

# **Independent Police Review Authority**

## **Quarterly Report**

**January 1, 2012 – March 31, 2012**

**April 16, 2012  
Corrected**

This report is filed pursuant to Municipal Code Section 2-57-110, which requires the filing of quarterly reports. This quarterly report provides information for the period January 1, 2012 through March 31, 2012. The information contained in this report is accurate as of March 31, 2012. All of IPRA's public reports are available at [www.iprachicago.org](http://www.iprachicago.org).

### Quarterly Overview

In the past quarter, IPRA opened 620 investigations. Of these, 186 resulted from a notification of a Taser discharge. IPRA responded to 12 officer-involved shootings with an individual struck. During this quarter, IPRA closed 649 investigations. Thus, despite continuing hurdles due to vacant positions, IPRA was able to close more investigations than it opened. As of the end of the quarter, IPRA continued to have 6 investigator vacancies, 2 supervising investigator vacancies, and a vacant Director of Public Affairs position.

Further, this quarter continued the trend of IPRA completing increased numbers of sustained investigations. IPRA previously reported that in 2011 it sustained 70 investigations, a significant increase from prior years. In the first quarter of 2012, IPRA sustained 33 investigations. This increase reflects a year-long effort by IPRA to complete older sustained investigations that require significantly more work than other investigations and additional levels of review before being closed. As part of this effort, IPRA investigators were given goals for completing investigations and IPRA streamlined its internal review process for sustained investigations.

In addition, this reflects IPRA's increased efforts to use mediation to resolve allegations of misconduct. Seven of the sustained investigations were the result of mediation. In mediation, the accused officer acknowledges the policy violations and agrees with IPRA on the appropriate discipline. For those allegations of misconduct where the goal of discipline is to change behavior, acknowledgement of wrongdoing is a strong indicator that behavior will change. Mediation therefore benefits the disciplinary process by allowing for that acknowledgement and focusing on future conduct. In addition, it benefits both IPRA and the accused officer. IPRA can focus its limited resources on other investigations. The officer is able to resolve the allegations more quickly and without the time delay of a full investigation followed by the grievance process. In the coming year, IPRA will attempt to work with the unions representing CPD members to continue to increase the use and effectiveness of mediation.

IPRA also hopes that it will soon fill the Director of Public Affairs position. It has been more than a year since IPRA has hosted a community meeting or had the resources to engage in proactive outreach to the stakeholders in its process. The vacancy has also decreased IPRA's ability to provide information to the public, and has thus impacted the transparency to the public.

## IPRA Cumulative Figures

|            | INTAKE<br>(all allegations/<br>notifications) <sup>1</sup> | IPRA<br>Investigations<br>Opened <sup>2</sup> | IPRA<br>Investigations<br>Closed <sup>3</sup> | IPRA Caseload <sup>4</sup> |
|------------|--|---|---|----------------------------|
| Sept. 2007 | 746  | 216   | 162   | 1290                       |
| 4Q 2007    | 2273   | 613   | 368   | 1535                       |
| 1Q 2008    | 2366   | 590   | 554   | 1571                       |
| 2Q 2008    | 2436   | 640   | 670   | 1541                       |
| 3Q 2008    | 2634   | 681   | 667   | 1555                       |
| 4Q 2008    | 2337   | 699   | 692   | 1562                       |
| 1Q 2009    | 2384   | 657   | 687   | 1532                       |
| 2Q 2009    | 2648   | 755   | 651   | 1635                       |
| 3Q 2009    | 2807   | 812   | 586   | 1981                       |
| 4Q 2009    | 2235   | 617   | 654   | 1949                       |
| 1Q 2010    | 2191   | 640   | 561   | 2028                       |
| 2Q 2010    | 2626   | 868   | 832   | 2048                       |
| 3Q 2010    | 2591   | 942   | 835   | 2168                       |
| 4Q 2010    | 2127   | 746   | 681 <sup>5</sup>                              | 2233                       |
| 1Q 2011    | 2023   | 610   | 711   | 2132                       |
| 2Q 2011    | 2171   | 778   | 747   | 2159                       |
| 3Q 2011    | 2335   | 788   | 749   | 2173                       |
| 4Q 2011    | 2038   | 688   | 594   | 2237                       |
| 1Q 2012    | 1995   | 620   | 649   | 2210                       |

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to the IPRA Ordinance, certain events trigger an IPRA investigation even in the absence of an allegation of misconduct. The term “notification” refers to those events that IPRA investigates where there is no alleged misconduct.

<sup>2</sup> This number includes investigations opened and assigned to IPRA as of the end of the identified quarter. It does not include investigations “Re-opened” because of the settlement of litigation, new evidence, or the results of the Command Channel Review process.

<sup>3</sup> This number may include some investigations “Re-closed” after being Re-opened.

<sup>4</sup> The caseload number for periods prior to 3Q 2009 are the numbers that IPRA previously reported in quarterly reports. As discussed previously, due to a calculation error, over time these numbers became inaccurate. The caseload number for 3Q 2009 reflects the results of IPRA’s complete audit of pending investigations.

<sup>5</sup> The number of investigations closed and IPRA Caseload reflect a correction of numbers reported in a previous report.

**IPRA Investigations Opened by Incident Type<sup>6</sup>**

|            | IPRA (COMPLAINTS) | IPRA (NOTIFICATIONS)          |                   |                  |                  |       |              |
|------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|-------|--------------|
|            | INFO & CR         | Extraordinary Occurrence (EO) | Hit Shooting (U#) | Non-Hit Shooting | Shooting/ Animal | Taser | OC Discharge |
| Sept. 2007 | 195               | 4                             | 4                 | 3                |                  | 3     | 2            |
| 4Q 2007    | 572               | 18                            | 7                 | 1                |                  | 12    | 5            |
| 1Q 2008    | 475               | 16                            | 8                 | 12               | 18               | 31    | 16           |
| 2Q 2008    | 526               | 16                            | 15                | 8                | 21               | 45    | 9            |
| 3Q 2008    | 563               | 8                             | 14                | 10               | 20               | 52    | 13           |
| 4Q 2008    | 579               | 16                            | 14                | 7                | 24               | 35    | 24           |
| 1Q 2009    | 553               | 11                            | 9                 | 9                | 25               | 39    | 14           |
| 2Q 2009    | 624               | 15                            | 14                | 13               | 28               | 56    | 7            |
| 3Q 2009    | 657               | 21                            | 18                | 16               | 18               | 63    | 22           |
| 4Q 2009    | 495               | 19                            | 16                | 19               | 20               | 39    | 9            |
| 1Q 2010    | 482               | 13                            | 12                | 14               | 29               | 74    | 15           |
| 2Q 2010    | 505               | 16                            | 10                | 10               | 19               | 285   | 27           |
| 3Q 2010    | 576               | 15                            | 11                | 10               | 30               | 285   | 16           |
| 4Q 2010    | 470               | 7                             | 10                | 10               | 28               | 227   | 10           |
| 1Q 2011    | 377               | 17                            | 15                | 12               | 27               | 155   | 10           |
| 2Q 2011    | 471               | 9                             | 20                | 10               | 20               | 240   | 10           |
| 3Q 2011    | 460               | 15                            | 16                | 17               | 22               | 248   | 9            |
| 4Q 2011    | 420               | 10                            | 7                 | 14               | 20               | 210   | 6            |
| 1Q 2012    | 384               | 14                            | 12                | 10               | 13               | 186   | 3            |

2-57-110(1): The number of investigations initiated since the last report

Between January 1, 2012 and March 31, 2012, IPRA issued 1995 Log Numbers. Of these Log Numbers, IPRA retained 620 for resolution. IPRA forwarded the remaining 1375 Log Numbers to the Internal Affairs Division of the Chicago Police Department for appropriate resolution.

Of the 620 Log Numbers retained by IPRA, IPRA classified 155 as Complaint Register Numbers. In addition, IPRA began Pre-affidavit Investigations for 229 of the Log Numbers retained by IPRA. The remainder of the retained Log Numbers consisted of 12 Log Numbers for shootings where an individual was hit by a bullet and a “U Number”

<sup>6</sup> Note: A single investigation may fall into more than one Incident Type. For instance, an investigation may be both an Extraordinary Occurrence (EO) and a Complaint Register (CR). For this chart, the investigation is counted in all applicable Incident Types. They are counted only once, in the total Log Numbers retained by IPRA. As defined by ordinance, an Extraordinary Occurrence (EO) is a death or injury to a person while in police custody or other extraordinary or unusual occurrence in a lockup facility.

was issued, 10 for shootings where no one was hit by a bullet, 13 for shots fired at animals, 186 for reported uses of tasers, 3 for reported uses of pepper spray,<sup>7</sup> and 14 for Extraordinary Occurrences.<sup>8</sup>

2-57-110(2): The number of investigations concluded since the last report

Since January 1, 2012, IPRA closed 649 Log Numbers. A Log Number is considered closed when IPRA completes its work on the matter, regardless of whether the Police Department is still processing the results.

2-57-110(3): The number of investigations pending as of the report date

As of March 31, 2012, there were 2210 investigations pending completion by IPRA. These include both allegations that have received Complaint Register Numbers, and those being followed under a Log Number, as well as officer-involved shootings, and Extraordinary Occurrences.

2-57-110(4): The number of complaints not sustained since the last report<sup>9</sup>

Between January 1, 2012 and March 31, 2012, IPRA recommended that 136 investigations be closed as “not sustained.”

In addition, 176 cases were closed after a Pre-affidavit Investigation because the complainants refused to sign an affidavit. IPRA recommended that 27 investigations be closed as “unfounded,” and 2 be closed as “exonerated.”

2-57-110(5): The number of complaints sustained since the last report

Between January 1, 2012 and March 31, 2012, IPRA recommended that 33 cases be closed as sustained. Attached are abstracts for each case where IPRA recommended a sustained finding, and the discipline IPRA recommended.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> As of December 31, 2007, IPRA issued a Log Number for notifications of uses of taser, pepper spray, or for shootings where no one is injured only if it received a telephonic notification of the incident or there was an allegation of misconduct. As of January 1, 2008, IPRA implemented procedures to issue Log Numbers for all uses of taser and shootings, regardless of the method of notification. In addition CPD issued a reminder to CPD personnel to provide notification to IPRA. IPRA continues to issue Log Numbers for discharges of pepper spray at the request of CPD personnel.

<sup>8</sup> These numbers include two Log Numbers classified as both a U Number and a Complaint Register; one Log Number classified as both a U Number and a Notification; and one Log Number classified as both an Extraordinary Occurrence and a Complaint Register. These Log Numbers are counted only once in the total number of Log Numbers retained by IPRA, but included in the breakouts of all applicable incident types.

<sup>9</sup> The term “not sustained” is a term of art in police misconduct investigations. It is defined in CPD G.O. 93-3 as “when there is insufficient evidence either to prove or disprove allegation.” In addition, cases may be “unfounded,” which means “the allegation is false or not factual.”

<sup>10</sup> Abstracts for all investigations where IPRA has recommended a sustained finding can be found at [www.iprachicago.org](http://www.iprachicago.org) under the Resources heading.

2-57-110(6): The number of complaints filed in each district since the last report<sup>11</sup>

Between January 1, 2012 and March 31, 2012, IPRA received complaints of alleged misconduct based on incidents in the following districts, as follows:

|                   |                          |                       |                  |
|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| District 01 = 75  | District 08 = 114        | District 14 = 50      | District 20 = 31 |
| District 02 = 74  | District 09 = 86         | District 15 = 61      | District 21 = 22 |
| District 03 = 105 | District 10 = 44         | District 16 = 73      | District 22 = 63 |
| District 04 = 113 | District 11 = 113        | District 17 = 33      | District 23 = 25 |
| District 05 = 93  | District 12 = 30         | District 18 = 62      | District 24 = 41 |
| District 06 = 121 | District 13 = 27         | District 19 = 47      | District 25 = 76 |
| District 07 = 110 |                          |                       |                  |
|                   | Outside City Limits = 33 | Unknown location = 24 |                  |

2-57-110(7): The number of complaints filed against each officer in each district since the last report<sup>12</sup>

(See Attachment)

2-57-110(8): The number of complaints referred to other agencies and the identity of such other agencies

Between January 1, 2012 and March 31, 2012, IPRA referred 1388 cases to other agencies as follows:

Chicago Police Department – Internal Affairs Division = 1375

Cook County State’s Attorney = 13

---

<sup>11</sup> “Complaints” is defined as all reports of alleged misconduct, whether from the community or from a source internal to the Police Department, whether a Complaint Register number has been issued or not. This does not include, absent an allegation of misconduct, reports of uses of Tasers, pepper spray, discharges of weapons whether hitting an individual or not, or Extraordinary Occurrences. Districts are identified based on the district where the alleged misconduct occurred. Some complaints occurred in more than one District, they are counted in each district where they occurred. This list does include confidential complaints.

On March 4, 2012, Districts 19 and 21 ceased to function and were merged into Districts 23 and 2, respectively. The numbers reported here for Districts 19 and 21 are for complaints prior to those mergers. The numbers for Districts 23 and 2 include post-merger complaints.

<sup>12</sup> This uses the same definition of “complaints” as the preceding section and addresses the District mergers in the same way. Except as otherwise noted, if a member was assigned to one unit but detailed to another at the time of the complaint, the member is listed under the detailed unit.

**ATTACHMENT: COMPLAINTS AGAINST CPD MEMBERS BY UNIT**

**District 001**

Members 1-17: 1 complaint each

Member 18: 2 complaints

Member 19: 4 complaints

**District 002**

Members 1-16: 1 complaint each

Member 17: 2 complaints

**District 003**

Members 1-20: 1 complaint each

Members 21-24: 2 complaints each

Members 25-26: 3 complaints each

Member 27: 4 complaints

**District 004**

Members 1-26: 1 complaint each

Members 27-31: 2 complaints each

**District 005**

Members 1-22: 1 complaint each

Members 23-25: 2 complaints each

**District 006**

Members 1-43: 1 complaint each

Members 44-49: 2 complaints each

**District 007**

Members 1-26: 1 complaint each

Member 27: 2 complaints

**District 008**

Members 1-19: 1 complaint each

Member 20: 2 complaints

Members 21-22: 3 complaints each

**District 009**

Members 1-31: 1 complaint each

Members 32-33: 2 complaints each

**District 010**

Members 1-16: 1 complaint each

Member 17: 2 complaints

**District 011**

Members 1-16: 1 complaint each

Member 17: 2 complaints

**District 012**

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each

Member 11: 2 complaints

**District 013**

Members 1-8: 1 complaint each

Member 9: 3 complaints

**District 014**

Members 1-19: 1 complaint each

**District 015**

Members 1-12: 1 complaint each

Members 13-16: 2 complaints each

Member 17: 3 complaints

**District 016**

Members 1-17: 1 complaint each

Members 18-21: 2 complaints each

**District 017**

Members 1-9: 1 complaint each

Members 10-12: 2 complaints each

**District 018**

Members 1-28: 1 complaint each

Member 29: 2 complaints

**District 019**

Members 1-14: 1 complaint each

Member 15: 3 complaints

**District 020**

Members 1-14: 1 complaint each

Member 15: 2 complaints

**District 021**

Members 1-7: 1 complaint each

**District 022**

Members 1-14: 1 complaint each

Member 15: 2 complaints

**District 023**

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

Member 4: 2 complaints

**District 024**

Members 1-9: 1 complaint each

Member 10: 2 complaints

**District 025**

Members 1-15: 1 complaint each

Member 16: 2 complaints

**Airport Law Enforcement Unit – North (050)**

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

**Airport Law Enforcement Unit – South (051)**

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

**Marine Unit (059)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Finance Division (122)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Human Resources Division (123)**

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

**Education and Training Division (124)**

Member 1: 2 complaints

**Public Safety Information Technology (125)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**CAPS Implementation Office (135)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Special Functions Group (141)**

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

**Traffic Section Administration (145)**

Members 1-8: 1 complaint each

**Records Inquiry Section (163)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Field Services Section (166)**

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

**Evidence & Recovered Property Unit (167)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

Member 2: 2 complaints

**Police Documents Section (169)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Bureau of Detectives (180)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Youth Investigation Section (184)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Narcotics Section (189)**

Members 1-15: 1 complaint each

Member 17: 2 complaints

**Intelligence Section (191)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Gang Investigation Section (193)**

Members 1-19: 1 complaint each

**Asset Forfeiture Section (196)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Office of the Deputy Chief, Area 1 (211)**

Members 1-6: 1 complaint each

**Office of the Deputy Chief, Area 2 (212)**

Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

**Office of the Deputy Chief, Area 3 (213)**

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

**Office of the Deputy Chief, Area 4 (214)**

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

**Office of the Deputy Chief, Area 5 (215)**

Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

**Medical Services Section (231)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Gang Team Area 1 (311)**

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

Member 6: 2 complaints

**Gang Team Area 2 (312)**

Members 1-6: 1 complaint each

**Gang Team Area 5 (315)**

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

Member 6: 2 complaints

**Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) Unit (353)**

Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

**Alternate Response Section (376)**

Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

**Juvenile Intervention Support Center (384)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Gang Enforcement Section (393)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Forensic Services Unit – South (477)**

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

**FOP Detail (541)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Detached Services-Miscellaneous Detail (543)**

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

**Central Investigations Section (606)**

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

**Detective Division, Area 1 (610)**

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each

**Detective Division, Area 2 (620)**

Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

Member 5: 2 complaints

**Detective Division, Area 3 (630)**

Members 1-8: 1 complaint each

**Detective Division, Area 4 (640)**

Member 1: 2 complaints

**Detective Division, Area 5 (650)**

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

**Public Transportation Section (701)**

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each

**Transit Security Unit (704)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JANUARY 2012

### ***Log/C.R. No. 1017419***

On June 16, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding multiple incidents that started on June 2008 involving one off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer (Officer A) and one on-duty CPD Sergeant (Sergeant B). It was alleged that Officer A verbally abused complainant; physically maltreated complainant; threatened to shoot complainant; displayed his weapon without justification; engaged in conduct by his overall actions which brought discredit upon the Department; engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department by his overall actions when he encountered the complainant by chance a month after the initial incident; engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department when he had contact with a witness to a Complaint Register investigation; engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department when he drove past a witness's home; and provided false statements to IPRA. It was alleged that Sergeant B failed to initiate a complete and comprehensive investigation relative to the allegations of misconduct against a Department member; failed to obtain a Complaint Register number after being made aware of allegations of misconduct against a Department member; and provided a false statements to IPRA. Based upon statements made by the accused members, complainant and witnesses, OEMC transmissions, photographs and reports, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer A verbally abused complainant; physically maltreated complainant; threatened to shoot complainant; displayed his weapon without justification; engaged in conduct by his overall actions which brought discredit upon the Department; engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department by his overall actions when he encountered the complainant by chance a month after the initial incident; engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department when he had contact with a witness to a Complaint Register investigation; and provided false statements to IPRA. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that Officer A engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department when he drove past a witness's home. Further, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Sergeant B failed to initiate a complete and comprehensive investigation relative to the allegations of misconduct against a Department member; failed to obtain a Complaint Register number after being made aware of allegations of misconduct against a Department member; and provided a false statements to IPRA. IPRA recommended **separation from the department for Officer A** and a **thirty (30) day suspension for Sergeant B.**

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**JANUARY 2012**

### ***Log/C.R. No. 312270***

On April 12, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on April 12, 2006 in the 24<sup>th</sup> District. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer engaged in an unjustified physical altercation; was in possession of a firearm while impaired; and made a false statement to IPRA. Based upon statements by the accused member, complainant and witnesses, photographs, OEMC transmissions, and reports, IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for allegations that the officer possessed a firearm while impaired. Further, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** allegations that the officer engaged in an unjustified physical altercation and made a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended a **thirty (30) day suspension for the accused officer.**

### ***Log/C.R. No. 312979***

On May 16, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on May 16, 2006 in the 22<sup>nd</sup> District involving one off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer (Officer A), one on-duty CPD Officer (Officer B), and one on-duty CPD Lieutenant (Lieutenant C). It was alleged that Officer A engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with Complainant; engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Complainant; was intoxicated while off duty; failed to properly secure his service weapon; and whose overall conduct impeded the department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals and brought discredit upon the department. It was further alleged that Officer B was inattentive to duty by failing to report misconduct by a fellow officer; failed to complete a tactical response report; and whose overall conduct impeded the department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals and brought discredit upon the department. It was further alleged that Lieutenant C failed to conduct a complete investigation regarding allegations that Officer A was intoxicated off-duty; violated an order or directive in that she failed to obtain a Central Booking number for Complainant after releasing him without charges; gave a false report to IPRA; and whose overall conduct impeded the department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals and brought discredit upon the department. Based upon statements by the accused members, complainant and witnesses, reports, and witness statements, IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for allegations that Officer A engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with Complainant

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**JANUARY 2012**

and failed to properly secure his service weapon. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** allegations that Officer A engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Complainant; was intoxicated while off duty; and whose overall conduct impeded the department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals and brought discredit upon the department. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** allegations that Officer B was inattentive to duty by failing to report misconduct by a fellow officer; failed to complete a tactical response report; and whose overall conduct impeded the department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals and brought discredit upon the department. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** allegations that Lieutenant C failed to conduct a complete investigation regarding allegations that Officer A was intoxicated off-duty; violated an order or directive in that she failed to obtain a Central Booking number for Complainant after releasing him without charges; gave a false report to IPRA; and whose overall conduct impeded the department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals and brought discredit upon the department. IPRA recommended a **ten (10) day suspension for Officer A, a seven (7) day suspension for Officer B, and a thirty (30) day suspension for Lieutenant C.**

### ***Log/C.R. No. 1035477***

On April 16, 2010, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on April 16, 2010 in the 3<sup>rd</sup> District. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer was inattentive to duty and mishandled her Taser causing it to deploy. Based upon a statement by the accused and reports, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation. IPRA recommended a **"violation noted" for the accused officer.**

### ***Log/C.R. No. 1014256***

On February 18, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred on February 16, 2008 in the 4<sup>th</sup> District and on October 12, 2003 on an unspecified location. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer pushed the victim repeatedly; grabbed/pulled the victim's hair; pulled hair from the victim's scalp; placed his gun to the victim's head; threatened to shoot the victim; grabbed the victim and applied his body weight on her back; struck the victim's right hand with his gun; and punched the victim on her nose on a previous occasion. Based upon statements by the accused and victim, reports, OEMC transcriptions, medical records,

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**JANUARY 2012**

photographs and records, IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for allegations that the officer pushed the victim repeatedly; grabbed/pulled the victim's hair; pulled hair from the victim's scalp; placed his gun to the victim's head; threatened to shoot the victim; grabbed the victim and applied his body weight on her back; struck the victim's right hand with his gun. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer and punched the victim on her nose on a previous occasion. IPRA recommended a **twenty-five (25) day suspension for the accused officer.**

### ***Log/C.R. No. 1002752***

On January 16, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on January 16, 2007 in the 4<sup>th</sup> District involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A and B). It was alleged that Officer A physically abused Victim A; struck Victim B about the body; placed her (Officer A) hand on her (Officer A) gun and verbally threatened Victim B; left a threatening voice message on Victim B's cellular telephone; pushed Victim C to the floor; kicked Victim C; threw flower plants and vases at Victim B; left her assigned job without authorization; and left her assigned district without authorization. It was alleged that Officer B left his assigned job without authorization and left his assigned district without authorization. Based upon statements by the accused members, one of the victims, one of the witnesses, a voice recording, 911 recordings, and reports, IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that Officer A physically abused Victim A. IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for allegations that Officer A struck Victim B about the body; placed her (Officer A) hand on her (Officer A) gun and verbally threatened Victim B; pushed Victim C to the floor; kicked Victim C; and threw flower plants and vases at Victim B. Further, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer A left a threatening voice message on Victim B's cellular telephone; left her assigned job without authorization; and left her assigned district without authorization. Further, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** allegations that Officer B left his assigned job and district without authorization. IPRA recommended a **twenty (20) day suspension for Officer A** and a **five (5) day suspension for Officer B.**

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**FEBRUARY 2012**

### ***Log/C.R. No. 1010320***

On October 22, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred on October 21, 2007 in the 3<sup>rd</sup> District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer (Officer A) and an on-duty CPD officer (Officer B). It was alleged that Officer A was insubordinate towards a superior; physically maltreated Officer B; directed profanities at Officer B; committed a Battery which resulted in her subsequent arrest; and brought discredit upon the Department due to her overall conduct. It was alleged that Officer B physically maltreated Officer A during the course of her arrest and verbally abused Officer A. Based upon statements by the accused members and witnesses, 911 recordings, medical records, reports and photographs, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer A was insubordinate towards a superior; physically maltreated Officer B; directed profanities at Officer B; committed a Battery which resulted in her subsequent arrest; and brought discredit upon the Department due to her overall conduct. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for allegations that Officer B physically maltreated Officer A during the course of her arrest. IPRA recommended a finding of **"EXONERATED"** for allegations that Officer B verbally abused Officer A. IPRA recommended **separation from the department for Officer A.**

### ***Log/C.R. No. 1020924***

On October 17, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding multiple incidents that occurred between November 2005 and October 2008 in the 1<sup>st</sup> District and East Chicago, Indiana. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer pointed his firearm at the complainant; threatened her; forced her to perform oral copulation at gunpoint; took their sons from the complainant's residence without permission; left his District of assignment without proper authorization; used his official position for personal gain; made false reports by submitting time records claiming he worked during a holiday for which he was not present for his entire tour of duty; and verbally abused and battered the complainant about the abdomen when she was pregnant. Based upon statements by the accused officer and complainant, police and court records, and reports, IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for allegations that the officer pointed his firearm at complainant; threatened her; forced her to perform oral copulation at gunpoint; and took their sons from the complainant's residence without permission. Further, IPRA

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**FEBRUARY 2012**

recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for allegations that the officer used his official position for personal gain or influence and verbally abused and battered the complainant about the abdomen while she was pregnant. Further, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** allegations that the officer left his District of assignment without proper permission and made false reports by submitting time records claiming he worked during a holiday for which he was not present for his entire tour of duty. IPRA recommended a **twenty (20) day suspension for the accused officer.**

### ***Log/C.R. No. 1009954***

On October 8, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred on October 8, 2007 in the 16<sup>th</sup> District with subsequent incidents continuing through April 2008. It was alleged that a Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer used departmental resources to access Complainant A's personal information; used departmental resources to access Complainant B's personal information; verbally maltreated Complainant B in October 2007 regarding her involvement with Complainant A; verbally maltreated Complainant B while seated in court during a pre-trial hearing on an unknown date; verbally maltreated Complainant B while at a hospital in March 2008; verbally maltreated Complainant B in April 2008 regarding her statement at IPRA; and verbally maltreated Complainant B in April 2008 regarding an alleged accident involving Complainant B. Based upon statements by the accused officer, complainant, witness, department reports, and medical and CPD department records, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the accused officer used departmental resources to access Complainant A's personal information; used departmental resources to access Complainant B's personal information; verbally maltreated Complainant B in October 2007 regarding her involvement with Complainant A; verbally maltreated Complainant B while seated in court during a pre-trial hearing on an unknown date; verbally maltreated Complainant B while at a hospital in March 2008; verbally maltreated Complainant B in April 2008 regarding her statement at IPRA; and verbally maltreated Complainant B in April 2008 regarding an alleged accident involving Complainant B. IPRA recommended a **twenty (20) day suspension for the accused officer.**

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**FEBRUARY 2012**

### ***Log/C.R. No. 1013436***

On January 16, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that took place on January 16, 2008 in the 4<sup>th</sup> District. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer engaged in an unnecessary physical altercation; was intoxicated. Based upon statements by the accused officer and witness, photographs, court records, breathalyzer tests, and official reports, IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for allegations that the officer engaged in an unnecessary physical altercation. Further, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that the officer was intoxicated. IPRA recommended a **seven (7) day suspension for the accused officer.**

### ***Log/C.R. No. 311066***

On February 7, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards) regarding multiple incidents that arose first on August 20, 2005 continuing through July 18, 2006 involving a Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer. It was alleged that on February 6, 2006, the accused officer made numerous harassing telephone calls to the victim. It was alleged that on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0300 hours, the accused officer arrived uninvited to the victim's new unlisted address; shouted victim's name outside her residence causing a disturbance; verbally abused the victim; was intoxicated; made numerous harassing telephone calls to the victim; and left numerous harassing telephone messages to the victim. It was alleged that on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0700 hours, the accused officer arrived uninvited to her address; verbally abused the victim; grabbed the telephone from the victim's hand to prevent her from calling the police; pushed the victim; struck the victim; choked the victim; and was subsequently arrested. It was alleged that between February 9, 2006 through February 14, 2006, the accused officer made numerous harassing telephone calls to the victim and repeatedly told her over the phone not to show up in court against him. It was alleged that on February 26, 2006, the accused officer made numerous harassing telephone calls to victim's cellular phone and violated an Order of Protection. It was alleged that on March 1, 2006, the accused officer was arrested for violation of an Order of Protection. It was alleged that between April 19, 2006 and April 25, 2006, the accused officer made numerous harassing telephone calls to the victim and violated an Order of Protection. It was alleged that on May 2, 2006, the accused officer was arrested for violation of an Order of Protection. It was

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**FEBRUARY 2012**

alleged that between April 27 through May 5, 2006, the accused officer sent numerous harassing e-mails to the victim and violated an Order of Protection. It was alleged that on July 11, 2006, the accused officer violated an Order of Protection. It was alleged that on July 18, 2006, the accused officer was arrested for violation of Order of Protection. It was alleged that on August 20, 2005, the accused officer threatened to kill the victim. It was alleged that on August 24, 2005, the accused officer made numerous harassing and threatening telephone calls to the victim and her family members and left numerous harassing and threatening telephone messages. It was alleged that on December 2005, the accused officer showed the victim a handgun that he (the accused officer) said was untraceable and not registered. Based on statements from the victim and witnesses, official reports, medical reports, OEMC reports and transmissions, court records, phone records, voicemail and electronic messages, drug test results and photographs, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the accused officer arrived uninvited to the victim's new unlisted address on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0300 hours; made numerous harassing telephone calls to the victim on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0300 hours; left numerous harassing telephone messages to the victim on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0300 hours; arrived uninvited to her address on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0700 hours; grabbed the telephone from the victim's hand to prevent her from calling the police on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0700 hours; pushed the victim on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0700 hours; struck the victim on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0700 hours; choked the victim on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0700 hours; was subsequently arrested on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0700 hours; made numerous harassing telephone calls to victim's cellular phone on February 26, 2006; violated an Order of Protection on February 26, 2006; was arrested for violation of an Order of Protection on March 1, 2006; the accused officer made numerous harassing telephone calls to the victim between April 19, 2006 and April 25, 2006; violated an Order of Protection between April 19, 2006 and April 25, 2006; was arrested for violation of an Order of Protection on May 2, 2006; sent numerous harassing e-mails to the victim between April 27 through May 5, 2006; violated an Order of Protection between April 27 through May 5, 2006; violated an Order of Protection on July 11, 2006; and was arrested for violation of Order of Protection on July 18, 2006. IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the accused officer made numerous harassing telephone calls to the victim on February 6, 2006; shouted victim's name outside her residence causing a disturbance on February

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

### **FEBRUARY 2012**

7, 2006 at approximately 0300 hours; verbally abused the victim on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0300 hours; verbally abused the victim on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0700 hours; made numerous harassing telephone calls to the victim between February 9, 2006 through February 14, 2006; repeatedly told her over the phone not to show up in court against him between February 9, 2006 through February 14, 2006; threatened to kill the victim on August 20, 2005; made numerous harassing and threatening telephone calls to the victim and her family members on August 24, 2005; left numerous harassing and threatening telephone messages on August 24, 2005; and showed the victim a handgun that he (the accused officer) said was untraceable and not registered on December 2005. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that the accused officer was intoxicated on February 7, 2006 at approximately 0300 hours. IPRA recommended **separation for the accused officer from the department.** During the course of this investigation, the accused officer was discharged from the department as a result of a different matter.

## Abstracts of Sustained Cases

March 2012

### Log/C.R. No. 1002011

On December 15, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on December 15, 2006 in the 12<sup>th</sup> District involving a Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant (Sergeant A) and six off-duty Officers (Officer B through F). It was alleged that Sergeant A and Officer C physically maltreated Victims A through D; engaged in an improper verbal and/or physical altercation; failed to report information concerning a crime or other unlawful actions; failed to report a fellow member's misconduct; prevented Victims A through D from obtaining police assistance; failed to complete a Tactical Response Report regarding the incident; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department. It was alleged that Officer B physically maltreated Victims A through D; engaged in an improper verbal altercation; was in possession of a firearm while consuming alcohol in violation of a General Order; failed to maintain control of his weapon; failed to report information concerning a crime or other unlawful actions; failed to report a fellow member's misconduct; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department. It was also alleged that Officer D and F physically maltreated Victims A through D; engaged in an improper verbal and/or physical altercation; failed to report information concerning a crime or other unlawful actions; failed to report a fellow member's misconduct; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit on the Department. It was also alleged that Officer E engaged in an improper verbal and/or physical altercation; was in possession of a firearm that was not registered to him in violation of a General Order; failed to report information concerning a crime or other unlawful actions; failed to report a fellow member's misconduct; unnecessarily displayed a weapon; failed to complete a Tactical Response Report regarding this incident; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit on the Department. It was alleged that Officer G failed to report information concerning a crime or other unlawful actions; failed to report a fellow member's misconduct; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department. IPRA's investigation consisted of statements from the accused members, complainants and witnesses, video recordings, photographs, medical records, 911 calls, and departmental records. IPRA recommended a finding of **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that both Sergeant G and Officer C failed to complete a Tactical Response Report regarding the incident. Further, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that both Sergeant G and Officer C engaged in an improper verbal and/or physical altercation; failed to

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**March 2012**

report information concerning a crime or other unlawful actions; failed to report a fellow member's misconduct; prevented Victims A through D from obtaining police assistance; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department. IPRA also recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Sergeant G physically maltreated Victims A through C. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer C physically maltreated Victim D. IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that Officer B physically maltreated Victims A through D. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer B engaged in an improper verbal altercation; was in possession of a firearm while consuming alcohol in violation of a General Order; failed to maintain control of his weapon; failed to report information concerning a crime or other unlawful actions; failed to report a fellow member's misconduct; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department. IPRA recommended a finding of **"CLOSED-HOLD"** for all allegations against Officer D because he resigned and did not address the allegations against him. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that Officer E unnecessarily displayed a weapon. IPRA recommended a finding of **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that Officer E failed to complete a Tactical Response Report regarding this incident. IPRA recommended a finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that Officer E engaged in an improper verbal and/or physical altercation; was in possession of a firearm that was not registered to him in violation of a General Order; failed to report information concerning a crime or other unlawful actions; failed to report a fellow member's misconduct; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit on the Department. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that Officer F physically maltreated Victims A through D; engaged in an improper verbal and/or physical altercation; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit on the Department. IPRA recommended a finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that Officer F failed to report information concerning a crime or other unlawful actions; and failed to report a fellow member's misconduct. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that Officer G engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the department. IPRA recommended a finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for allegations that Officer G failed to report information concerning a crime or other unlawful actions and failed to report a fellow member's misconduct. IPRA recommended a **forty-five (45) day suspension for Sergeant A, thirty (30) day suspension for Officer B, twenty-five (25) day suspension for Officer C, thirty (30) day suspension for Officer**

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**March 2012**

**E, fifteen (15) day suspension for Officer F, and a five (5) days suspension for Officer G.**

### **Log/C.R. No. 311925**

On March 15, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards) regarding two incidents that occurred on February 11, 2006 in the 17<sup>th</sup> District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant. It was alleged that on February 11, 2006, the accused Sergeant behaved in a hostile, intimidating and inflammatory manner to Victim A and made a threatening comment referring to Victim A. It was later alleged that on March 24, 2006, the accused Sergeant verbally abused and threatened complainant Victim A; struck Victim A; kicked Victim A; shoved the Victim B; punched Victim C; charged towards Victim D in a hostile manner; and by his overall actions brought discredit upon the Department. Based upon statements by the accused sergeant, Victims and witnesses, police reports, photographs, medical records, and 911 calls, IPRA recommended a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that on February 11, 2006, the accused Sergeant behaved in a hostile, intimidating and inflammatory manner to Victim A and made a threatening comment referring to Victim A. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that on March 24, 2006, the accused Sergeant verbally abused and threatened complainant Victim A; struck Victim A; kicked Victim A; shoved the Victim B; punched Victim C; charged towards Victim D in a hostile manner; and by his overall actions brought discredit upon the Department. IPRA recommended a **twenty-five (25) day suspension for the accused sergeant.**

### **Log/C.R. No. 312890**

On May 11, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards) regarding an incident that occurred on May 10, 2006 in the 24<sup>th</sup> District involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A and B). It was alleged that Officer A squeezed the complainant's testicles; failed to inventory or return the complainant's keys; provided false information on an arrest report; failed to follow proper procedure in that he failed to secure complainant's vehicle after his arrest; and improperly searched the complainant's vehicle. It was alleged that Officer B handcuffed the complainant too tightly; failed to inventory or return the complainant's keys; provided false information on an arrest report; and failed to follow proper procedure in that he

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**March 2012**

failed to secure complainant's vehicle after his arrest. Based upon statements by the accused officers, complainant and witnesses, and OEMC and department records, and photographs, IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer A squeezed the complainant's testicles; failed to inventory or return the complainant's keys; and provided false information on an arrest report. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer A failed to follow proper procedure in that he failed to secure complainant's vehicle after his arrest. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that Officer A improperly searched the complainant's vehicle. IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer B handcuffed the complainant too tightly; failed to inventory or return the complainant's keys; and provided false information on an arrest report. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer B failed to follow proper procedure in that he failed to secure complainant's vehicle after his arrest. IPRA recommended **"Violation Noted" for both Officers A and B.**

### **Log/C.R. No. 1005098**

On April 22, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA, f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on April 21, 2007 in the 14<sup>th</sup> District. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) sergeant unnecessarily discharged his weapon; failed to properly secure his weapon; failed to remain on the scene; failed to make proper notifications; and failed to submit a Tactical Response Report. Based upon a statement by the accused sergeant, OEMC transmissions, photographs, department records, and laboratory reports, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the accused sergeant unnecessarily discharged his weapon; failed to properly secure his weapon; failed to remain on the scene; failed to make proper notifications; and failed to submit a Tactical Response Report. IPRA recommended **separation for the accused sergeant from the department.**

### **Log/C.R. No. 1005376**

On May 2, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA, f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred on May 2, 2007 in the 6<sup>th</sup> District. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer pointed his weapon at Victims A through F; kicked Victim C several times; kicked Victim A; punched Victim A; choked Victim B; threatened Victim A; directed profanities at Victims A through C; and

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**March 2012**

made a false statement to IPRA. Based upon statements by the accused officer, victims and witnesses, department reports, OEMC transcripts, medical records, photographs and depositions, IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that the accused officer pointed his weapon at Victims A through F and threatened Victim A. IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the accused officer kicked Victim A; punched Victim A; and choked Victim B. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the accused officer kicked Victim C several times; directed profanities at Victims A through C; and made a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended a **thirty (30) day suspension for the accused officer.**

### **Log/C.R. No. 1006073**

On May 28, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA, f/k/a the Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident that occurred in the 14<sup>th</sup> District involving two off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A and B), an on-duty Officer (Officer C), and an on-duty Sergeant (Sergeant D). It was alleged that Officer A kicked Victim A on the thigh and groin area; grabbed Victim A by his hair; struck Victim A's head/face against a vehicle; searched and moved Victim A's vehicle without justification; removed and used a disposable camera from the glove compartment of Victim A's vehicle; failed to return or inventory the disposable camera belonging to Victim A; directed profanities and racial slurs at Victim A; was intoxicated while off-duty; urinated in public view; and violated state traffic law in that proof of insurance was not provided. It was alleged that Officer B snatched Victim A's cellular phone from his hand, grabbed Victim A's hand roughly and twisted it behind him; handcuffed Victim A too tightly; searched Victim A's vehicle without justification; directed profanities at Victim A; and was intoxicated while off-duty. It was alleged that Officer C failed to conduct a thorough traffic investigation; failed to secure Victim A's vehicle; and directed profanities at Victim B. It was alleged that Sergeant D was inattentive to duty in that he failed to interview all the witnesses and request an evidence technician and failed to ensure that a thorough traffic crash investigation was conducted. Based upon statements by the accused members, victim statements, departmental reports, witness statements, OEMC transmissions, and traffic citations, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer A kicked Victim A on the thigh and groin area; grabbed Victim A by his hair; struck Victim A's head/face against a vehicle; searched and moved Victim A's vehicle without justification; and urinated in public

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**March 2012**

view. IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer A removed and used a disposable camera from the glove compartment of Victim A's vehicle; failed to return or inventory the disposable camera belonging to Victim A; directed profanities and racial slurs at Victim A; and was intoxicated while off-duty. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that Officer A violated state traffic law in that proof of insurance was not provided. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer B snatched Victim A's cellular phone from his hand, grabbed Victim A's hand roughly and twisted it behind him; and handcuffed Victim A too tightly. IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer B directed profanities at Victim A and was intoxicated while off-duty. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that Officer B searched Victim A's vehicle without justification. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer C directed profanities at Victim B. IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer C failed to conduct a thorough traffic investigation. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that Officer C failed to secure Victim A's vehicle. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Sergeant D was inattentive to duty in that he failed to interview all the witnesses and request an evidence technician and failed to ensure that a thorough traffic crash investigation was conducted. IPRA recommended **separation for Officer A from the department, a thirty (30) day suspension for Officer B, a five (5) day suspension for Officer C, and a ten (10) day suspension for Sergeant D.**

### **Log/C.R. No. 1010031**

On October 11, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on September 13, 2007 in the 8<sup>th</sup> District. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer struck complainant in the face; directed profanities at complainant; failed to submit a Tactical Response Report; failed to ensure complainant received medical attention; gave false statements to the DEA, IPRA and/or at trial; brought discredit upon the department when he was indicted; and brought discredit upon the department when he was arrested. Based on statements from the accused officer, complainant and witnesses, court reports and transcripts, department records, medical records, and photographs, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the accused officer struck complainant in the face; directed profanities at complainant; failed to submit a Tactical

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**March 2012**

Response Report; gave false statements to the DEA, IPRA and/or at trial; brought discredit upon the department when he was indicted; and brought discredit upon the department when he was arrested. IPRA recommended a finding of **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that the accused officer failed to ensure complainant received medical attention. IPRA recommended **separation for the accused officer from the department.**

### **Log/C.R. No. 1011021**

On November 19, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on November 19, 2007 in the 11<sup>th</sup> District involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A and B) and two Detention Aides (Detention Aide C and D). It was alleged Officer A, Officer B, Detention Aide C, and Detention Aide D violated department orders when they failed to follow the guidelines for arrestee screening for Victim. Based on statements from the accused members and witnesses, department, medical and official records, drug test and OEMC reports, and photographs, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer A violated department orders when he failed to follow the guidelines for arrestee screening for Victim. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that the Officer B, Detention Aide C, and Detention Aide D violated department orders when they failed to follow the guidelines for arrestee screening for Victim. IPRA recommended a **three (3) day suspension for the accused officer.**

### **Log/C.R. No. 1014252**

On February 18, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on February 17, 2008 in Oak Lawn, Illinois involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused officer harassed complainant by following her to a business establishment and keeping her whereabouts under surveillance; was detained by the Oak Lawn Police Department where it was determined that he was intoxicated; operated a motor vehicle while intoxicated; and was in possession of a firearm while intoxicated. It was alleged that between approximately December 2007 and February 2008, that the accused officer harassed complainant by repeatedly following her. It was alleged that between February 17, 2008 and March 17, 2011, the accused officer gave false statements to IPRA and the Oak Lawn Police Department. Based on statements from the accused officer and witnesses, CPD and Oak Park Police Department reports, and drug

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

### **March 2012**

tests, IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the accused officer harassed complainant by following her to a business establishment and keeping her whereabouts under surveillance on February 17, 2008; and harassed complainant by repeatedly following her between approximately December 2007 and February 2008. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the accused officer was detained by the Oak Lawn Police Department where it was determined that he was intoxicated; operated a motor vehicle while intoxicated; was in possession of a firearm while intoxicated; and gave false statements to IPRA and the Oak Lawn Police Department between February 17, 2008 and March 17, 2011. IPRA recommended a **thirty (30) day suspension for the accused officer.**

### **Log/C.R. No. 1015651**

On April 10, 2008 a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on April 10, 2008, involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Members, Officer (Officer A) and Detective (Detective B). It was alleged that Officer A punched Detective B in the face; shoved Detective B; and by his overall actions brought discredit on the department. It was alleged that Detective B punched Officer A about his body; verbally abused Officer A; and made a verbally abusive comment directed at Officer A regarding people with disabilities. Based on statements from the accused members and witnesses, department and medical reports, and photographs, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer A punched Detective B in the face and by his overall actions brought discredit on the department. IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer A shoved Detective B. IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Detective B punched Officer A about his body; verbally abused Officer A; and made a verbally abusive comment directed at Officer A regarding people with disabilities. IPRA recommended a **five (5) day suspension for Officer A.** Officer A retired prior to the completion of IPRA's investigation.

### **Log/C.R. No. 1020690**

On October 10, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 10, 2008 in the 4<sup>th</sup> District. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer physically abused the Victim; was arrested for domestic battery; pushed the Victim; grabbed and/or choked the Victim; struck the Victim about her face and body; and gave a false statement to IPRA. Based on statements

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

### **March 2012**

from the accused officer and Victim, department reports, OEMC transcriptions and reports, medical records, photographs, court records, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the accused officer physically abused the Victim; was arrested for domestic battery; pushed the Victim; grabbed and/or choked the Victim; struck the Victim about her face and body; and gave a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended **separation for the accused officer from the department.**

#### **Log/C.R. No. 1021122**

On October 25, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 25, 2008 in the 4<sup>th</sup> District involving three on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A, B and C). It was alleged that an Officer A was inattentive to duty in that he failed to secure a shotgun; and was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged a shotgun. It was alleged that an Officer B was inattentive to duty in that he failed to secure a shotgun. It was alleged that an Officer C was inattentive to duty in that he failed to secure a shotgun. Based on a mediation, Officers A, B, and C agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for all allegations and a **written reprimand.**

#### **Log/C.R. No. 1023369**

On January 26, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that took place in the 5<sup>th</sup> District Station involving six on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A through F), an on-duty Captain (Captain G), an on-duty Lieutenant (Lieutenant H), two on-duty Sergeants (Sergeants I and J), and on-duty Detention Aide. It was alleged that Captain G failed to perform his duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. It was alleged that Officer A failed to perform her duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. It was alleged that Lieutenant H failed to perform his duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met and failed as a supervisor, to ensure his subordinate staff complied with policy. It was alleged that Sergeant I failed to perform his duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met and failed as a supervisor, to ensure his subordinate staff complied with department policy. It was alleged that Officer B failed to perform her duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. It was alleged that Officer C failed to perform her duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. It was alleged that the Detention Aide

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**March 2012**

failed to perform her duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. It was alleged that Sergeant J failed to perform his duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met and failed as a supervisor, to ensure his subordinate staff complied with department policy. It was alleged that Officer D failed to perform her duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. It was alleged that Officer E failed to perform her duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. It was alleged that Officer F failed to perform her duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. Based upon statements by the accused members, departmental records, medical records, and photographs, IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that Captain G failed to perform his duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. IPRA recommended a finding of **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that Officer A failed to perform her duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that both Officers B through F, Lieutenant H, Sergeants I and J, and Detention Aide failed to perform their duty to ensure that the medical needs of an arrestee were met. Further, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that both Lieutenant H and Sergeants I and J failed as a supervisor, to ensure that their subordinate staff complied with department policy. IPRA recommended a **three (3) day suspension for Lieutenant H, a one (1) day suspension for Sergeants I and J, a two (2) day suspension for Officers B through F, and a written reprimand for the accused Detention Aide.**

### **Log/C.R. No. 1024565**

On March 10, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on March 10, 2009 in the 5<sup>th</sup> District. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant had an expired FOID card; discharged her weapon in violation of the department's policy on Deadly Force; impeded the subsequent investigation by tampering with evidence; and gave false statements to IPRA and CPD. Based on statements from the accused sergeant and witnesses, department reports, photographs, and OEMC recordings, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the accused officer had an expired FOID card; discharged her weapon in violation of the department's policy on Deadly Force; and gave false statements to IPRA and CPD. IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegation that the accused officer impeded the subsequent investigation by tampering

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**March 2012**

with evidence. IPRA recommended a **thirty (30) day suspension for the accused sergeant.**

### **Log/C.R. No. 1025475**

On April 13, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred on April 11, 2009, in the 18<sup>th</sup> District involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant (Sergeant A) and two on-duty CPD Officers (Officer B and Victim Officer C). It was alleged that Sergeant A made derogatory remarks about Victim Officer E in the presence of Officer B; made a racial remark about Victim Officer C and Victim Officer D in the presence of Officer B; and made a racial remark about Victim Officer E in the presence of Officer B. It was alleged that Officer B failed to report a fellow member's misconduct and provided a false statement to IPRA. It was alleged that Victim Officer C failed to report a fellow member's misconduct. Based upon statements by the accused officers, victims and witnesses, and department records, IPRA recommended a finding of **"SUSTAINED"** the allegation that Sergeant A made derogatory remarks about Victim Officer E in the presence of Officer B. IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Sergeant A made a racial remark about Victim Officer C and Victim Officer D in the presence of Officer B; and made a racial remark about Victim Officer E in the presence of Officer B. IPRA recommended a finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that Officer B failed to report a fellow member's misconduct and provided a false statement to IPRA. IPRA recommended a finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that Victim Officer C failed to report a fellow member's misconduct. IPRA recommended a **five (5) day suspension for Sergeant A and Officer B** and a **written reprimand for Victim Officer C.**

### **Log/C.R. No. 1026439**

On May 16, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that took place on May 15, 2009 in the 5<sup>th</sup> District involving two off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A and B). It was alleged that Officer A pushed complainant and punched complainant. It was alleged that Officer B failed to report a fellow member's misconduct. Based upon statements by the accused officers, the Victim and witnesses, and photographs, IPRA recommended a finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that Officer A pushed the Victim and punched the Victim. IPRA recommended a finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that Officer B failed to report a fellow member's

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**March 2012**

misconduct. IPRA recommended a **seven (7) day suspension for Officer A** and a **"Violation Noted" for Officer B.**

### **Log/C.R. No. 1027271**

On July 13, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on July 13, 2009 in the 8<sup>th</sup> District involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the Officer was intoxicated and intentionally discharged his weapon. Based on a mediation, the accused officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for all allegations and a **thirty (30) day suspension.**

### **Log/C.R. No. 1042917**

On January 23, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on January 23, 2011 in Hoffman Estates, Illinois. It was alleged that an off-duty officer pushed Victim, which resulted in his arrest for Domestic Battery; damaged property belonging to Victim, which resulted in his arrest for Criminal Damage to Property; and was intoxicated while off-duty. Based on a mediation, the accused officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for all allegations and a **two (2) day suspension.**

### **Log/C.R. No. 1043460**

On February 20, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on February 19, 2011 in the 3<sup>rd</sup> District involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officer A and B). It was alleged that Officer A accidentally discharged his weapon while attempting to holster his weapon; failed to immediately notify OEMC that he discharged his weapon; and dragged/pulled Victim A down the stairs. It was alleged that Officer B put a gun to Victim B's head; stepped on Victim B's stomach; stepped on Victim B's neck; and verbally abused Victim B. Based on statements from Officer B, a Victim and witnesses, department and OEMC reports, IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer B put a gun to Victim B's head; stepped on Victim B's neck; and verbally abused Victim B. IPRA recommended a finding of **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that Officer B stepped on Victim B's stomach. Based on a mediation, Officer A agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for all allegations and a **one (1) day suspension.**

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

### **March 2012**

#### **Log/C.R. No. 1044302**

On March 27, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on March 27, 2011 in the 11<sup>th</sup> District involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his weapon. Based on a mediation, the accused officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a **written reprimand**.

#### **Log/C.R. No. 1045517**

On May 19, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on May 19, 2011, in the 13<sup>th</sup> District involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused officer was inattentive to duty in that she accidentally discharged her taser. Based upon a mediation, the accused officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a "**Violation Noted**".

#### **Log/C.R. No. 1045833**

On June 2, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on June 2, 2011, in the 13<sup>th</sup> District involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the accused officer was inattentive to duty in that she accidentally discharged her taser. Based upon a mediation, the accused officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a "**Violation Noted**".