

# **Independent Police Review Authority**

## **Quarterly Report**

**July 1, 2013 – September 30, 2013**

**October 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 July 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013. The information contained in this report is accurate as of October 11, 2013. All of IPRA's public reports are available at [www.iprachicago.org](http://www.iprachicago.org).

### Quarterly Overview

During the third quarter of 2013, IPRA initiated 508 investigations. This includes the 110 investigations resulting from notifications of a Taser discharge. IPRA responded to 13 officer-involved shootings during the third quarter of 2013.

IPRA closed 692 investigations during the last quarter. This number is slightly up from the previous quarter. IPRA began the third quarter interviewing for the 5 vacant Investigator positions. IPRA continues to work with the Mayor's Office and Budget Office to address these key personnel issues.

IPRA completed 13 sustained investigations during the last quarter. The Mediation process continues to be a successful tool. There were 27 cases this past quarter identified where mediation was deemed appropriate and 24 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.

During this quarter, IPRA attended 34<sup>th</sup> Ward Alderman Carrie Austin's Town Hall Meeting on September 19 at the Sheldon Heights Church (11325 S. Halsted). IPRA joined First Defense Legal Aid for a community meeting in North Lawndale on August 1, 2013 at the Lawndale Christian Fitness Center (3750 W. Ogden) and in Englewood at "*Imagine Englewood if . . .*" (730 W. 69<sup>th</sup> Street). IPRA continued its outreach to elected officials, community residents, community based organizations, and faith based institutions in order to explain IPRA's role and its process. IPRA also attended the three scheduled monthly Police Board Meetings during the past quarter.

## IPRA Cumulative Figures

	INTAKE (all allegations/ notifications) <sup>1</sup>	IPRA Investigations Opened <sup>2</sup>	IPRA Investigations 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
2Q 2012	2155	693	747	2155
3Q 2012	2264	690	698	2147

<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 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
2Q 2013	2122	558	668	1754
3Q 2013	2032	508	692	1594

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

	IPRA (COMPLAIN T S)	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

<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.

**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
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
1Q 2013	329	24	11	9	15	87	5
2Q 2013	400	14	13	7	16	96	5
3Q 2013	344	14	13	5	14	110	8

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

Between July 1, 2013 and September 30, 2013, IPRA issued 2032 Log Numbers. Of these Log Numbers, IPRA retained 508 for resolution. IPRA forwarded the remaining 1524 Log Numbers to the Internal Affairs Division of the Chicago Police Department for appropriate resolution.

Of the 508 Log Numbers retained by IPRA, IPRA classified 156 as Complaint Register Numbers. In addition, IPRA began Pre-affidavit Investigations for 188 of the Log Numbers retained by IPRA. The remainder of the retained Log Numbers consisted of 13 Log Numbers for shootings where an individual was hit by a bullet and a “U Number” was issued, 5 for shootings where no one was hit by a bullet, 14 for shots fired at animals, 110 for reported uses of tasers, 8 for reported uses of pepper spray,<sup>7</sup> and 14 for Extraordinary Occurrences.

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

Between July 1, 2013 and September 30, 2013, IPRA closed 692 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

<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.

As of September 30, 2013, there were 1594 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>8</sup>

Between July 1, 2013 and September 30, 2013, IPRA recommended that 185 investigations be closed as “not sustained.”

In addition, 172 cases were closed after a Pre-affidavit Investigation because the complainants refused to sign an affidavit. IPRA recommended that 110 investigations be closed as “unfounded,” and 7 be closed as “exonerated.”

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

Between July 1, 2013 and September 30, 2013, IPRA recommended that 8 cases be closed as sustained. Attached are abstracts for each case where IPRA recommended a sustained finding, and the discipline IPRA recommended.<sup>9</sup>

2-57-110(6): The number of complaints filed in each district since the last report<sup>10</sup>

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

District 01 = 78	District 07 = 118	District 14 = 38	District 20 = 36
District 02 = 134	District 08 = 92	District 15 = 53	District 22 = 70
District 03 = 121	District 09 = 83	District 16 = 64	District 24 = 53
District 04 = 107	District 10 = 74	District 17 = 35	District 25 = 70
District 05 = 87	District 11 = 169	District 18 = 77	
District 06 = 126	District 12 = 54	District 19 = 78	
	Outside City Limits = 32	Unknown location = 13	

<sup>8</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>9</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.

<sup>10</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.

2-57-110(7): The number of complaints filed against each officer in each district since the last report<sup>11</sup>

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

Between July 1, 2013 and September 30, 2013, IPRA referred 1541 cases to other agencies as follows:

Chicago Police Department – Internal Affairs Division = 1524

Cook County State’s Attorney = 16

Federal Bureau of Investigations = 1

(See Attachment)

---

<sup>11</sup> 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 1-16: 1 complaint each

**District 002**

Members 1-30: 1 complaint each

Members 31-32: 2 complaints each

Member 33: 3 complaints

**District 003**

Members 1-31: 1 complaint each

Members 32-34: 2 complaints each

**District 004**

Members 1-25: 1 complaint each

Members 26-27: 2 complaints each

**District 005**

Members 1-16: 1 complaint each

Members 17-18: 2 complaints each

**District 006**

Members 1-34: 1 complaint each

Members 35-37: 2 complaints each

Member 38: 3 complaints

**District 007**

Members 1-45: 1 complaint each

Member 46: 2 complaints

**District 008**

Members 1-29: 1 complaint each

Members 30-31: 2 complaints each

**District 009**

Members 1-13: 1 complaint each

Members 14-15: 2 complaints each

**District 010**

Members 1-21: 1 complaint each

Members 22-25: 2 complaints each

**District 011**

Members 1-30: 1 complaint each

Members 31-34: 2 complaints each

**District 012**

Members 1-14: 1 complaint each

Members 15-16: 2 complaints each

**District 014**

Members 1-17: 1 complaint each

**District 015**

Members 1-11: 1 complaint each

Member 12: 2 complaints

**District 016**

Members 1-20: 1 complaint each

**District 017**

Members 1-14: 1 complaint each

**District 018**

Members 1-23: 1 complaint each

Member 24: 2 complaints

**District 019**

Members 1-22: 1 complaint each

Members 23-24: 2 complaints

**District 020**

Members 1-12: 1 complaint each

Members 13-15: 2 complaints

**District 022**

Members 1-21: 1 complaint each

**District 024**

Members 1-14: 1 complaint each

Members 15-16: 2 complaints each

**District 025**

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each



**Recruit Training (044)**<sup>1</sup>

Member 1: 1 complaint

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

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

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

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

**Special Investigations Unit (079)**

Members 1-2: 1 complaint

**Bureau of Internal Affairs (121)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Human Resources Division (123)**

Members 1-4: 1 complaint

Member 5: 2 complaints

**Education and Training Division (124)**

Members 1-3: 1 complaint

**Public Safety Information Technology (125)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Research and Development Division (127)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Professional Counseling Division (128)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS) Division (135)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Office of the First Deputy Superintendent (140)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Special Functions Division (141)**

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

**Traffic Section (145)**

Members 1-6: 1 complaint each

Member 7: 3 complaints

**Field Services Section (166)**

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

**Central Detention (171)**

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

**Forensics Services Division (177)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Youth Investigation Section (184)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

**Narcotics Section (189)**

Members 1-18: 1 complaint each

**Gang Investigation Division (193)**

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each

**Bureau of Patrol – Area Central (211)**

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

**Bureau of Patrol – Area South (212)**

Members 1-15: 1 complaint each

**Bureau of Patrol – Area North (213)**

Members 1-17: 1 complaint each

Members 18-20: 2 complaints each

**Medical Services Section (231)**

Members 1-2: 1 complaint

**Troubled Buildings Unit (241)**

Members 1-2: 2 complaints

**Forensic Services – Evidence Technician Section (277)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

---

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

**Gang Enforcement – Area Central (311)**

Members 1-8: 1 complaint each

**Gang Enforcement – Area South (312)**

Members 1-8: 1 complaint each

Member 9: 2 complaints

**Gang Enforcement – Area North (313)**

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Member 3: 2 complaints

**Canine Unit (341)**

Member 1: 1 complaint

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

Member 1: 1 complaint each

**Alternate Response Section (376)**

Members 1-8: 1 complaint each

Members 9-11: 2 complaints each

**Gang Enforcement Division (393)**

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

**Central Investigations Unit (606)**

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

**Bureau of Detectives – Area Central (610)**

Members 1-15: 1 complaint each

Member 16: 2 complaints

**Bureau of Detectives – Area South (620)**

Members 1-7: 1 complaint each

**Bureau of Detectives – Area North (630)**

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each

**Public Transportation Section (701)**

Members 1-7: 1 complaint

**Transit Security Unit (704)**

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**JULY 2013**

### ***Log/C.R. No. 1043958***

On March 14, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident that occurred on March 14, 2011, involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Officers A and B). It was alleged that Officers A and B both falsified the circumstances of Victim's arrest; were inattentive to duty in that the Victim escaped their custody; failed to report the escape of the Victim; struck the Victim with an unknown object; punched the Victim about the head; and forcefully pulled the Victim's handcuffs. Based upon a mediation, both Officers A and B agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a **suspension of twenty-one (21) days each.**

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**AUGUST 2013**

### ***Log/C.R. No. 1036882***

On June 4, 2010, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding domestic incidents involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer that occurred between June 3, 2010 and June 4, 2010 in the 5<sup>th</sup> District. It was alleged that the accused Officer slapped Victim A on the face and struck him on the head with her gun and verbally abused Victim B, her minor daughter, on June 3, 2010. It was further alleged that the Officer physically maltreated Victim A when she shot him with a gun; struck Victim A on the head with a gun; failed to secure weapons in her home; had an unauthorized and unregistered weapon in her home; and endangered the life her child by having an unsecured weapon in her home on June 4, 2010. IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the accused Officer slapped Victim A on the face and struck him on the head with her gun on June 3, 2010; verbally abused Victim B on June 3, 2010; and struck Victim A on the head with a gun on June 4, 2010. IPRA recommended a finding of **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that the accused Officer physically maltreated Victim A when she shot him with a gun on June 4, 2010. Based upon a mediation, the accused Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that she failed to secure weapons in her home; had an unauthorized and unregistered weapon in her home; and endangered the life her child by having an unsecured weapon in her home on June 4, 2010. The Officer agreed through mediation to accept a **suspension of fifteen (15) days.**

### ***Log/C.R. No. 1028126***

On July 13, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding a domestic incident involving two off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers (Complainant Officer A and Complainant Officer B) that occurred on July 13<sup>th</sup>, 2009 in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> Districts. It was alleged that Complainant Officer A engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Complainant Officer B, in that he struck or punched her on the chest, neck, back and face; removed Complainant Officer B's duty weapon, money and car keys from the residence without authorization; left three minor children without care and adult supervision; and brought discredit upon the Department in that he was arrested for Theft and for Contributing to the Neglect of a Child. It was alleged that Complainant Officer B engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Complainant Officer A in that she punched him on the head and struck him on the face; attempted to prevent Complainant Officer A from reporting the incident; and brought discredit upon the Department in that she was

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**AUGUST 2013**

arrested for Domestic Battery. Based on statements from the accused Officers, witnesses, photographs, Department reports, and Court, OEMC and medical records, IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that Complainant Officer A left three minor children without care and adult supervision. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Complainant Officer A engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Complainant Officer B in that he struck or punched her on the chest, neck, back and face; removed Complainant Officer B's duty weapon, money and car keys from the residence without authorization; and brought discredit upon the Department in that he was arrested for Theft and for Contributing to the Neglect of a Child. Further, IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Complainant Officer B attempted to prevent Complainant Officer A from reporting the incident. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Complainant Officer B engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Complainant Officer A in that she punched him on the head and struck him on the face; and brought discredit upon the Department in that she was arrested for Domestic Battery. IPRA recommended a **ten (10) day suspension for Complainant Officer A** and a **five (5) day suspension for Complainant Officer B**.

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**SEPTEMBER 2013**

### ***Log/C.R. No. 1027778***

On June 29, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident involving one off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Police Agent (Police Agent A), two on-duty Officers (Officers B and C), and one on-duty Sergeant (Sergeant D) that occurred on June 29, 2009 in the 22<sup>nd</sup> District. It was alleged that Police Agent A pushed the Victim on the chest; grabbed the Victim by the arm; directed profanities towards the Victim; handcuffed the Victim too tightly; and threw Victim's mobile telephone to the ground. It was also alleged that Officers B and C failed to notify a supervisor when the Victim requested to file a complaint of police conduct. It was alleged that Sergeant D failed to take appropriate police action during the alleged incident. Based on statements from the accused members and the Victim, Department reports, ET photographs, OEMC and medical records, IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Police Agent A pushed the Victim on the chest; directed profanities towards the Victim; handcuffed the Victim too tightly; and threw Victim's mobile telephone to the ground. IPRA recommended a finding of **"EXONERATED"** for the allegations that Police Agent A grabbed the Victim by the arm. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officers B and C failed to notify a supervisor when the Victim requested to file a complaint of police conduct. IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Sergeant D failed to take appropriate police action during the alleged incident. IPRA recommended a **written reprimand for Officers B and C.**

### ***Log/C.R. No. 1031161***

On October 20, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Sergeant that occurred on October 20, 2009 in the 22<sup>nd</sup> District. It was alleged that the accused Sergeant failed to properly execute a search warrant at the correct address and failed to terminate entry before the CPD entry team members effected a controlled take down maneuver and handcuffed the homeowner. Based on a mediation, the accused Sergeant agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for all allegations and a **one (1) day suspension.**

### ***Log/C.R. No. 1047201***

On July 25, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident involving a off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officer that occurred on July

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**SEPTEMBER 2013**

24, 2011 in the 13<sup>th</sup> District. It was alleged that the accused Officer directed profanities at Complainants A and B; pointed a gun at Complainants A and B; and threatened to mace Complainant A. Based on statements from the accused Officer and Complainants, Department reports, OEMC records, and video surveillance, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that the accused Officer directed profanities at Complainants A and B; pointed a gun at Complainants A and B; and threatened to mace Complainant A. IPRA recommended a **ten (10) day suspension for the accused Officer.**

### ***Log/C.R. No. 1052314***

On March 5, 2012, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring on March 4, 2012 in the 14th District. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer was inattentive to duty in that she accidentally discharged a Taser. Based on statements from the accused officer and Department reports, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that the accused was inattentive to duty in that she accidentally discharged a Taser. IPRA recommended a **"Violation Noted" for the accused Officer.**

### ***Log/C.R. No. 1027519***

On June 21, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding incidents involving one off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) Police Officer (Officer A), two on-duty Officers (Officers B and C), and one on-duty Sergeant (Sergeant D) that occurred on multiple dates in the 8<sup>th</sup> District. It was alleged Officer A, during a domestic incident, engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with the Victim; grabbed the Victim by the arms, punched her and pushed/shoved her head into a doorjamb or similar structure in the house; and left the scene without calling for medical aid for the Victim on June 19, 2009. It was also alleged that Officer A, during a domestic incident, engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with the Victim; forced his way into their home, pushed her to the floor; and was intoxicated on June 20, 2009. It was alleged that Officer A accessed Department records to search the Victim's arrest record on an unknown date. It was alleged that Officer B failed to request a Sergeant after responding to a domestic incident involving a Department Member; failed to report an allegedly intoxicated Department Member; and failed to create a case report on July 19, 2009. It was alleged that Officer C failed to request a Sergeant after responding to a domestic incident involving a Department Member; failed to report an allegedly intoxicated Department Member; failed to

## **Abstracts of Sustained Cases**

**SEPTEMBER 2013**

create a case report; and hugged Officer A while responding to a domestic incident on July 19, 2009. It was further alleged that Officer C accessed Department records to search the Victim's arrest record on June 3, 2008. It was alleged that Sergeant D failed to initiate a log number and/or make the appropriate notifications when he observed Officer A exhibit signs of intoxication and allowed Officer A to drive his vehicle from the scene while he exhibited signs of intoxication on July 19, 2009. Based on statements from the accused Members and the Victim, Department reports, OEMC and medical records, IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer A engaged in a unjustified verbal altercation with the Victim on June 20, 2009; forced his way into their home, pushed her to the floor, and was intoxicated on June 20, 2009; engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with the Victim on June 19, 2009; and grabbed the Victim by the arms, punched her and pushed/shoved her head into a doorjamb or similar structure in the house on June 19, 2009. IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that Officer A left the scene without calling for medical aid for the Victim on June 19, 2009. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer A accessed Department records to search the Victim's arrest record on more than one occasion. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegation that Officer B failed to request a Sergeant after responding to a domestic incident involving a Department Member on July 19, 2009. IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer B failed to report an allegedly intoxicated Department Member and failed to create a case report on July 19, 2009. IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer C failed to report an allegedly intoxicated Department Member on July 19, 2009; failed to create a case report on July 19, 2009; and hugged Officer A while responding to a domestic incident on July 19, 2009. IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Officer C failed to request a Sergeant after responding to a domestic incident involving a Department Member on July 19, 2009 and accessed Department records to search the Victim's arrest record on June 3, 2008. IPRA recommended to **"NOT SUSTAIN"** the allegations that Sergeant D failed to initiate a log number and/or make the appropriate notifications when he observed Officer A exhibit signs of intoxication and allowed Officer A to drive his vehicle from the scene while he exhibited signs of intoxication on July 19, 2009. IPRA recommended a **written reprimand for Officers A and C** and a **"Violation Noted" for Officer B.**