Abstracts of Sustained Cases

August 2016

Log# 1066466

Notification Date: December 6, 2013

Location: 7th District

Complaint Type: Misdemeanor Arrest

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 41, Off-Duty, Civilian Uniform,

Year of Appointment – 1996

Subject 1: Female/Black, 40

Summary: In an incident involving Officer A, it was alleged that Officer A

committed domestic battery resulting in Officer A's arrest.

Finding(s): Based on the arrest report; police reports; incident scene

photographs; OEMC transmissions; and department rules and

general orders, IPRA recommends the following:

Officer A:

- Allegation 1: Struck Subject 1 about the face during a domestic altercation
 - Pursuant to Section 3.4 of the Uniform Peace Officers' Disciplinary Act, this allegation could not be further investigated due to no signed affidavit.
- Allegation 2: Forced his way into Subject 1's unit
 - Pursuant to Section 3.4 of the Uniform Peace Officers' Disciplinary Act, this allegation could not be further investigated due to no signed affidavit.
- Allegation 3: Broke down Subject 1's bathroom door
 - Pursuant to Section 3.4 of the Uniform Peace Officers' Disciplinary Act, this allegation could not be further investigated due to no signed affidavit.
- Allegation 4: Resisted arrest by refusing to follow repeated commands to show his hands
 - Pursuant to Section 3.4 of the Uniform Peace Officers' Disciplinary Act, this allegation could not be further investigated due to no signed affidavit.
- Allegation 5: Arrested and Charged with assault
 - A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 6: Intoxicated while off-duty
 - A finding of Sustained

During mediation, Officer A agreed to accept IPRA's penalty of a **2-DAY SUSPENSION** for the Sustained allegations.

Notification Date: December 22, 2013

Location: 6th District

Complaint Type: Firearm Discharge with Hits – On-Duty

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Hispanic, 38, On-Duty, In-Uniform,

Year of Appointment – 2006

Officer B: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 33, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year

of Appointment – 2004

Subject 1: Male/Black, 18

Subject 2: Male/Black, 18

Summary: In an incident involving Officers A and B and other officers, it was

alleged that Officer A used deadly force by firing his weapon 16 times at a moving car in order to stop its driver from running over a citizen whom Officer A believed was being dragged. In addition, it was alleged that Officer B failed to complete and submit a Tactical

Response Report (TRR) regarding his use of force during an encounter with one of the youths that was arrested during this

incident.

Finding(s): Based on the in-car camera video recording; department rules;

general orders; and statements to IPRA from the accused and witness officers, subjects, and witnesses, IPRA recommends the

following:

Officer A: • Allegation 1: Used deadly force in violation of General Order

03-02-03, II, B & III, C; and in violation of Rule 2

A finding of Sustained

Allegation 2: Unlawfully and unnecessarily discharged his
 weapon into a vehicle that was moving away from him, in

weapon into a vehicle that was moving away from him, in

violation of Rule 38

o A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **SEPARATION** was recommended for the Sustained

allegations.

Officer B:
• Allegation 1: Failed to complete and submit a TRR reporting his

use of force during his encounter with a witness in violation of

Rule 6

A finding of Unfounded

Notification Date: June 19, 2014
Location: 10th District
Complaint Type: Excessive Force

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Hispanic, 37, On-Duty, In-Uniform,

Year of Appointment – 2007

Officer B: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 35, Unknown if On-Duty,

Civilian Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2006

Subject 1: Male/Black, 21

Summary: In an incident where Subject 1 was detained by Officers A and B, a

physical altercation ensued as the Officers attempted to place Subject 1 into custody. Subsequently Subject 1 was placed into custody. It was further alleged that the Officers directed profanities

to Subject 1's family.

Finding(s): Based on the incident reports, Subject 1 pleading guilty to a

narcotics offence, a general order, and statements to IPRA from the accused officers, subject, and witnesses, IPRA recommends the

following:

Officer A:

- Allegation 1: Choked Subject 1 while he was handcuffed in violation of Rule 8
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 2: Slammed Subject 1's head onto a police vehicle in violation of Rule 8
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 3: Threw Subject 1 to the ground in violation of Rule
 - A finding of Exonerated
- Allegation 4: Directed profanities at Subject 1's family in violation of Rule 2
 - A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 5: Struck Subject 1 about the chest with a closed fist in violation of Rule 8
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 6: Unnecessarily pointed his weapon at Subject 1's family in violation of Rule 38
 - A finding of Not Sustained

A penalty of **A 1-DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the Sustained allegation.

Officer B:

- Allegation 1: Choked Subject 1 while he was handcuffed in violation of Rule 8
 - o A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 2: Slammed Subject 1's head onto a police vehicle in violation of Rule 8
 - o A finding of Unfounded
- Allegation 3: Threw Subject 1 to the ground in violation of Rule
 - o A finding of Unfounded
- Allegation 4: Directed profanities at Subject 1's family in violation of Rule 2
 - A finding of Unfounded
- Allegation 5: Struck Subject 1 about the chest with a closed fist in violation of Rule 8
 - o A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 6: Unnecessarily pointed his weapon at Subject 1's family in violation of Rule 38
 - o A finding of Not Sustained

Log# 1075057

Notification Date: May 7, 2015

Location: Multiple Districts

Complaint Type: Domestic

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Hispanic, 37, Off-Duty, Not In-Uniform,

Year of Appointment – 2002

Subject 1: Female/White, 31

Summary: In an incident involving Officer A, it was alleged that Officer A used

his office to locate and obtain information regarding a civilian friend of Subject 1; drove his personal vehicle to place of residence of said civilian and photograph himself making a threatening

gesture towards the residence; verbally harassed, threatened and directed profanities at Subject 1 in person and via email and text message, including making threats against her friends and family members, and making several derogatory racial comments; made a

false report in verifying documents to a court of law which

contained statements he knew to be untrue; physically attacked Subject 1 in his personal vehicle and threatened to end his own life; placed Subject 1 in danger by pulling his weapon in his personal vehicle and informing her that it did not have a safety; coerced

Subject 1 into disclosing information about her friends and past relationships; illegally accessed Subject 1's computer; threatened to kill himself and other in the event he lost his job; pinned Subject 1 and prevented her from moving; threatened to call authorities and make false statements in order to have Subject 1 removed from his apartment and their son removed from her care; told Subject 1 she should end her own life; threatened to have Subject 1 physically attacked once she was no longer pregnant with their child; threatened to rape Subject 1's sister and her sister's roommates; stalked Subject 1 and sent her pictures of himself in his vehicle in different location; and attempted to coerce Subject 1 to terminate IPRA's investigation into these allegations.

Finding(s):

Based on department rules, general orders, and special orders; statements to IPRA from the subject; statements to IPRA from the accused officer; text messages and photographs provided by the subject; and an investigation into Officer A's use of LEADS, IPRA recommends the following:

Officer A:

- Allegation 1, Count 1: Violated the law when he conducted one or more LEADS investigations for personal purposes
 - A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 1, Count 2: Violated the law when he conducted one or more LEADS investigations for personal purposes
 - A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 1, Count 3: Disobeyed an order or directive when he conducted one or more LEADS investigations for personal purposes
 - A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 1, Count 4: Used his office for personal gain or influence when he conducted on or more LEADS investigations for personal purposes
 - A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 2: Disrespected and mistreated Subject 1 by sending her a photograph of himself making a threatening gesture towards the place of residence of one of her friends
 - A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 3: Engaged in unjustified verbal altercations with Subject 1 when he repeatedly directed profanities towards her via text and email
 - A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 4: Engaged in unjustified verbal altercations with Subject 1 when he repeatedly made disparaging racial comments to her about African-Americans and other

nationalities to her via email and text message

- A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 5: Engaged in unjustified verbal altercations with Subject 1 when he repeatedly made threats against her and her family via email and text message
 - A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 6: Engaged in unjustified verbal altercations with Subject 1 when he repeatedly made threats against her friends via email and text message
 - A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 7: Engaged in unjustified verbal altercations with Subject 1 when he repeatedly made harassing remarks about her and her family via email and text message
 - A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 8, Count 1: Made a false written or oral report when he made a false report in verifying documents to a court of law
 - A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 8, Count 2: Violated the law when he knowingly provided false information to a court of law
 - A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 9: Engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Subject 1 when he grabbed her by her jacket collar and pinned her against a car door
 - A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 10: Engaged in an unjustified altercation with Subject 1 when he pulled his gun and threatened to kill himself
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 11: Engaged in an unjustified altercation with Subject 1 when he pulled his gun in close proximity to Subject 1 and informed her that it did not have a safety, placing her life in danger
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 12: Engaged in an unjustified altercation with Subject 1 when he coerced her into providing him information about her past relationships
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 13: Used his office for personal gain when he illegally accessed Subject 1's computer
 - o A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 14: Participated in actions which bring discredit upon the Department and engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with Subject 1 when he threatened to kill himself and others if he were to lose his job

- A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 15: Engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Subject 1 when he pinned her, not allowing her to move
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 16: Engaged in an unjustified altercation with Subject 1 when he threatened to make false statements to authorities to have her removed from his residence and their son taken away from her
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 17: Engaged in an unjustified altercation with Subject 1 when he posted a "countdown" on G-chat and left intimidating comments with the intention to cause emotional distress
 - o A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 18: Disrespected and mistreated Subject 1 and engaged in an unjustified altercation with Subject 1 when he told her the only weapon she needed was a noose around her neck so she could kill herself
 - o A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 19: Engaged in an unjustified altercation with Subject 1 when he told her he had several people ready to attach her once she was no longer pregnant
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 20: Engaged in an unjustified altercation with Subject 1 when he threaten to rape her sister and her sisters roommates
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 21: Engaged in an unjustified altercation with Subject 1 when he stalked her and sent her pictures from various locations to demonstrate he knew her whereabouts
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 22: Engaged in an unjustified altercation with Subject 1 when he attempted to coerce her into terminating IPRA's investigation into these allegations
 - o A finding of Not Sustained

A penalty of **SEPARATION** was recommended for the Sustained allegations.

Notification Date: December 5, 2015

Location: 5th District

Complaint Type: Excessive Force

Sergeant B: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 38, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year

of Appointment – 1998

Lieutenant B: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 42, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year

of Appointment – 1993

Lieutenant A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 44, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year

of Appointment – 1994

Lieutenant C: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Hispanic, 56, On-Duty, In-Uniform,

Year of Appointment – 1982

Sergeant C: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 42, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year

of Appointment – 1997

Sergeant A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 61, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of

Appointment – 1991

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 48, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of

Appointment – 1996

Officer B: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 38, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of

Appointment – 1999

Officer C: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 48, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of

Appointment – 1993

Officer D: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 49, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of

Appointment – 1997

Officer E: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 49, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of

Appointment – 1990

Detention Aide A: Detention Aide, Male/Black, 47, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of

Appointment – 1992

Subject 1: Male/Black, 42

Summary: In an incident where Subject 1 was arrested following a physical

altercation with his mother, Subject 1 was taken to the 5th District

station where his behavior was, at times, erratic and

uncooperative. The next morning, Subject 1 refused to cooperate and six Department members entered Subject 1's cell in an attempt to obtain his cooperation from a "display of force." At Sergeant A's request, Officer A discharged his taser. Then, the group of Officers used physical force to take Subject 1 to the floor and restrain him in handcuffs and leg shackles. Detention Aide A then removed Subject

1 from his cell pulling his handcuffs and dragging him. The other Department members followed and watched as Detention Aide A continued to drag Subject 1 down the a hallway.

After that, Detention Aide A called medical support to remove the taser probes, paramedics took Subject 1 to the hospital, and Officers D and E accompanied Subject 1 to the hospital. At the hospital, Subject 1 struggled violently with medical staff and officers and attempted to flee. Once the officers gained control of Subject 1, the medical staff administered a sedative to Subject 1. Subject 1 had a negative reaction to the drug causing his death later that day.

Finding(s):

Based on the 5th District lockup video recordings, civil suit depositions; Department rules; general and special orders; statements to IPRA from the accused officers and witnesses; and from the totality of circumstances, IPRA recommends the following:

Sergeant B:

- Allegation 1: Violation of Rule 6 in that he failed to follow the provisions of Special Order S04-20-01 and General Order G06-01-01 when he failed to bring Subject 1 for medical and/or mental health treatment
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **A 120-DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the Sustained allegation.

Lieutenant B:

- Allegation 1: Violation of Rule 6 in that he failed to follow the provisions of Special Order S04-20-01 and S06-01 when he failed to make medical and/or mental health treatment available for Subject 1
 - A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 2: Maltreated Subject 1 by allowing him to walk around the lockup area with his pants down
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 3: Failed to follow the provisions of Special Order 06-01 by not allowing Subject 1's father to see his son while Subject 1 was in custody
 - A finding of Exonerated
- Allegation 4: Violation of Rule 6 in that he failed to follow the provisions of General Order G04-09-02 regarding Exposure to Communicable Disease
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **A 28-DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the Sustained allegation.

<u>Lieutenant A:</u>

- Allegation 1: Knew Subject 1 needed medical and/or mental health treatment and refused to make it available for him
 - o A finding of Unfounded

Lieutenant C:

- Allegation 1: Knew Subject 1 needed medical and/or mental health treatment and refused to make it available for him
 - A finding of Unfounded

Sergeant C:

- Allegation 1: Failed to make medical and/or mental health treatment available for Subject 1
 - A finding of Unfounded
- Allegation 2: Used excessive force on Subject 1
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 3: Violation of Rules 3, 6, and 8 in that he failed to follow the provisions of General Order G06-01-01 when he failed to intervene when Detention Aide A physically maltreated Subject 1 by dragging him while he was handcuffed and shackled.
 - A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 4: Violation of Rule 22 in that he observed misconduct and failed to report it when Detention Aide A dragged Subject 1 from his cell and down the hallway while he was handcuffed and shackled.
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **A 28-DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the Sustained allegation.

Sergeant A:

- Allegation 1: Violation of Rule 6 in that he failed to follow the provisions of Special Orders S04-20-01 and S06-01 when he failed to make medical and/or mental health treatment available for Subject 1
 - A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 2: Violation of Rule 6 in that he failed to follow the provisions of Special Order S06-01-02 when he instructed Officer A to bring a taser into the lockup facility
 - A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 3: Used excessive force on Subject 1
 - o A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 4: Violation of Rules 3, 6, and 8 in that he failed to

follow the provisions of General Order G06-01-01 and Special Order S06-01 when he failed to intervene when Detention Aide A physically maltreated Subject 1 by dragging him while he was handcuffed and shackled

- A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 5: Violation of Rule 22 in that he observed misconduct and failed to report it when Detention Aide A dragged Subject 1 from his cell and down the hallway while he handcuffed and shackled
 - A finding of Sustained

IPRA would have recommended a penalty of **SEPARATION**; however, Sergeant A retired in 2014. Thus, IPRA recommends that the Department take any and all possible action to prevent him from future employment with the City of Chicago.

Officer A:

- Allegation 1: Used excessive force on Subject 1
 - o A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 2: Violation of Rules 3, 6, and 8 in that he failed to follow the provisions of General Order G06-01-01 when he failed to intervene when Detention Aide A physically maltreated Subject 1 by dragging him while he was handcuffed and shackled
 - A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 3: Violation of Rule 22 in that he observed misconduct and failed to report it when Detention Aide A dragged Subject 1 from his cell and down the hallway while he was handcuffed and shackled
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **A 28-DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the Sustained allegation.

Officer B:

- Allegation 1: Used excessive force on Subject 1
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 2: Violation of Rules 3, 6, and 8 in that he failed to follow the provisions of General Order G06-01-01 when he failed to intervene when Detention Aide A physically maltreated Subject 1 by dragging him while he was handcuffed and shackled
 - A finding of Sustained
- Allegation 3: Violation of Rule 22 in that he observed misconduct and failed to report it when Detention Aide A

dragged Subject 1 from his cell and down the hallway while he was handcuffed and shackled

A finding of Sustained

A penalty of A 28-DAY SUSPENSION was recommended for the Sustained allegation.

Officer C:

- Allegation 1: Used excessive force on Subject 1
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 2: Failed to intervene when Detention Aide A dragged Subject 1 from his cell and down the hallway while he was handcuffed and shackled
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- Allegation 3: Observed misconduct and failed to report it when Detention Aide A dragged Subject 1 from his cell and down the hallway while he was handcuffed and shackled
 - A finding of Not Sustained

Officer D:

- Allegation 1: Used excessive force on Subject 1
 - A finding of Not Sustained

Officer E:

- Allegation 1: Used excessive force on Subject 1
 - A finding of Not Sustained

<u>A:</u>

- **Detention Aide** Allegation 1: Violation of Rules 6 and 8 in that he failed to follow the provisions of General Order G03-02 when he physically maltreated Subject 1 by dragging him from his cell while he was handcuffed and shackled
 - A finding of Sustained
 - Allegation 2: Violation of Rules 6 and 8 in that he failed to follow the provisions of General Order G03-02 when he physically maltreated Subject 1 by dragging him down the hallway while he was handcuffed and shackled
 - A finding of Sustained
 - Allegation 3: Violation of Rule 2 in that by his overall actions and conduct he brought discredit upon the Department
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of a **90-DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the Sustained allegation.

Notification Date: July 01, 2016
Location: City of Chicago

Complaint Type: Accidental Taser Discharge

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Hispanic, 33, On-Duty, In-Uniform,

Year of Appointment – 2006

Summary: In an incident involving Officer A, it was alleged that Officer A

accidentally discharged his taser while responding to a "burglary in

progress." Officer A hit a wall with the taser and no one was

injured.

Finding(s): Based on a department general order; statements to IPRA from the

accused officer and witness officers; and department reports, IPRA

recommends the following:

Officer A:
• Allegation 1: Accidentally discharged his Department issued

taser

A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **A NOTED VIOLATION** was recommended for the

Sustained allegation.

Log# 1081377

Notification Date: July 9, 2016 Location: 16th District

Complaint Type: Accidental Taser Discharge

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 46, On-Duty In Uniform, Year of

Appointment - 1995

Summary: In an incident involving Officer A, it was alleged that Officer A

accidentally discharged his taser while performing a "spark test."

Officer A did not hit anyone when the taser discharges and no one

was injured.

Finding(s): Based on a department general order; statements to IPRA from the

accused officer and witness officers; and department reports, IPRA

recommends the following:

Officer A:

- Allegation 1: Accidentally discharged his Department issued taser
 - o A finding of Not Sustained

A penalty of **A NOTED VIOLATION** was recommended for the Sustained allegation.