

Independent Police Review Authority

Quarterly Report

January 1, 2013 – March 31, 2013

April 15, 2013

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, 2013 through March 31, 2013. The information contained in this report is accurate as of April 11, 2013. All of IPRA's public reports are available at www.iprachicago.org.

Quarterly Overview

During the first quarter of 2013, IPRA initiated 475 investigations. This includes the 87 investigations resulting from notifications of a Taser discharge. IPRA responded to 11 officer-involved shootings during the first quarter of 2013.

This past quarter, IPRA closed 509 investigations. The number reflects a slight decrease compared to last quarter. IPRA begins this new quarter having filled three vacant Supervising Investigator positions. IPRA will continue to work with the Mayor's Office and Budget Office to address filling positions as they become open.

During the first three months of 2013, IPRA completed 10 sustained investigations. Sustained cases were down during the first quarter of 2013 compared to the previous quarter. However, both the number of cases identified for mediation as well the number of officers who agreed to accept mediation more than doubled in both categories. There were 40 cases this past quarter identified where mediation was deemed appropriate and 34 officers agreed to accept. IPRA will continue to work with the Fraternal Order of Police to extend mediation to those cases where it is warranted, thus, leaving more investigative resources to close older cases.

Chief Administrator Ilana Rosenzweig announced to Mayor Rahm Emanuel and the IPRA staff that she will be stepping down from the position she has held since September 2007. The Chief has expressed her gratitude to the entire IPRA staff for their hard work and dedication in ensuring fair, thorough, and timely investigation.

IPRA Cumulative Figures

	INTAKE (all allegations/ notifications) ¹	IPRA Investigations Opened ²	IPRA Investigations Closed ³	IPRA Caseload ⁴
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 ⁵	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
2Q 2012	2155	693	747	2155
3Q 2012	2264	690	698	2147

¹ 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.

² 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.

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

⁴ 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.

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

IPRA Cumulative Figures (Continued)

	INTAKE (all allegations/ notifications)	IPRA Investigations Opened	IPRA Investigations Closed	IPRA Caseload
4Q 2012	1824	543	759	1925
1Q 2013	1828	475	509	1883

IPRA Investigations Opened by Incident Type⁶

	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
2Q 2012	440	9	5	12	23	188	3
3Q 2012	411	12	19	14	28	204	5
4Q 2012	328	8	14	13	26	149	4

⁶ 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.

IPRA Investigations Opened by Incident Type (Continued)

	IPRA (COMPLAINTS)	IPRA (NOTIFICATIONS)					
	INFO & CR	EXTRAORDINARY OCCURRENCE (EO)	HIT SHOOTING (U#)	NON-HIT SHOOTING	SHOOTING/ ANIMAL	TASER	OC DISCHARGE
1Q 2013	329	24	11	9	15	87	5

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

Between January 1, 2013 and March 31, 2013, IPRA issued 1828 Log Numbers. Of these Log Numbers, IPRA retained 476 for resolution. IPRA forwarded the remaining 1352 Log Numbers to the Internal Affairs Division of the Chicago Police Department for appropriate resolution.

Of the 476 Log Numbers retained by IPRA, IPRA classified 176 as Complaint Register Numbers. In addition, IPRA began Pre-affidavit Investigations for 153 of the Log Numbers retained by IPRA. The remainder of the retained Log Numbers consisted of 11 Log Numbers for shootings where an individual was hit by a bullet and a “U Number” was issued, 9 for shootings where no one was hit by a bullet, 15 for shots fired at animals, 87 for reported uses of tasers, 5 for reported uses of pepper spray,⁷ and 24 for Extraordinary Occurrences⁸.

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

Between January 1, 2013 and March 31, 2013, IPRA closed 509 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, 2013, there were 1883 investigations pending completion by IPRA. These include both allegations that have received Complaint Register Numbers, and those

⁷ 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.

⁸ These numbers include three Log Numbers classified as both a U Number and a Complaint Register; and two Log Numbers 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.

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 report⁹

Between January 1, 2013 and March 31, 2013, IPRA recommended that 167 investigations be closed as “not sustained.”

In addition, 129 cases were closed after a Pre-affidavit Investigation because the complainants refused to sign an affidavit. IPRA recommended that 67 investigations be closed as “unfounded,” and 4 be closed as “exonerated.”

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

Between January 1, 2013 and March 31, 2013, IPRA recommended that 10 cases be closed as sustained. Attached are abstracts for each case where IPRA recommended a sustained finding, and the discipline IPRA recommended.¹⁰

2-57-110(6): The number of complaints filed in each district since the last report¹¹

Between January 1, 2013 and March 31, 2013, IPRA received complaints of alleged misconduct based on incidents in the following districts, as follows:

District 01 = 62	District 07 = 105	District 14 = 40	District 20 = 17
District 02 = 117	District 08 = 104	District 15 = 88	District 22 = 55
District 03 = 74	District 09 = 83	District 16 = 53	District 24 = 47
District 04 = 72	District 10 = 77	District 17 = 26	District 25 = 62
District 05 = 95	District 11 = 107	District 18 = 67	
District 06 = 134	District 12 = 56	District 19 = 63	
	Outside City Limits = 44	Unknown location = 90	

⁹ 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.”

¹⁰ Abstracts for all investigations where IPRA has recommended a sustained finding can be found at www.iprachicago.org under the Resources heading.

¹¹ “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.

2-57-110(7): The number of complaints filed against each officer in each district since the last report¹²

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

Between January 1, 2013 and March 31, 2013, IPRA referred 1384 cases to other agencies as follows:

Chicago Police Department – Internal Affairs Division = 1352

Cook County State’s Attorney = 26

Federal Bureau of Investigations = 6

(See Attachment)

¹² This uses the same definition of “complaints” as the preceding section. 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 1-14: 1 complaint each
Members 15-16: 2 complaints each

District 002

Members 1-27: 1 complaint each
Members 28-29: 2 complaints each

District 003

Members 1-23: 1 complaint each
Member 24: 2 complaints

District 004

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each
Member 11: 2 complaints

District 005

Members 1-42: 1 complaint each
Members 43-46: 2 complaints each

District 006

Members 1-33: 1 complaint each
Member 34-38: 2 complaints each
Member 39: 3 complaints

District 007

Members 1-22: 1 complaint each
Members 23-24: 2 complaints each

District 008

Members 1-17: 1 complaint each
Member 18-19: 2 complaints each

District 009

Members 1-7: 1 complaint each
Member 8: 2 complaints

District 010

Members 1-40: 1 complaint each
Members 41-43: 2 complaints each

District 011

Members 1-18: 1 complaint each
Member 19: 2 complaints

District 012

Members 1-20: 1 complaint each

District 014

Members 1-9: 1 complaint each
Member 10: 2 complaints

District 015

Members 1-27: 1 complaint each
Members 28-29: 2 complaints each

District 016

Members 1-15: 1 complaint each
Member 16: 2 complaints

District 017

Member 1: 2 complaints

District 018

Members 1-11: 1 complaint each
Members 12: 2 complaints

District 019

Members 1-15: 1 complaint each

District 020

Members 1-9: 1 complaint each

District 022

Members 1-15: 1 complaint each
Member 16-17: 2 complaints each

District 023

Member 1: 1 complaint

District 024

Members 1-14: 1 complaint each
Members 15-16: 2 complaints each
Member 17: 3 complaints

District 025

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each
Member 11-13: 2 complaints each

Recruit Training (044)¹

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

Airport Law Enforcement Unit – North (050)

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

Airport Law Enforcement Unit – South (051)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Marine Unit (059)

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

Special Investigations Unit (079)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Finance Division (122)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Human Resources Division (123)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Education and Training Division (124)

Member 1-2: 1 complaint

Public Safety Information Technology (125)

Member 1: 1 complaint each

Professional Counseling Division (128)

Member 1: 1 complaint each

Special Functions Division (141)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Traffic Section (145)

Members 1-6: 1 complaint each

Member 7: 2 complaints

Records Inquiry Section (163)

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

Central Detention (171)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Bureau of Detectives (180)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Narcotics Section (189)

Members 1-13: 1 complaint each

Asset Forfeiture Division (192)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Gang Investigation Division (193)

Members 1-16: 1 complaint each

Member 17: 2 complaints

Bureau of Patrol – Area Central (211)

Members 1-7: 1 complaint each

Bureau of Patrol – Area South (212)

Members 1-12: 1 complaint each

Bureau of Patrol – Area North (213)

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each

Members 11-14: 2 complaints each

Troubled Buildings Unit (241)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint

Court Section (261)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Gang Enforcement – Area Central (311)

Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

Member 5: 2 complaints

Gang Enforcement – Area South (312)

Members 1-9: 1 complaint each

Gang Enforcement – Area North (313)

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

¹ These numbers include CPD members who are detailed to a District as part of their training, but are officially still assigned to Recruit Training.

Alternate Response Section (376)

Members 1-7: 1 complaint each

Member 8-9: 2 complaints each

Gang Enforcement Division (393)

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

Member 4-5: 2 complaints each

Crime Processing Unit – ET South (477)

Member 1: 1 complaint each

Central Investigations Unit (606)

Members 1-7: 1 complaint each

Major Accident Investigation Unit (608)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Bureau of Detectives – Area Central (610)

Members 1-12: 1 complaint each

Bureau of Detectives – Area South (620)

Members 1-7: 1 complaint each

Bureau of Detectives – Area North (630)

Members 1-9: 1 complaint each

Member 10: 2 complaints

Public Transportation Section (701)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Transit Security Unit (704)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

January 2013

Log/C.R. No. 1034408

On March 2, 2010, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on March 2, 2010 in the 2nd District, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Detective (Detective A) and Officer (Officer B). It was alleged that Detective A became combative towards Officer B and had to be restrained; directed profanities at Officer B; verbally abused Officer B; and by his overall actions brought discredit on the department. It was alleged that Officer B directed profanities at Detective A and attempted to provoke Detective A into a physical altercation. Based on statements from the accused members and witnesses, and department reports, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Detective A became combative towards Officer B and had to be restrained; directed profanities at Officer B; verbally abused Officer B; and by his overall actions brought discredit on the department. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that Officer B directed profanities at Detective A and attempted to provoke Detective A into a physical altercation. IPRA recommended a **ten (10) day suspension for DETECTIVE A.**

Log/C.R. No. 1018010

On June 22, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on June 22, 2008, in the 7th District involving three on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A through C). It was alleged that Officers A through C fired their weapons into a wall behind which the Subject was not clearly visible in violation of a General Order. Based on statements from the accused members and witnesses, Office of Emergency Management and Communications (OEMC), Illinois State Police (ISP), CPD, and medical reports, Evidence Technicians (ET) photographs, Forensic Services reports and video, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer B fired his weapon into a wall behind which the Subject was not clearly visible in violation of a General Order. Further, IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer A fired his weapon into a wall behind which the subject was not clearly visible in violation of a General Order. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that Officer C fired his weapon into a wall behind which the subject was not clearly visible in violation of a General Order. IPRA recommended a **three (3) day suspension for Officer B.**

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

January 2013

Log/C.R. No. 1031119

On October 19, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 17, 2009, in the 4th District involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A and B). It was alleged that Officer A engaged in improper verbal action while speaking with the Complainant; directed racially biased language at the Complainant; and failed to complete a Contact Card for Complainant. It was alleged that Officer B failed to complete a Contact Card for Complainant. Based on statements from the accused Officers, complainant, and witnesses, video and photographs, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer A directed racially biased language at the Complainant and failed to complete a Contact Card for Complainant. Further, IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer A engaged in improper verbal action while speaking with the Complainant. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer B failed to complete a Contact Card for Complainant. IPRA recommended a **seven (7) day suspension for Officer A** and a **written reprimand for Officer B**.

Log/C.R. No. 1046629

On July 2, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding three separate incidents involving one off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer (Officer A) and one on-duty CPD Sergeant (Sergeant B). It was alleged that on an unspecified date in 2008, that Officer A pushed the Victim. It was alleged that on November 14, 2010, that Officer A engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with the Victim and that Sergeant B failed to initiate a complaint log number. It was also alleged that on July 2, 2011, Officer A was arrested for Domestic Battery; failed to provide the Department with a current address; used Department equipment for Non-Departmental purposes; and was insubordinate in that he disobeyed a direct order given by Sergeant C. Based on statements from the accused members, the Victim and witnesses, OEMC, department, court, and phone records, ET photographs, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer A was arrested for Domestic Battery; failed to provide the Department with a current address; and used Department equipment for Non-Departmental purposes on July 2, 2011. IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer A pushed the Victim on an unspecified date in 2008, engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with the Victim on November 14, 2010 and was insubordinate in that he disobeyed a direct order given by Sergeant C on July 2, 2011. IPRA

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

January 2013

recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Sergeant B failed to initiate a complaint log number on November 14, 2010. IPRA recommended a **ten (10) day suspension for Officer A** and a **written reprimand for Sergeant B.**

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

February 2013

Log/C.R. No. 1050511

On December 5, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on December 5, 2011 in the 12th District involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant. It was alleged that the Sergeant accidentally discharged his weapon. Based upon a mediation, the accused Sergeant agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a **suspension of two (2) days**.

Log/C.R. No. 1027914

On July 3, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on July 3, 2009 in the 5th District involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer. It was alleged that the Officer verbally abused Complainants 1 through 5 during a traffic stop; improperly searched Complainants 1 through 5; conducted an improper search of the vehicle; and by his overall actions brought discredit on the department. Based on statements from the accused Officer, Complainants and witnesses, traffic and department records, IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegation that the accused Officer improperly searched Complainants 1 through 5. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the accused Officer verbally abused Complainants 1 through 5 during a traffic stop; conducted an improper search of the vehicle; and by his overall actions brought discredit on the department. IPRA recommended a **ten (10) day suspension for the accused Officer**.

Log/C.R. No. 1031087

On October 18, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on October 18, 2009 in the 21th District involving an off-duty Civilian Crossing Guard. It was alleged that the Civilian Crossing Guard punched the Victim about the body; pulled the Victim's hair; verbally abused the Victim; was intoxicated while off-duty; was arrested, charged and found Guilty of Battery; provided a false statement to IPRA; and by her overall actions brought discredit on the department. Based on statements from the Civilian Crossing Guard, Victim and witnesses, photographs, department reports, court and medical records, IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the Civilian Crossing Guard pulled the Victim's hair; verbally abused the Victim; and was intoxicated while off-duty. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the Civilian Crossing Guard punched the Victim about the body; was arrested, charged and found Guilty of

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

February 2013

Battery; provided a false statement to IPRA; and by her overall actions brought discredit on the department. IPRA recommended a **thirty (30) thirty day suspension for the Civilian Crossing Guard.**

Log/C.R. No. 1026190

On May 8, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on May 8, 2009 in the 22nd District involving three off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A through C). It was alleged that Officer A kicked in the door of Victim Officer B's residence and entered without justification; pointed a firearm at Victim Officer B without justification; struck Victim Officer B about the face and head; prevented Victim Officer B from calling 911 by smashing her telephone; failed to render medical assistance or call 911 on behalf of Victim Officer B; damaged Victim Officer B's residential property; was arrested for Domestic Battery, and subsequently pleaded Guilty to Aggravated Battery; and was ordered via cell phone at approximately 0800 hours to report to the 22nd District and subsequently did not arrive until 1145 hours. It was alleged that Officer C failed to make the necessary notifications regarding a crime in a timely manner and by his overall actions brought discredit on the Department. Based on statements from the accused Officers, the Victim and witnesses, ET photographs, department reports, OEMC transmissions, court and medical records, IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer A prevented Victim Officer B from calling 911 by smashing her telephone. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer A kicked in the door of Victim Officer B's residence and entered without justification; pointed a firearm at Victim Officer B without justification; struck Victim Officer B about the face and head; failed to render medical assistance or call 911 on behalf of Victim Officer B; damaged Victim Officer B's residential property; was arrested for Domestic Battery, and subsequently pleaded Guilty to Aggravated Battery; and was ordered via cell phone at approximately 0800 hours to report to the 22nd District and subsequently did not arrive until 1145 hours. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that Officer C failed to make the necessary notifications regarding a crime in a timely manner and by his overall actions brought discredit on the department. IPRA recommended **separation for Officer A from the Department.**

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

February 2013

Log/C.R. No. 1024914

On March 23, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on November 16, 2008 in the 9th District involving one on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant and twelve on-duty Officers (Officers A through L). It was alleged that the accused Sergeant improperly served a search warrant; pointed a gun at Complainant A and her family members; ransacked Complainant A's home; destroyed documents and property; took and subsequently failed to return or inventory a PlayStation II game cartridge and one hundred dollars; failed to properly document a strip search; and failed to promote the Department's efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals. It was alleged that Officer A conducted a strip search of Complainant A without probable cause and verbally abused Complainant A. It was alleged that Officer B pointed guns at Complainant A and her family members; searched Complainant A's home without justification; ransacked Complainant A's home; destroyed personal documents and property; took and subsequently failed to return or inventory a PlayStation II game cartridge and one hundred dollars; verbally abused Complainant A; and submitted a false Report to IPRA concerning the incident. It was alleged that Officer C pointed guns at Complainant A and her family members; searched Complainant A's home without justification; ransacked Complainant A's home; destroyed personal documents and property; took and subsequently failed to return or inventory a PlayStation II game cartridge and one hundred dollars; and conducted an improper strip search of Complainant B. It was alleged that Officers D through L pointed guns at Complainant A and her family members; searched Complainant A's home without justification; ransacked Complainant A's home; destroyed personal documents and property; and took and subsequently failed to return or inventory a PlayStation II game cartridge and one hundred dollars. Based on statements from the accused members, Complainants and witnesses, photographs, department reports, IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the accused Sergeant pointed a gun at Complainant A and her family members; ransacked Complainant A's home; destroyed documents and property; and took and subsequently failed to return or inventory a PlayStation II game cartridge and one hundred dollars. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the accused Sergeant improperly served a search warrant; failed to properly document a strip search; and failed to promote the Department's efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer A conducted

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

February 2013

a strip search of Complainant A without probable cause and verbally abused Complainant A. IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer B pointed guns at Complainant A and her family members; ransacked Complainant A's home; destroyed personal documents and property; took and subsequently failed to return or inventory a PlayStation II game cartridge and one hundred dollars; and submitted a false Report to IPRA concerning the incident. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that Officer B searched Complainant A's home without justification. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer B verbally abused Complainant A. IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer C pointed guns at Complainant A and her family members; ransacked Complainant A's home; destroyed personal documents and property; took and subsequently failed to return or inventory a PlayStation II game cartridge and one hundred dollars; and conducted an improper strip search of Complainant B. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that Officer C searched Complainant A's home without justification. IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officers D through L pointed guns at Complainant A and her family members; ransacked Complainant A's home; destroyed personal documents and property; and took and subsequently failed to return or inventory a PlayStation II game cartridge and one hundred dollars. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that Officers D through L searched Complainant A's home without justification. IPRA recommended a **fifteen (15) day suspension for the accused Sergeant, a ten (10) day suspension for Officer A, and a five (5) day suspension for Officer B.**

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

MARCH 2013

Log/C.R. No. 1025739

On April 23, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on April 23, 2009, involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Detective (Detective A), an on-duty CPD Sergeant (Sergeant B), and an on-duty Officer (Officer C). It was alleged that Detective A was intoxicated while off-duty; pointed his weapon at the Victim and threatened to shoot him; failed to pay a cab fare; was in possession of a firearm while off-duty knowing there was a likelihood of consuming alcoholic beverages; was arrested and charged with Theft and Aggravated Assault; and was convicted of committing a Theft and Aggravated Assault. It was alleged that Sergeant B failed to conduct a thorough log number investigation; failed to document an allegation that a department member threatened a citizen with a firearm; failed to document an allegation that a department member was intoxicated; failed to ensure that a Department member accused of intoxication was administered a breathalyzer; and failed to ensure that a case report be prepared that a Department member failed to pay a cab fare. It was alleged that Officer C improperly attempted to influence an investigation. Based upon statements from the accused, the Victim and witnesses, photo arrays and photographs, Department and OEMC reports, IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer C improperly attempted to influence an investigation. Based upon the evidence, IPRA recommended that all allegations against Detective A be **"SUSTAINED"**. Upon the rejection of a proposed mediated resolution at the Superintendent's direction, IPRA recommended **separation for Detective A from the Department**. Further, based upon a mediation, Sergeant B agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that he failed to ensure that a case report be prepared that a Department member failed to pay a cab fare and a **suspension of five (5) days**.