false report and had her arrested for domestic battery, had Complainant falsely arrested for theft, erased photographs from her SIM card and failed to return the SIM card, took Complainant's money and failed to return it, and on several occasions physically, mentally, and emotionally abused her, his daughters, her son and her sisters' children.

Log/C.R. No. 1048888

Notification Date: September 13, 2011

Location: 15th District

Complaint: Unnecessary Physical Contact

Summary: In an incident involving three on-duty CPD Officers (Officer A, B, and C), an Unknown on-duty CPD officer, a Complainant/Victim (Complainant/Victim 1), and another Victim (Victim 2); it was alleged that, while conducting a traffic stop, Officer A threatened, pushed, and stripped searched Victim 2 in public without proper authorization and improperly used Complainant/Victim 1's vehicle. It is also alleged that Officers B and C stripped searched Victim 2 in public without proper authorization and improperly used Complainant/Victim 1's vehicle. It is further alleged that an Unknown Officer stripped searched the Complainant/Victim 1 without proper authorization or justification.

Finding: During mediation, Officers A, B, and C agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegation that they improperly used Complainant/Victim 1's vehicle

Allegations against Unknown Officer were **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that she stripped searched the Complainant/Victim 1 without proper authorization.

Log/C.R. No. 1025620

Notification Date: April 17, 2009

Location: 8th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Summary: In an incident involving four on-duty CPD Officers (Officer A,B,C, D), an Unknown on-duty CPD officer, and four Victims (Victim 1,2,3, and 4); it was alleged that Officer A and B pushed Victim 1 to the ground, stepped on Victim 1's head and failed to report that a fellow officer used improper force against Victim 1. It is also alleged that Officer C kicked and punched Victim 2, Victim 3 and Victim 4; failed to report that a fellow officer used improper force against Victim 1, disobeyed a Department General Order, failed to document the encounter with Victim 1, and submitted a false oral report. Also, it is alleged that Officer D failed to report that a fellow officer used improper force against Victim 1, disobeyed a Department General Order, and failed to document the encounter with Victim 1. Finally, it is alleged that an Unknown Officer punched Victim 3 on his face.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officers, witness, Victim 1, 2, 3 and 4; department records/reports, medical records, and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A and B: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that they pushed Victim 1 to the ground, stepped on Victim 1's head and failed to report that a fellow officer used improper force against Victim 1.

Officer D: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he failed to report that a fellow officer used improper force against Victim 1, disobeyed a Department General Order, and failed to document the encounter with Victim 1.

Officer C: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he kicked and punched Victim 3, kicked Victim 4, failed to report that a fellow officer used improper force against Victim 1 and disobeyed a Department General Order; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he kicked and punched Victim 2, punched Victim 4, and submitted a false oral report; **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **Reprimand** for the allegation that he failed to properly document the encounter with Victim 1.

Unknown Officer : A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that he punched Victim 3 on his face.

Log/C.R. No. 1066878

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Notification Date: January 5, 2014

Location: 6th District

Complaint: Accidental Taser Discharge

Summary: An on-duty CPD Officer was alleged to have accidentally discharged his Taser.

Finding: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegation and a penalty of

Violation Noted.