

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

June 2015

Log/C.R. No. 1071692

Notification Date: September 24, 2014

Location: 10th District

Complaint: Firearm Discharge

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty CPD Officer, it was alleged that during the execution of a search warrant, the Officer was inattentive to duty in that she failed to maintain control of her firearm, causing it to accidentally discharge.

Finding: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for the allegation and a penalty of a **1-day suspension**.

Log/C.R. No. 1065759

Notification Date: October 27, 2013

Location: Aurora, IL

Complaint: Unnecessary Physical Contact

Summary: In an incident involving an off-duty CPD Officer and the Complainant, it was alleged that while involved in a verbal altercation the Officer grabbed, pushed and directed profanities at the Complainant.

Finding: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **Violation Noted** for the allegation that while involved in an verbal altercation he directed profanities; "**UNFOUNDED**" for the allegation that he grabbed and pushed the Complainant.

Log/C.R. No. 1066452

Notification Date: December 5, 2013

Location: 19th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving an off-duty CPD Officer and the Complainant, it was alleged that the Officer engaged in an unjustified

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

June 2015

physical altercation when he pushed the Complainant to the floor causing injury to his right shoulder. It was also alleged that the Officer used profanity and directed racially motivated language at the Complainant, was intoxicated, and brought discredit upon the Department when he engaged in a verbal and physical altercation while off-duty.

Finding: Based on statements to IPRA from the accused and the Complainant; and department reports/records; IPRA recommended the following:

Officer: A finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and penalty of a **20-day suspension** for the allegations that he engaged in an unjustified physical altercation when he pushed the Complainant to the floor causing injury to his right shoulder, used profanity and directed racially motivated language at the Complainant, and brought discredit upon the Department when he engaged in a verbal and physical altercation while off-duty; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that he was intoxicated.

Log/C.R. No. 1069362

Notification Date: May 23, 2014

Location: 22nd District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving two off-duty CPD Officers (Officer A and B), it was alleged that Officer A grabbed the Complainant from behind and placed him in a "full nelson" position, failed to complete an Officer's Battery Report (OBR), failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR), and detained the Complainant without lawful justification. It was also alleged that on September 30, 2014, Officer A's demeanor was unbecoming during a discussion regarding possible mediation of his case. In addition, it was alleged that on October 15, 2015, Officer A delayed the investigation because he failed to arrive for a scheduled statement with IPRA. It was further alleged that on October 21, 2014, Officer A provided a false statement to IPRA. Finally, it was alleged that Officer B grabbed the Complainant's arm and bent it.

Finding: Based on statements to IPRA from the accused, the

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

June 2015

Complainant, and witnesses; and department reports/records; IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of **“SUSTAINED”** and a penalty of a **3-day suspension** for the allegations that he failed to complete an OBR, failed to complete a TRR, and delayed the investigation because he failed to arrive for a scheduled statement with IPRA; **“UNFOUNDED”** for the allegation that he detained the Complainant without lawful justification; **“NOT SUSTAINED”** for all the other allegations.

Officer B: During mediation, Officer B agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **“SUSTAINED”** for the allegation and a penalty of a **Reprimand**.

Log/C.R. No. 1067407

Notification Date: February 8, 2014

Location: 22nd District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD Sergeants (Sergeant 1 and 2), eight on-duty CPD Officers (Officer A, B, C, D, E, F, G, and H) and three Complainants (1a, 2b, and 3c), it was alleged that Officers A and B reported an armed robbery in progress without sufficient evidence, thereby unnecessarily placing citizens, the Complainants, and fellow officers in a potentially dangerous situation. It was also alleged that Sergeants 1, 2 and Officers C, D, E, F, G and H pointed a gun at the Complainants, grabbed and pushed the Complainants to the ground and against a vehicle, and directed profanities at the Complainants.

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

Sergeant 1: A finding of **“UNFOUNDED”** for all allegations.

Sergeant 2: A finding of **“EXONERATED”** for the allegation that he pointed a gun at the Complainants; **“NOT SUSTAINED”** for all the other allegations.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

June 2015

Officer A: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for the allegation and a penalty of a **30-day suspension**.

Officer B: A finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for the allegation and a penalty of a **30-day suspension**.

Officer C, D, E, F, G: A finding of "**UNFOUNDED**" for all allegations.

Officer H: A finding of "**EXONERATED**" for the allegation that they pointed a gun at the Complainants; "**NOT SUSTAINED**" for all the other allegations.

Log/C.R. No. 300039

Notification Date: August 17, 2014

Location: 17th District

Complaint: Inattention to Duty

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty CPD Sergeant, an on-duty CPD Officer and the Complainant, it was alleged that the Sergeant failed to comply with a general order, left his duty assignment without being properly relieved or without proper authorization, left his district of assignment and failed to obtain authorization to leave his district of assignment. Also, it was alleged that the Sergeant failed to notify OEMC that he initiated the pursuit of a vehicle, was involved in an unauthorized vehicle pursuit and failed to properly document his involvement in the vehicle pursuit of a stolen vehicle, failed to make immediate notification to OEMC about the traffic accident, failed to obtain immediate medical attention for the Complainant, failed to complete a vehicle pursuit report after the incident, gave an inaccurate account of his involvement in the pursuit of the stolen vehicle, and gave an inaccurate account involving his actions. It was further alleged that on September 23, 2004, the Sergeant submitted an inaccurate report regarding his involvement in the vehicle pursuit, and submitted an inaccurate report regarding his actions related to the traffic accident. Finally, it was alleged that during his formal deposition on September 14, 2006, the Sergeant gave inconsistent testimony regarding his involvement in a vehicle pursuit in that he was not involved in a vehicle pursuit and that he never told an investigator that he was in the parking lot prior to the

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

June 2015

accident. The Officer was alleged to have failed to comply with a general order, left his duty assignment without being properly relieved or without proper authorization, was involved in an unauthorized vehicle pursuit, failed to notify a supervisor of the vehicle pursuit and failed to properly document his involvement in the pursuit of a stolen vehicle. It was further alleged that the Officer failed to notify OEMC that he initiated a pursuit of a vehicle, failed to make an immediate notification to OEMC about the traffic accident, failed to provide immediate medical attention to the Complainant, failed to complete a vehicle pursuit report after the incident, and provided an inaccurate account of his involvement in the pursuit of the stolen vehicle. Also, on September 23, 2004, it was alleged that the Officer submitted an inaccurate report regarding his involvement of the vehicle pursuit. In addition, it was alleged that the Officer submitted an inaccurate report regarding his actions related to the traffic accident. Finally, it was alleged that during the Officer's formal deposition on September 14, 2006, he gave inconsistent testimony regarding his involvement in a vehicle pursuit by stating he was not involved in a vehicle pursuit and that he was never in the parking lot prior to the accident.

Finding: During mediation, the Sergeant and the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **90-day suspension** for all allegations.