

Independent Police Review Authority

Quarterly Report

January 1, 2014 – March 31, 2014

April 15, 2014

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, 2014 through March 31, 2014. The information contained in this report is accurate as of April 15, 2014. All of IPRA's public reports are available at www.iprachicago.org.

Quarterly Overview

IPRA initiated 388 investigations during the first quarter of 2014. These numbers include 10 officer-involved shootings during the quarter as well. Taser discharges during the first quarter accounted for 76 investigations.

IPRA closed 583 investigations between January and March of 2014. This number is down slightly from the previous quarter. IPRA worked with the Mayor's Office and Budget Office in hiring two Paralegal positions and filling two additional Investigator positions.

This past quarter IPRA completed 23 sustained investigations. There were 13 cases this from January to March where mediation was deemed appropriate and 12 officers accepted the mediation. IPRA will continue to work with the Fraternal Order of Police and other unions to extend mediation to those cases where it is warranted, thus, leaving more investigative resources to close older cases.

During this quarter, IPRA continued its use of social media (Facebook = "*John IPRA Smith*" and Twitter = "*@IPRA_CHI*") in order to expand its outreach to the community. IPRA was present at the three scheduled monthly Police Board Meetings during January, February, and March.

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
2Q 2013	2122	558	668	1754
3Q 2013	2032	508	692	1594
4Q 2013	1588	375	632	1327
1Q 2014	1483	388	583	1133

IPRA Investigations Opened by Incident Type⁶

	IPRA (COMPLAIN TS)	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

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
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
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
4Q 2013	263	17	5	4	9	77	2
1Q 2014	264	17	10	4	14	76	2

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

Between January 1, 2014 and March 31, 2014, IPRA issued 1483 Log Numbers. Of these Log Numbers, IPRA retained 388 for resolution. IPRA forwarded the remaining 1095 Log Numbers to the Internal Affairs Division of the Chicago Police Department for appropriate resolution.

Of the 388 Log Numbers retained by IPRA, IPRA classified 120 as Complaint Register Numbers. In addition, IPRA began Pre-affidavit Investigations for 144 of the Log Numbers retained by IPRA. The remainder of the retained Log Numbers consisted of 10 Log Numbers for shootings where an individual was hit by a bullet and a “U Number” was issued, 4 for shootings where no one was hit by a bullet, 14 for shots fired at animals,

or reported uses of tasers, 2 for reported uses of pepper spray,⁷ and 17 for Extraordinary Occurrences⁸.

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

Between January 1, 2014 and March 31 2014, IPRA closed 583 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, 2014, there were 1133 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 report⁹

Between January 1, 2014 and March 31, 2014, IPRA recommended that 132 investigations be closed as “not sustained.”

In addition, 148 cases were closed after a Pre-affidavit Investigation because the complainants refused to sign an affidavit. IPRA recommended that 69 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, 2014 and March 31, 2014, IPRA recommended that 23 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

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 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.

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,

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

District 01 = 41	District 07 = 85	District 14 = 28	District 20 = 24
District 02 = 71	District 08 = 77	District 15 = 54	District 22 = 56
District 03 = 103	District 09 = 62	District 16 = 39	District 24 = 30
District 04 = 66	District 10 = 45	District 17 = 24	District 25 = 72
District 05 = 79	District 11 = 123	District 18 = 49	
District 06 = 84	District 12 = 55	District 19 = 35	
Outside City Limits = 29		Unknown location = 17	

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, 2014 and March 31, 2013, IPRA referred 1107 cases to other agencies as follows:

Chicago Police Department – Internal Affairs Division = 1095

Cook County State’s Attorney = 12

Federal Bureau of Investigations = 0

(See Attachment)

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.

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 1-8: 1 complaint each

District 002

Members 1-21: 1 complaint each

Members 21- 22: 2 complaints each

District 003

Members 1-23: 1 complaint each

Members 24-27: 2 complaints each

District 004

Members 1-11: 1 complaint each

Members 12-13: 2 complaints each

District 005

Members 1-23: 1 complaint each

Members 24 - 26: 2 complaints each

District 006

Members 1-24: 1 complaint each

Member 25: 2 complaints

District 007

Members 1-25: 1 complaint each

Members 26 – 29: 2 complaints each

District 008

Members 1-19: 1 complaint each

Members 20-25: 2 complaints each

District 009

Members 1-19: 1 complaint each

Members 20-22: 2 complaints each

District 010

Members 1-22: 1 complaint each

District 011

Members 1-19: 1 complaint each

Member 20 - 25: 2 complaints each

Member 26: 3 complaints each

District 012

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each

Members 11-12: 2 complaints each

District 014

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

District 015

Members 1-20: 1 complaint each

Member 21: 2 complaints

District 016

Members 1-8: 1 complaint each

Member 9: 3 complaints each

District 017

Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

Member 5 - 6: 2 complaints each

Member 5: 3 complaints

District 018

Members 1-12: 1 complaint each

Member 13: 3 complaints

District 019

Members 1-11: 1 complaint each

Member 12: 2 complaints

District 020

Members 1-11: 1 complaint each

District 022

Members 1-18: 1 complaint each

Members 19-20: 2 complaints each

District 024

Members 1-9: 1 complaint each

District 025

Members 1-30: 1 complaint each

Member 31: 2 complaints

Recruit Training (044)¹

Member 1: 1 complaint

Airport Law Enforcement Unit – North (050)

Members 1-6: 1 complaint each

Airport Law Enforcement Unit – South (051)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Mounted Patrol Unit (055)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Special Investigations Unit (079)

Member 1: 2 complaints

Deployment Operations Center (116)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Bureau of Internal Affairs (121)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Human Resources Division (123)

Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

Member 5: 2 complaints

Education and Training Division (124)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Member 2: 3 complaints

Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS) Division (135)

Member 1: 2 complaints

Traffic Section (145)

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

Members 6-7: 2 complaints each

Evidence and Recovered Property Section (167)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Police Documents Section (169)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Central Detention (171)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Bureau of Detectives (180)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Youth Investigation Section (184)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Narcotics Section (189)

Members 1-24: 1 complaint each

Members 25-28: 2 complaints each

Members 29-30: 3 complaints each

Member 31: 4 complaints

Intelligence Section (191)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Vice and Asset Forfeiture Division (192)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Gang Investigation Division (193)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Bureau of Patrol – Area Central (211)

Members 1-11: 1 complaint each

Member 12: 2 complaints

Bureau of Patrol – Area South (212)

Members 1-9: 1 complaint each

Bureau of Patrol – Area North (213)

Members 1-26: 1 complaint each

Member 27: 2 complaints

Member 28: 3 complaints

Medical Services Section (231)

Member 1: 1 complaint each

Court Section (261)

Members 1-2: 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.

Gang Enforcement – Area Central (311)

Members 1-11: 1 complaint each

Gang Enforcement – Area South (312)

Members 1-15: 1 complaint each

Members 16-19: 2 complaints each

Gang Enforcement – Area North (313)

Members 1-9: 1 complaint each

Members 10-13: 2 complaints each

Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) (353)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Alternate Response Section (376)

Members 1-8: 1 complaint each

Member 9: 2 complaints

Area Central , Deputy Chief – Bureau of Patrol (411)

Members 1-8: 1 complaint each

Area South , Deputy Chief – Bureau of Patrol (412)

Members 1-6: 1 complaint each

Area North , Deputy Chief – Bureau of Patrol (413)

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

Member 6: 2 complaints

Special Activities Section (441)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Detached Services – Miscellaneous Detail (543)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Detective Division - Administration (601)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Central Investigations Unit (606)

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

Bureau of Detectives – Area Central (610)

Members 1-9: 1 complaint each

Bureau of Detectives – Area South (620)

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each

Member 11: 2 complaints

Bureau of Detectives – Area North (630)

Members 1-8: 1 complaint each

Detective Division, Area 5 (650)²

Members 1-2: 1 complaint

Public Transportation Section (701)

Members 1-14: 1 complaint

Member 15: 2 complaints

Transit Security Unit (704)

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

Member 6-8: 2 complaints each

² Unit 650 is no longer in existence. Unit 650 has been renamed

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JANUARY 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1058330

On November 10th, 2012, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident involving an on-duty Chicago Police Officer that occurred on November 9th, 2012 in the 11th District. It was alleged that the Officer accidentally discharged his Taser as he attempted to re-holster it. During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for the allegation and a penalty of **Violation Noted**.

Log/C.R. No. 1052121

On February 25th, 2012, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident involving one on-duty Chicago Police Officer and the Complainant that occurred on February 25th, 2012 in the 1st District. It was alleged that the accused Officer bumped Complainant with his body and used profanities at him. During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for the allegation and a penalty of **Violation Noted**.

Log/C.R. No. 1049179

On October 10th, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident involving an off-duty Chicago Police Officer that occurred on October 9th, 2011 on a boat in Lake Michigan near Wilmette, IL. It was alleged that the Officer was intoxicated while off-duty; was in possession of a firearm while consuming alcoholic beverages; failed to notify a supervisor and/or submit a written report that he had been detained or under investigation by an outside agency; failed to immediately make the proper notifications that he had discharged his weapon; unnecessarily displayed and/or used his firearm; failed to secure his department issued weapon; and engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the department. Based on statements from the accused Officer and witnesses, Department reports, and photographs IPRA recommended to "**Sustain**" all allegations. IPRA recommended a **45-day suspension**.

Log/C.R. No. 1044510

On April 5th, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident involving seven members of the Chicago Police Department (CPD) including three on-duty Sergeants (Sergeants A, B, and C), three on-duty Chicago Police Officers (Officers D, E, and F), one Lieutenant and the Complainant

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JANUARY 2014

that occurred on April 3rd 2011 in the 8th District. It was alleged that Sergeant A refused to register Complainant's complaint against the accused officers. Allegations against Sergeants B and C, Officer D, and the Lieutenant were that they pointed their gun at Complainant; forced entry into Complainant's apartment; searched Complainant's apartment without justification; and provided Complainant with a false report for criminal trespass to residence. It was also alleged that Officer E provided Complainant with a false report. It was further alleged that Officer F used unprofessional and/or rude language with Complainant. Based on statements from the accused Officers, Sergeants, Lieutenant, Complainant, and witness, Department reports, and photographs, IPRA recommended a finding of **"SUSTAINED"** against Sergeant A for refusing to register Complainant's complaint. During mediation, Sergeant A accepted a **Reprimand**. IPRA recommended a **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that Sergeants B and C, Officer D, and the Lieutenant pointed their gun at Complainant. Additionally, IPRA recommended to **"UNFOUND"** for the allegations against Sergeant B and the Lieutenant for forceful entry into complainant's apartment. However, IPRA found that Sergeant C and Officer D were **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation of forceful entry. Further, IPRA recommended to **"UNFOUND"** the allegations against Sergeants B and C, Officer D, and the Lieutenant in that they searched Complainant's apartment without justification and provided Complainant with a false report for criminal trespass to residence. As well, IPRA recommended a finding of **"UNFOUND"** against Officer E for the allegation that he provided Complainant with a false report. IPRA recommended that allegation against Officer F in that he used unprofessional and or rude language were **"NOT SUSTAINED"**.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

FEBRUARY 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1059381

On January 7th, 2013, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident involving two on-duty Chicago Police Officers (Officer A and Complainant/Officer B) that occurred on January 7th, 2013 in the 17th District. It was alleged that Officer A intentionally pushed Complainant/ Officer B from behind without justification. During mediation, Officer A agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegations and a **one (1) day suspension**.

Log/C.R. No. 1043379

On February 17th, 2011, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers (Officers A and B) that occurred on February 17th, 2011 in the 25th District. It was alleged that the accused Officers A and B were inattentive to duty in that they failed to properly search Subject A which resulted in Subject A causing injury to self. During mediation, Officer A agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegations and a **one (1) day suspension**. During mediation, Officer B agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegations and a **three (3) day suspension**.

Log/C.R. No. 1022078

On November 29th, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding a domestic incident involving an off-duty Chicago Police Officer that occurred on November 29th, 2008 in New Tazewell, TN. It was alleged that the Officer displayed and pointed his weapon at the Victim; failed to follow lawful orders by New Tazewell Police official; verbally abused Victim; and was arrested for three counts of aggravated assault. During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for all allegations that the Officer displayed and pointed his weapon at the Victim; failed to follow lawful orders by New Tazewell Police official; verbally abused Victim; arrested for three counts of aggravated assault, and whose overall conduct brought discredit upon the Department. The Officer agreed to a **twenty (20) day suspension**.

Log/C.R. No. 1022314

On December 9, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding a incident involving eleven members of the Chicago Police Department (CPD) including seven on-duty Police Officers (Officers A, B, C, D, E, F, and

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

FEBRUARY 2014

G), three on-duty Sergeants (Sergeants H, I, J), and one-on duty Detention Aide that occurred on December 8, 2008 in the 17th District. It was alleged that Officers B, E and F used improper force against Subject. It is further alleged, Officer F failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR). Additionally, it was alleged that Officer B, Officer E, and Officer G were inattentive to duty when they observed and/or were aware of misconduct and failed to report it. As well, there were allegations against Sergeants H, I, and J stating they were inattentive to duty when they observed and/or were aware of misconduct and failed to report and/or take action of such. Other allegations included that Officers C and D falsified department reports subsequent to the arrest of Subject and provided IPRA with false statement. It was further alleged that Sergeant I, Officer A, and the Detention Aide accepted the Subject into lockup with an obvious injury. Also, stated was that Sergeant I failed to oversee the conduct of the lockup and the lockup personnel. Based on statements from the accused Officers, Sergeants, Subject, Complainant, and witnesses, Department reports, photographs, and video IPRA recommended to **"UNFOUNDED"** the allegations that Officers B, E and F used improper force against Subject. However during mediation, Officer F agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that he failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR) and a **Reprimand**. Allegations against Officer B and Officer E for being inattentive to duty when they observed and/or were aware of misconduct and failed to report it were **"NOT SUSTAINED"**. Further, IPRA recommended to **"UNFOUNDED"** the allegation against Officer G for being inattentive to duty for failing to report allegations of misconduct. As well, the allegations against Sergeants H, I, J for being inattentive to duty when they observed and/or were aware of misconduct and failed to report and/or take action of such were **"NOT SUSTAINED"**. However during mediation, Sergeant I agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegation of failing to oversee the conduct of the lockup and the lockup personnel and a **REPRIMAND**. The allegations against Officers C and Officer D for falsifying department records and providing IPRA with false statements were also recommended by IPRA to be **"UNFOUNDED"**. During mediation, Officer A agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegation of accepting the Victim into lockup with an obvious injury and the **VIOLATION NOTED**. IPRA recommended to **"UNFOUNDED"** the allegation against the Detention Aide for accepting the Victim into lockup with an obvious injury.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

MARCH 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1022732

Notification Date: December 29, 2008

Location: 21st District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: A total of three CPD members involved – two on-duty officers and an on-duty sergeant. Complainant/Officer A alleged that Officer B engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Complainant/Officer A, unnecessarily interfered with Complainant/Officer A's field stop/investigation, and failed to promptly identify herself to Complainant/Officer A as a Chicago Police Officer. Officer B is alleged to have engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Complainant/Officer A. The Sergeant is alleged to have failed to immediately make the proper notifications that misconduct of the two officers occurred.

Finding:

Officer A: Based on statements from the accused Officers, Sergeant, and witness, department reports, and photographs, IPRA recommended to **"SUSTAIN"** the allegations against Complainant/Officer A and recommended a **3-day suspension**.

Officer B: During mediation, Officer B agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegation of engaging in an unjustified physical altercation with Complainant/Officer A and a **one (1) day suspension**. Officer B was **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation of interfering with Complainant/Officer A's investigation. Further, IPRA recommended to **"UNFOUND"** the allegation that Officer B failed to promptly identify herself to Complainant/Officer A as a Chicago Police Officer.

Sergeant: During mediation, the Sergeant agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegation and a penalty of **Violation Noted**.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

MARCH 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1025868

Notification Date: April 28, 2009

Location: 25th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: An incident involving four on-duty Chicago Police Officers (Officers A, B, C, and D) and a Sergeant. It was alleged that the Sergeant Tased Subject without justification, failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR), failed to notify a supervisor of a Taser discharge, and sparked his Taser as a warning to Subject. Officers A, B, C, and D are alleged to have failed to provide safety and/or intervene in the maltreatment of the Subject and failing to report misconduct by a department member.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officers, Sergeant, and Subject, department reports, and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Sergeant: **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that the Sergeant Tased the subject without justification. During mediation, the Sergeant agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAIN"** for failing to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR), failing to notify a supervisor of a Taser discharge, and sparking his Taser as a warning for a **1-day suspension**.

Officers A, B, and D:

"NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegations against accused Officers A, B, and D.

Officer C: **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations against Officer C.

Log/C.R. No. 1028040

Notification Date: July 9, 2009

Location: 4th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: An incident involving two on-duty Chicago Police Officers (Officers A and B). It was alleged that Officer A and B directed profanities at Subject, unnecessarily displayed their weapons, and used improper force against Subject.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

MARCH 2014

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officers, Subject, and witnesses, department reports, and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **Reprimand** for the allegation that Officer A directed profanities at Subject. **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that his weapon was unnecessarily displayed, and **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the improper force allegation.

Officer B: **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that Officer B used profanities and improper force against subject. IPRA recommended that Officer B be **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that he unnecessarily displayed his weapon.

Log/C.R. No. 1031495

Notification Date: November 2, 2009

Location: 5th District

Complaint: Domestic incident

Summary: An incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers (A and B) and Victim. It was alleged that Officer A disabled and caused damage to Victim's vehicle, made unnecessary physical contact with victim, made threats to Victim, harassed Victim, went outside of his assigned district, failed to notify the department that he was a party involved in an Order of Protection and violated such order, used profanities toward Victim, drove in a threatening and reckless manner, and vandalized the windows of the Victim's residence. Officer B was alleged to have gone outside of his district without cause.

Findings: Based on statements from the accused Officers, Victim, and witnesses; department reports, OEMC transmissions, and GPS data, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation the Officer A made unnecessary physical contact with Victim, made threats to Victim, used profanities toward victim, caused damage to Victim's vehicle, drove in a threatening and reckless manner, and vandalized the windows of the Victim's residence. During mediation, Officer A agreed to a finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that Officer A disabled Victim's vehicle, harassed Victim, went outside of his assigned district, and

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

MARCH 2014

failed to notify the department that he was a party involved in an Order of Protection and violated such order for a **3-day suspension**.

Officer B: **"VIOLATION NOTED"** for the allegation against Officer B for going outside of his district without cause.

Log/C.R. No. 1032213

Notification Date: December 1, 2009

Location: 14th District

Complaint: Unnecessary Physical Contact

Summary: An incident involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department Crossing Guards (A and B), Complainant, and Complainant's minor son ("Minor"). It was alleged that Crossing Guard A made unnecessary physical contact with Minor. It was also alleged that Crossing Guard B failed to initiate a complaint on behalf of Complainant.

Findings: Based on statements from the accused Cross Guards, Complainant, Minor, AND department reports, IPRA recommended the following:

Crossing Guards A and B: **"SUSTAINED"** for both Crossing Guards and **Violation Noted**.

Log/C.R. No. 1032817

Notification Date: December 29, 2009

Location: 2nd District

Complaint: Accidental Discharge of a weapon

Summary: An on-duty Chicago Police Officer is alleged to have accidentally discharged his weapon while attempting to detain the Subject who was in a fleeing vehicle.

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

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

MARCH 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1034528

Notification Date: March 11, 2010

Location: 2nd District

Complaint: Domestic Incident

Summary: A domestic matter involving a Chicago Police Department Commander and the Complainant/Police Officer which occurred over a period of time. It was alleged that the Commander repeatedly made calls and threatening comments to Complainant/Officer, which lead to an arrest for harassment; damaged Complainant/Officer's vehicle; violated an Order of Protection; and ultimately brought discredit to the Department. The Complainant/Officer is alleged to have made derogatory remarks to the Commander via telephone, texts, and/or messages; and engaged in unbecoming conduct.

Findings:

Commander: During mediation, the Commander agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for the allegations of repeatedly making calls and threatening comments to Complainant/Officer, which lead to an arrest for harassment and ultimately brought discredit to the Chicago Police Department and a "**1-day suspension**". All other allegations against the Commander were "**NOT SUSTAINED**".

Complainant/Officer: During mediation, the Complainant/Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for the allegations and a penalty of a **Reprimand**.

Log/C.R. No. 1042518

Notification Date: January 6, 2011

Location: 21st District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: An incident involving three on-duty Chicago Police Officers – Officers A, B, and Unknown Officer C – and Complainant. It was alleged that Officer A pointed his weapon, directed profanities, and refused to identify himself to Complainant upon request. Officer B is alleged to have used improper force and directed profanities toward Complainant, refused to identify himself, and failed to complete a tactical response report (TRR). Unknown Officer C was accused of failing to register a complaint on behalf of Complainant.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

MARCH 2014

Findings: Based on statements from the accused, complainant, and witnesses; department reports, and photographs IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: “**UNFOUNDED**” for the allegations that Officer A pointed his weapon at Complainant. “**NOT SUSTAINED**” for the allegations that he used profanities and refused to identify himself.

Officer B: “**UNFOUNDED**” for the allegations that Officer B used improper force against the Complainant. “**NOT SUSTAINED**” for the allegations of directing profanities toward Complainant and failing to identify himself. During mediation, Officer B agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “**SUSTAINED**” for the allegation of failing to complete a TRR and a penalty of a **Reprimand**.

Unknown Officer C: IPRA found that the allegation against the Unknown Officer was “**NOT SUSTAINED**”.

Log/ C.R. No. 1056921

Notification Date: September 9, 2012

Location: 10th District

Complaint: Accidental Discharge of a Weapon

Summary: On-duty Officer is accused of accidentally discharging his weapon while in a foot pursuit.

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

Log/ C.R. No. 1060422

Notification Date: February 27, 2013

Location: 12th District

Complaint: Use of Profanity

Summary: On-duty Chicago Police Officer is alleged to have directed profanities and engaging in a verbal altercation with Complainant.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

MARCH 2014

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

Log/ C.R. No. 1051467

Notification Date: January 25, 2012

Location: 25th District

Complaint: Failure to Initiate Proper Action and Unnecessary Physical Contact On Duty

Summary: Three CPD members involved - two unknown on-duty Chicago Police Officers (Unknown Officer A and B) and an on-duty sergeant. It is alleged that Unknown Officer A engaged in unjustified physical contact with Complainant and failed to identify himself. It is alleged that Unknown Officer B entered Complainant's residence without permission, unnecessarily displayed his weapon, failed to identify himself, and coerced the Complainant. The Sergeant is alleged to have failed to initiate proper action.

Finding: Based on statements from the Complainant, witnesses, department reports, and video footage, IPRA recommended the following:

Unknown Officer A: "**NOT SUSTAINED**" for the allegations that Unknown Officer A engaged in unjustified physical contact with Complainant and failed to identify himself.

Unknown Officer B: "**NOT SUSTAINED**" for the allegations that Unknown Officer B entered Complainant's residence without permission, unnecessarily displayed his weapon, and failed to identify himself. "**UNFOUNDED**" for the allegation that Unknown Officer B coerced the Complainant.

Sergeant: During mediation, Sergeant agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for the allegation and a penalty of **Violation Noted**.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

MARCH 2014

Log/ C.R. No. 1048796

Notification Date: September 25, 2011

Location: 22nd District

Complaint: Accidental Taser Discharge

Summary: An on-duty Chicago Police Officer is alleged to have accidentally discharged his Taser.

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

Log/ C.R. No. 1046285

Notification Date: June 20, 2011

Location: 7th District

Complaint: Unnecessary Display of Weapon

Summary: An incident involving two on-duty Chicago Police Officers (Officers A and B,) an on-duty Detective/Complainant, and an on-duty Sergeant. Officer A is alleged to have conducted an unjustified stop and unlawfully detained the Complainant. Officer B is alleged to have conducted an unjustified stop, unlawfully detained the Complainant, unnecessarily displayed his weapon while on duty, and unnecessarily made physical contact with the Complainant while on-duty. The Detective/Complainant is alleged to have failed to identify himself as a police officer, and failed to provide a telephone number. The Sergeant is alleged to have failed to register a complaint in a timely manner.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officers, Sergeant, witness, Complainant/Detective and department reports, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: "**UNFOUNDED**" for the allegations that Officer A conducted an unjustified stop and unlawfully detained the Complainant.

Officer B: "**UNFOUNDED**" for the allegations that Officer B conducted an unjustified stop, unlawfully detained the

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

MARCH 2014

Complainant, unnecessarily displayed his weapon while on duty, and unnecessarily made physical contact with the Complainant while on duty.

Detective/Complainant: “**UNFOUNDED**” for the allegations that Detective/Complainant failed to identify himself and failed to provide information.

Sergeant: “**SUSTAIN**” for failing to register a complaint in a timely fashion for a **1-day suspension**.

Log/ C.R. No. 1044613

Notification Date: April 10, 2011

Location: 7th District

Complaint: Accidental Taser Discharge

Summary: An on-duty Chicago Police Officer is alleged to have accidentally discharged her Taser.

Finding: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “**SUSTAINED**” for the allegation and a penalty of **Violation Noted**.

Log/ C.R. No. 1043346

Notification Date: February 15, 2011

Location: 19th District

Complaint: Domestic Incident

Summary: An off-duty Chicago Police Crossing Guard was alleged to have struck, pushed and scratched Victim, and being intoxicated.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused, Victim, and witness; department reports, photographs, and OEMC transmissions IPRA recommended to “**NOT SUSTAIN** ” the allegation that the Crossing Guard scratched Victim. “**SUSTAIN**” the allegations that the Crossing Guard was intoxicated, struck and pushed Victim for a **5-day suspension**.