

Independent Police Review Authority

Quarterly Report

April 1, 2014 – June 30, 2014

July 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 April 1, 2014 through June 30, 2014. The information contained in this report is accurate as of July 15, 2014. All of IPRA's public reports are available at www.iprachicago.org.

Quarterly Overview

IPRA initiated 484 investigations during the second quarter of 2014. These numbers include 9 officer-involved shootings during the quarter as well. Taser discharges during the first quarter accounted for 111 investigations.

IPRA closed 583 investigations between April and June of 2014. This represents a ten percent increase from the previous quarter in spite of IPRA's recent loss of positions to attrition. The recent reduction in staff includes a Supervising Investigator and two Intake Aides which leaves IPRA with 5 Intake vacancies to go along with 5 Investigator vacancies.

This past quarter IPRA completed 52 sustained investigations. There were 29 cases from January to March where mediation was deemed appropriate and 24 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.

The IPRA has worked to increase its presence in the community by hosting and appearing at various community events. During the past quarter, IPRA held three community meetings of its own, spoke at two Town Hall Meetings – the Asian American Town Hall Forum and the State Of Today's "MAN" Town Hall Meeting at Malcolm X College, and participated in the NAACP's "Know Your Rights and Resources" Community Conference at Whitney Young High School. IPRA was also present at the three scheduled monthly Police Board Meetings during April, May, and June.

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
2Q 2014	1768	484	642	971

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

IPRA Investigations Opened by Incident Type (Continued)

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 (COMPLAINTS)	IPRA (NOTIFICATIONS)					
	INFO & CR	EXTRAORDINARY OCCURRENCE (EO)	HIT SHOOTING (U#)	NON-HIT SHOOTING	SHOOTING/ ANIMAL	TASER	OC DISCHARGE
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
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
2Q 2014	307	25	9	9	23	111	1

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

Between April 1, 2014 and June 30, 2014, IPRA issued 1,768 Log Numbers. Of these Log Numbers, IPRA retained 484 for resolution. IPRA forwarded the remaining 1,284 Log Numbers to the Internal Affairs Division of the Chicago Police Department for appropriate resolution.

Of the 484 Log Numbers retained by IPRA, IPRA classified 152 as Complaint Register Numbers. In addition, IPRA began Pre-affidavit Investigations for 155 of the Log Numbers retained by IPRA. The remainder of the retained Log Numbers consisted of 9 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, 23 for shots fired at animals, 111 for reported uses of tasers, 1 for reported uses of pepper spray,⁷ and 25 for Extraordinary Occurrences⁸.

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 one Log Number 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.

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

Between April 1, 2014 and June 30 2014, IPRA closed 642 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 June 30, 2014, there were 971 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 April 1, 2014 and June 30, 2014, IPRA recommended that 169 investigations be closed as “not sustained.”

In addition, 133 cases were closed after a Pre-affidavit Investigation because the complainants refused to sign an affidavit. IPRA recommended that 79 investigations be closed as “unfounded,” and 10 be closed as “exonerated.”

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

Between April 1, 2014 and June 30, 2014, IPRA recommended that 52 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

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.

Between April 1, 2014 and June 30, 2014, IPRA received complaints of alleged misconduct based on incidents in the following districts, as follows:

District 01 = 70	District 07 = 94	District 14 = 32	District 20 = 29
District 02 = 59	District 08 = 84	District 15 = 75	District 22 = 66
District 03 = 100	District 09 = 73	District 16 = 49	District 24 = 30
District 04 = 103	District 10 = 70	District 17 = 25	District 25 = 49
District 05 = 80	District 11 = 130	District 18 = 59	
District 06 = 110	District 12 = 40	District 19 = 67	
Outside City Limits = 30		Unknown location = 25	

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 April 1, 2014 and June 30, 2014, IPRA referred 1,299 cases to other agencies as follows:

Chicago Police Department – Internal Affairs Division = 1,284

Cook County State’s Attorney = 14

Federal Bureau of Investigations = 1

(See Attachment)

ATTACHMENT: COMPLAINTS AGAINST CPD MEMBERS BY UNIT

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.

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.

District 001

Members 1-14: 1 complaint each

District 002

Members 1-18: 1 complaint each

Members 19- 20: 2 complaints each

District 003

Members 1-16: 1 complaint each

District 004

Members 1-34: 1 complaint each

Members 35-39: 2 complaints each

District 005

Members 1-32: 1 complaint each

Member 33: 2 complaints

District 006

Members 1-25: 1 complaint each

Member 26: 2 complaints

District 007

Members 1-23: 1 complaint each

Member 24: 2 complaints

District 008

Members 1-8: 1 complaint each

Members 9-11: 2 complaints each

District 009

Members 1-22: 1 complaint each

Member 23: 2 complaints

District 010

Members 1-25: 1 complaint each

District 011

Members 1-39: 1 complaint each

Members 40-42: 2 complaints each

District 012

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each

Members 11-12: 2 complaints each

District 014

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each

Member 11: 2 complaints

District 015

Members 1-21: 1 complaint each

Members 22-24: 2 complaints each

District 016

Members 1-12: 1 complaint each

Member 13: 2 complaints

District 017

Members 1-7: 1 complaint each

Member 8: 3 complaints

District 018

Members 1-13: 1 complaint each

Members 14-15: 2 complaints each

District 019

Members 1-18: 1 complaint each

Members 19-20: 2 complaints each

District 020

Members 1-14: 1 complaint each

District 022

Members 1-12: 1 complaint each

District 024

Members 1-14: 1 complaint each

Members 15-16: 2 complaints each

District 025

Members 1-18: 1 complaint each

Members 19-21: 2 complaints each

Recruit Training (044)¹

Member 1: 2 complaints

Airport Law Enforcement Unit – North (050)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Airport Law Enforcement Unit – South (051)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Special Investigations Unit (079)

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

Deployment Operations Center (116)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Bureau of Internal Affairs (121)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Human Resources Division (123)

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

Education and Training Division (124)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Special Functions Division (141)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Traffic Section (145)

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

Field Services Section (166)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Police Documents Section (169)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Central Detention (171)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint

Equipment and Supply Section (172)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Forensics Services Division (177)

Member 1: 2 complaints

Bureau of Organized Crime (188)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Narcotics Section (189)

Members 1-25: 1 complaint each

Members 26-32: 2 complaints each

Members 33-34: 3 complaints each

Intelligence Section (191)

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

Vice and Asset Forfeiture Division (192)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Gang Investigation Division (193)

Members 1-6: 1 complaint each

Bureau of Patrol – Area Central (211)

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each

Member 11: 2 complaints

Bureau of Patrol – Area South (212)

Members 1-24: 1 complaint each

Member 25: 1 complaint

Member 26: 1 complaint

Bureau of Patrol – Area North (213)

Members 1-6: 1 complaint each

Members 7-8: 2 complaints each

Member 9: 4 complaints

Medical Services Section (231)

Member 1: 1 complaint each

Gang Enforcement – Area Central (311)

Members 1-13: 1 complaint each

Member 14: 1 complaints

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 South (312)

Members 1-7: 1 complaint each

Gang Enforcement – Area North (313)

Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

Member 5: 3 complaints

Alternate Response Section (376)

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each

Gang Enforcement Division (393)

Members 1-8: 1 complaint each

Member 9: 2 complaints

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

Members 1-6: 1 complaint each

Member 8: 2 complaints

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

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Members 3-4: 2 complaint each

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

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

Detached Services – Miscellaneous Detail (543)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Arson Section (603)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Central Investigations Unit (606)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Bureau of Detectives – Area Central (610)

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each

Member 11: 2 complaints

Bureau of Detectives – Area South (620)

Members 1-9: 1 complaint each

Bureau of Detectives – Area North (630)

Members 1-13: 1 complaint each

Members 14-15: 2 complaints each

Bureau of Detectives – Area North (630)

Detective Division, Area 4 (640)²

Member 1: 1 complaint each

Public Transportation Section (701)

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

Transit Security Unit (704)

Members 1-6: 1 complaint each

Member 7: 2 complaints

² Unit 640 is no longer in existence. Unit 640 has been renamed

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

APRIL 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1021475

Notification Date: November 6, 2008

Location: 11th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: It was alleged that an on-duty CPD officer, while at a Chicago Public School facility, grabbed and threw the Complainant to the ground and failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR).

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

Officer: A finding of **"SUSTAINED"** the allegations against the Officer for failing to complete a TRR and a penalty of the **Violation Noted**. The allegation that the Officer threw the Complainant to the ground was **"NOT SUSTAINED."**

Log/C.R. No. 1032947

Notification Date: January 5, 2010

Location: 10th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: It was alleged that an on-duty CPD officer punched, grabbed, pushed, handcuffed too tightly, poked and threatened the Complainant. It was further alleged that the Officer failed to document his contact with the Complainant.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officer and Complainant, department reports, photographs, OEMC transmissions and GPS records, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that the Officer punched, grabbed, pushed, handcuffed tightly, poked, and threatened the Complainant. However, IPRA **"SUSTAINED"** the allegation that the Officer failed to document his contact with the Complainant and a penalty of a **Reprimand**.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

APRIL 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1037059

Notification Date: June 10, 2010

Location: 8th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving two CPD members, including one on-duty Chicago Police Officer and one Sergeant, it was alleged that the Officer directed profanities at the Complainant and Subject, directed racial slurs at the Complainant and Subject, threatened to arrest the Complainant and falsely arrested the Subject. It was further alleged that the Sergeant refused the Complainant's request to file a complaint against the involved Officer.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officers, the Complainant, the Subject, department reports, court documents and POD Video, IPRA recommended the following:

Sergeant: A finding of "**NOT SUSTAINED**" for all allegations against the Officer. IPRA further concluded that the allegation against the Sergeant for failing to file Complainant's complaint against the involved Officer was "**SUSTAINED.**"

Log/C.R. No. 1039999

Notification Date: September 20, 2010

Location: N/A

Complaint: Harassment and Misuse of department records

Summary: An incident involving an off-duty Chicago Police Officer and the Complainant/Spouse, it was alleged that the Officer harassed the Complainant/Spouse via text messages, used department records to run name checks on acquaintances of the Complainant/Spouse, and hacked the Complainant's/Spouse's e-mail accounts.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officer and the Complainant/Spouse; text messages, department reports and other court documents, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **3-day Suspension** for the allegation that the Officer used department records to run name checks on acquaintances of the Complainant. All other allegations against the Officer were "**NOT SUSTAINED.**"

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

APRIL 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1041451

Notification Date: August -November 2010

Location: N/A

Complaint: Domestic incident

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers (Officer A and Complainant/Officer B), it was alleged that Officer A directed profanities and/or derogatory remarks via telephone conversation and text messages to the Complainant/Officer B. It was further alleged that Officer A threatened the Complainant/Officer B via text messages and misused departmental equipment to direct profanities and/or derogatory statements towards the Complainant/ Officer B.

Findings: Based on statements from the accused Officer, the Complainant/Officer, and one witness; department reports, cellular phone records and Portable Data Terminal information, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for the allegations that Officer A directed profanities and/or derogatory remarks via telephone conversation and text messages to the Complainant/Officer B and for his misuse of departmental equipment and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension**. The allegations that Officer A threatened the Complainant/Officer B via text messages were "**NOT SUSTAINED.**"

Log/C.R. No. 1045260

Notification Date: May 8, 2011

Location: 21st District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an in incident involving an off-duty CPD Officer and the Complainant, it was alleged that the Officer was intoxicated while off-duty; punched the Complainant without justification; made false oral reports to on-duty CPD officers and a Supervisor investigating the incident; provided false information for departmental records and reports; took police action when there was no immediate threat; and provided false statements to an Independent Police Review Authority investigator.

Findings: Based on statements from the accused Officer, the Complainant and witnesses; department reports, court documents,

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

APRIL 2014

medical records, OEMC 911 audio recordings, photographs and video, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that the Officer punched the Complainant without justification; made false oral reports to on-duty CPD officers and a Supervisor investigating the incident; provided false information for departmental records and reports; took police action when there was no immediate threat; and provided false statements to an Independent Police Review Authority investigator. IPRA further recommended a **Separation** from the department. The allegation that the Officer was intoxicated while off-duty was **"NOT SUSTAINED."**

Log/C.R. No. 1047062

Notification Date: July 18, 2011

Location: 9th District

Complaint: Excessive Force and Unnecessary Display of Weapon

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty CPD Officer and the Subject, it was alleged that the Officer pointed his weapon; pushed, shoved, grabbed and dragged the Subject from his vehicle; handcuffed; and directed profanities at the Subject. It was also alleged that the Officer failed to document his contact with the Subject and failed to complete a Tactical Response report (TRR).

Findings: Based on statements from the accused Officer, the Complainant, the Subject and a witness; department reports; and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that the Officer pointed his weapon at the Subject and that he grabbed and dragged the Subject from his vehicle. A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that the Officer directed profanities, pushed, shoved and handcuffed Subject; and that the Officer failed to complete a TRR. However, IPRA recommended a finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **Reprimand** for not documenting his contact with the Subject.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

APRIL 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1047958

Notification Date: August 24, 2011

Location: 8th District

Complaint: Domestic Incident

Summary: In an incident involving an off-duty CPD Officer and their Spouse, it was alleged that the Officer was intoxicated while off-duty and used profanities in front of his spouse and other Officers at the scene.

Findings: Based on department reports and blood alcohol content (BAC) test results, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that the Officer used profanities in public and a finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of the **Violation Noted** for being intoxicated while off-duty.

Log/C.R. No. 1054766

Notification Date: June 14, 2012

Location: 12th District

Complaint: Altercation/Disturbance

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers (A and B), it was alleged that the Officers engaged in a verbal altercation with each other. The allegations are that Officer A was rude and unprofessional, made inappropriate comments, and was verbally abusive toward Officer B. The allegations against Officer B were that she was rude, unprofessional and shoved Officer A.

Findings: Based on statements and reports from the involved Officers, witnesses and test results, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for all allegations against the Officer and a **1-day Suspension**.

Officer B: A finding that the allegations were **"UNFOUNDED."**

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

APRIL 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1058793

Notification Date: December 1, 2012

Location: 19th District

Complaint: Unnecessary Display and Discharge of a Weapon

Summary: In an incident involving three on-duty CPD members including an Officer, a Sergeant and a Lieutenant, it was alleged that the Officer directed profanities at the Complainant, shot the Complainant's dog and falsified the circumstances of such shooting. Further allegations were that the Lieutenant and Sergeant served the Complainant with an Administrative Notion of Violation without justification and refused to leave Complainant's home when asked to do so.

Findings: Based on statements and reports from the involved CPD members, the Complainant and witnesses; department records and reports; OEMC transmissions; GPS Data; and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer: A finding of "**NOT SUSTAINED**" for the allegations of the use of profanities, and a finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for shooting the Complainant's dog and falsifying the circumstances of the shooting, and a penalty of a **30-day Suspension**.

Sergeant : A finding that the allegations were "**UNFOUNDED.**"

Lieutenant: A finding that the allegations were "**UNFOUNDED.**"

Log/C.R. No. 1062181

Notification Date: May 13, 2013

Location: 9th District

Complaint: Unnecessary Verbal Remarks and Physical Contact; Improper Search of Vehicle

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers (A and B), it was alleged that Officer A directed racial slurs at the Complainant, conducted an improper vehicle search and made unnecessary physical contact with the Complainant. Other allegations were that Officer B detained the Complainant on a traffic stop without justification and failed to document his contact with the Complainant.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

APRIL 2014

Findings: Based on statements from the accused Officers, the Complainant and witness; department reports; GPS data; POD video; and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for all allegations.

Officer B: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation of detaining the Complainant without justification and a finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegation for failing to document contact with the Complainant and a penalty of a **Reprimand**.

Log/C.R. No. 1062434

Notification Date: May 23, 2013

Location: 11th District

Complaint: Domestic Altercation

Summary: In an incident involving an off-duty CPD Officer and the Complainant, it was alleged that the Officer engaged in a verbal and physical altercation with the Complainant in that he grabbed and pulled her out of chair; struck and slapped the Complainant; verbally abused the Complainant; struck the Complainant's minor child; caused damage to the Complainant's vehicle; and harassed and threatened the Complainant. Further allegations include the Officer threatened a Domestic Violence Advocate, used profanities and brought discredit upon the CPD by being loud and disruptive.

Findings: Based on statements from the accused Officer, Complainant and witnesses; department reports and court documents, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer: A finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegations regarding the use of profanities, threatening a Domestic Violence Advocate and bringing discredit upon the CPD and a penalty of a **5-day Suspension**, and a finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation of striking a minor, as well as a finding of **"NOT SUSUTAINED"** for all other allegations.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

APRIL 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1065469

Notification Date: October 11, 2013

Location: 24th District

Complaint: Domestic Incident

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty CPD Officer and the Complainant, it was alleged that the Officer unnecessarily displayed and pointed her weapon at the Complainant and subsequently prohibited the Complainant from calling 911.

Findings: Based on statements from the accused Officer, the Complainant and witnesses; department reports; OEMC Transmissions and court documents, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer: A finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for the allegation of prohibiting the Complainant from calling 911 and a penalty of a **5-day Suspension**; all other allegations were "**NOT SUSTAINED.**"

Log/C.R. No. 1003391

Notification Date: February 12, 2007

Location: 4th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving five on-duty CPD Officers (A, B, C, D and an Unknown Officer) and the Complainant, it was alleged that Officers A and B grabbed, pulled, punched and tackled the Complainant; and subsequently refused to call a supervisor upon request. Other allegations against Officer A also included his use of profanity. Allegations against Officer C, D and the Unknown Officer were that they stopped, searched and detained the Complainant without justification; grabbed, choked and smashed the Complainant's hands on the hood of vehicle; used profanities; threw the Complainant's food on the ground, and refused to provide their names and star numbers.

Findings: Based on statements from the accused Officers, the Complainant and witnesses; department reports, court documents, OEMC transmissions; POD CD's; and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of "**NOT SUSTAINED**" for all allegations.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

APRIL 2014

Officer B: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a **Violation Noted** for refusing to call a supervisor upon request; and a finding of “**NOT SUSTAINED**” for all other allegations.

Officer C: A finding of “**NOT SUSTAINED**” for all allegations.

Officer D: A finding of “**NOT SUSTAINED**” for all allegations.

Unknown Officer: A finding of “**NOT SUSTAINED**” for all allegations.

Log/C.R. No. 1033859

Notification Date: February 13, 2010

Location: 8th District

Complaint: Domestic Altercation

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers (A and B), one off-duty Officer (C), the Complainant, and four additional Complainants (1,2,3, and 4), it was alleged that, during a domestic disturbance with a neighbor, Officer C instigated a fight between the Complainant and the Officer's son; directed profanities and racial slurs at Complainant's 1,2,3 and 4. Punched, pushed, handcuffed and twisted the arm of Complainant 2; seized and handcuffed Complainant 3; and abused his authority in that he arrested Complainant's 2 and 3 when he was personally involved. The allegations against Officers A and B were that they arrested Complainant's 2 and 3 while knowing that Officer C was personally involved, witnessed misconduct of an officer and failed to report it, and left their duty assignment without authorization.

Findings: Based on statements from the accused Officers, the Complainants and witnesses; department reports; court documents; and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer C: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” for all allegations and a penalty of a **15-day Suspension**.

Officer A: A finding of “**UNFOUNDED**” for arresting Complainant's 2 and 3 while knowing that Officer C was personally involved, and a

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

APRIL 2014

finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation of leaving a duty assignment without authorization.

Officer B: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for arresting Complainant's 2 and 3 while knowing that Officer C was personally involved and a finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation of leaving a duty assignment without authorization.

Log/C.R. No. 1034754

Notification Date: March 19, 2010

Location: 22nd District

Complaint: Unnecessary display of a weapon

Summary: In an incident involving four members of the CPD, including one off-duty Officer (A), a Lieutenant, two on-duty Unknown Officers (B and C), a Complainant, and four Complainant's (1,2,3 and 4), it was alleged that the Lieutenant directed profanities at the Complainant and Complainants 1 and 2. Allegations against Officer A were that she interfered with a funeral procession by driving her personal vehicle into a procession which she was not a part of; called 911 and made false reports against the Complainant; made false reports and statements against the Complainant resulting in charges filed against Complainant in Cook County Circuit Court; made false statements, committed perjury and was indicted for testimony made under oath in Cook County Circuit Court. Unknown Officers B and C were alleged to have pointed their guns, directed profanities, and tightly handcuffed the Complainant and Complainant's.

Findings: Based on statements from the accused Officer, Lieutenant, Complainants and witnesses; department reports; court documents; GPS data; OEMC transmissions; POD camera; video and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for all allegations and a **Separation** from the CPD.

Lieutenant: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations.

Unknown Officer B: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

APRIL 2014

Unknown Officer C: A finding of “**NOT SUSTAINED**” for the allegations.

Log/C.R. No. 1016377

Notification Date: May 8, 2008

Location: Unknown

Complaint: Domestic Incident

Summary: In an incident involving an off on-duty CPD Officer and their spouse, it was learned by CPD authorities that the Officer was involved in court proceedings with his spouse alleging that the Officer grabbed, choked, threatened and bit his spouse; emotionally and verbally abused his minor step-child; and neglected to secure his weapons by leaving them in full reach of minors and/or leaving a loaded weapon in the glove box of his personal vehicle.

Findings: Based on statements from the accused, complainant, and witness; department reports, and court documents IPRA recommended the following:

Officer: A finding of “**NOT SUSTAINED**” for the allegations of threatening and biting his spouse, emotional and verbal abuse of his minor step-child, and securing his weapons by leaving them in full reach of minors. A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” in that the Officer was involved in court proceedings with his spouse, and that he left a loaded weapon in the glove box of his personal vehicle for a penalty of a **Reprimand**.

Log/ C.R. No. 1039179

Notification Date: August 23, 2010

Location: 22nd District

Complaint: Discharge of a Weapon

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty officers (A and B), it was alleged that the two officers initiated and engaged in a vehicle pursuit while being in an unmarked department vehicle for a minor traffic offense and failed to withdraw as the primary pursuit vehicle when a marked department became available.

Findings: During mediation, both Officers agreed to accept IPRA's finding of “**SUSTAINED**” for all allegations and a **Violation Noted**.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

MAY 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1017048

Notification Date: June 2, 2008

Location: N/A

Complaint: Domestic Incident

Summary: In an incident involving an off-duty officer and Complainant, it was alleged that the off-duty CPD officer verbally abused and engaged in an argument with Complainant on two separate occasions. Allegations also included appearing at the Complainant's home uninvited, sending numerous texts and sending offensive emails.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officer and a witness; emails and social media, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer: A finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for the allegations against the Officer for engaging in an argument with the Complainant and sending harassing emails and text messages; a penalty of a **3-day**

Suspension. The allegation that the Officer verbally abused the Complainant was "**UNFOUNDED**" and the allegation of coming to the Complainant's home uninvited was "**NOT SUSTAINED.**"

Log/C.R. No. 1022792

Notification Date: January 1, 2009

Location: 10th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving three on-duty CPD members, including an Officer, an Unknown Officer, a Sergeant, and a Subject; it was alleged that, while attempting to apprehend the Subject who was involved in a shooting, all members entered and searched the Complainant's apartment and other apartments without a search warrant. Additional allegations were that the Sergeant punched, kicked, stomped, slammed, and directed profanities toward the Complainant. It was also alleged that Officer A kicked and stomped the Complainant, and failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR). The Unknown Officer was alleged to have kicked, stomped, and struck the Complainant. Further allegations against the Unknown Officer were that he pushed and directed profanities toward a witness, threw a witness' cellular phone to the ground, attempted to strike a

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

MAY 2014

witness with his squadrol, and left witnesses outside in the cold for a long period of time without justification.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officer, four witnesses, and the Complainant; department reports/records, photographs, medical records, and POD videos, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for all allegations.

Unknown Officer: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for all allegations.

Sergeant: During mediation, Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for all allegations and a penalty of a **3-day Suspension**.

Log/C.R. No. 1067033

Notification Date: January 15, 2014

Location: 8th District

Complaint: Accidental Taser Discharge

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty CPD Officer, the Officer was 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. 1065923

Notification Date: November 6, 2013

Location: 6th District

Complaint: Accidental Taser Discharge

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty CPD Officer, the Officer was alleged to have accidentally discharged his Taser.

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

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

MAY 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1062689

Notification Date: June 5, 2013

Location: 12th District

Complaint: Accidental Taser Discharge

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty CPD Officer, the Officer was alleged to have accidentally discharged his Taser.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officer, a witness, and department reports, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer: A finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that the Officer accidentally discharged his weapon and a penalty of a **Reprimand**.

Log/C.R. No. 1062591

Notification Date: May 31, 2013

Location: 16th District

Complaint: Domestic incident

Summary: In an incident involving two off-duty CPD Officers (Officer A and Complainant/Officer B), it was alleged while at their residence, Officer A pushed Complainant/ Officer B while holding their mutual child, physically prevented Complainant/Officer B from picking up their mutual child, physically intimidated , threatened, smacked and verbally abused Complainant/Officer B.

Finding: During mediation, Officer A agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that he pushed Complainant/ Officer B while holding their mutual child and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension**.

Log/C.R. No. 1056520

Notification Date: August 23, 2012

Location: 4th District

Complaint: Firearm Discharge

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty CPD Officer and the Subject, it was alleged that while in pursuit of the Subject, the Officer accidentally discharged his firearm, striking Subject.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

MAY 2014

Finding: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for the allegation that he accidentally discharged his firearm, striking Subject and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension**.

Log/C.R. No. 1055558

Notification Date: July 16, 2012

Location: 4th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving three on-duty CPD Officers (A, B, and C, an Unknown Officer) and a Subject, it was alleged that, while attempting to apprehend the Subject, all of the Officers used excessive force against the Subject. It was also alleged that Officer A violated the CPD use of force policy by using inappropriate force against the Subject. An additional allegation was made against Officer B that he placed the Subject in a headlock while attempting to pull him out of a vehicle. It was further alleged that the Unknown Officer struck the Subject with a baton.

Findings: Based on statements from one accused Officer, the Subject, one witness; department reports/records, POD video, and OEMC transmissions, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer B: "**EXONERATED**" for the allegation that he placed the subject in a headlock.

Officer A: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for the allegation that she violated CPD's Use of Force policy, and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension**.

Unknown: A finding of "**NOT SUSTAINED**" for the allegation against the Unknown Officer.

Log/C.R. No. 1051663

Notification Date: February 3, 2012

Location: 5th District

Complaint: Firearm Discharge

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty CPD Officer, it was alleged while conducting a search of a residence; the Officer was

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

MAY 2014

inattentive to duty in that he did not properly handle his firearm, causing it to discharge.

Finding: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for the allegation that he did not properly handle his firearm, causing it to discharge, and a penalty of **Violation Noted**.

Log/C.R. No. 1049123

Notification Date: October 7, 2011

Location: 6th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving three on-duty CPD members, including two Officers (A and B) and a Sergeant; a Complainant, and a Victim; it was alleged that, while executing a search warrant, Officer A directed profanities at the Complainant and Victim, kned the Victim in the back and pulled his hair. The allegation against Officer B was that he damaged several pieces of property during the execution of the search. It was further alleged that the Sergeant threatened to return to the residence and arrest the Complainant and Victim if they filed a complaint against them and that he failed to register a complaint after police misconduct had been reported to him.

Findings: Based on statements from the accused Officers, Sergeant, Complainant, and the Victim; department reports/records, and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer B: A finding of "**UNFOUNDED**" for the allegation.

Sergeant: A finding of "**NOT SUSTAINED**" for the allegations.

Officer A: A finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for the allegation that profanities were directed at the Victim; "**NOT SUSTAINED**" for the allegation that he directed profanities at the Complainant and kned the Victim in the back and pulled his hair.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

MAY 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1048220

Notification Date: September 3, 2011

Location: 4th and 6th Districts

Complaint: Unnecessary Physical Contact/Misuse of Department Records/Leaving Assignment

Summary: In an incident involving three on-duty CPD members, including two Officers (A and B), a Sergeant, and Complainant. It was alleged that Officer A left his district of assignment to confront Complainant at his place of employment, engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation where he directed profanities at the Complainant, shoved, handcuffed, threatened and struck the Complainant with his fist.

Allegations against Officer B were that he witnessed misconduct but failed to report it and, without justification, activated the emergency lights and sirens of the Departmental vehicle he was driving. It was further alleged that the Sergeant failed to register a complaint on behalf of the Complainant upon request and pointed his finger in the face of the Complainant's spouse.

Findings: Based on statements from the two accused Officers, the Complainant, and two witnesses; department reports/records, Court documents and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **5-day Suspension** for leaving his assignment, engaging in an unjustified verbal altercation, and striking the Complainant. IPRA further concluded that the allegations that the Officer shoved, pushed and threatened Complainant were "**NOT SUSTAINED.**"

Officer B: A finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for the allegations and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension.**

Sergeant: A finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for the allegations and a penalty of a **Reprimand.**

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

MAY 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1047895

Notification Date: August 22, 2011

Location: 6th District

Complaint: Neglect of Duty

Summary: In an incident involving an off-duty CPD Officer, it was alleged the Officer was inattentive to duty in that his weapon discharged after he was struck in the head while working off duty. It was also alleged that he failed to register his weapon with the City of Chicago and armed himself with the unauthorized weapon and ammunition.

Finding: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for all allegations and a penalty of a **5-day Suspension**.

Log/C.R. No. 1043908

Notification Date: March 12, 2011

Location: 4th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving three on-duty CPD members, Officers (A, B, and C), and two Victims (1 and 2), it was alleged that Officer A, B, and C entered and searched the Victim's residence without justification or a warrant. It was also alleged that Officer A slammed and handcuffed Victim 2 and directed profanities at a witness. Additional allegations against Officer B were that he pushed Victim 1 and refused to identify himself upon request. It was further alleged that Officer C failed to identify himself as well.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officers, Victims, and a witness; department records/reports, and POD Video, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegation of entering and searching the Victim's residence without justification. All other allegations against the Officer were "**NOT SUSTAINED.**"

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

MAY 2014

Officer B: A finding of “**NOT SUSTAINED**” for the allegations that the Officer entered the Victim’s residence, pushed Victim 1, and failed to identify himself. The allegation that the Officer searched the residence was “**UNFOUNDED.**”

Officer C: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegation of entering and searching the Victim’s residence without justification. The allegation for failing to identify himself was “**NOT SUSTAINED.**”

Log/C.R. No. 1043472

Notification Date: February 20, 2011

Location: Lisle, Illinois

Complaint: Domestic Incident

Summary: In an incident involving two off-duty CPD members, including an Officer and a Sergeant, which took place in Lisle, Illinois, it was alleged that, while engaging in a physical altercation between the two, the Officer struck the Sergeant on the face, resulting in the Officers arrest and his being charged with Domestic Battery. As such, it was alleged that the Officer pled guilty and was found guilty of Battery. It was alleged that the Sergeant engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with the Officer.

Finding: Based on a statement from the accused Sergeant, Lisle Police Department reports/records, photographs, and 911 recordings; and DuPage County court documents, IPRA recommended the following:

Sergeant: A finding of “**NOT SUSTAINED**” for the allegation.

Officer: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA’s finding of “**SUSTAINED**” for the allegations and a penalty of a **10-day Suspension.**

Log/C.R. No. 1040116

Notification Date: September 25, 2010

Location: 2nd District

Complaint: Domestic Incident

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

MAY 2014

Summary: In an incident involving four on-duty CPD members, including three Officers (A, B, and C) and a Sergeant, and a Complainant it was alleged that, during a response to a 911 call to a gas station involving a customer dispute, Officer A verbally abused, directed profanities at, searched, grabbed, and pushed the Complainant without justification; he also failed to provide his badge number upon request. It was alleged that Officers B and C were inattentive to duty when they failed to intercede on behalf of the Complainant. It was further alleged that the Sergeant failed to register a complaint on behalf of Complainant.

Finding: During mediation, the Officers agreed to accept IPRA's findings regarding the following:

Officer A: "SUSTAINED" for all allegations and a penalty of a 3-day Suspension.

Officer B and Officer C: "SUSTAINED" for all allegations and a penalty of a 1-day Suspension.

Sergeant: "SUSTAINED" for the allegation and a penalty of a Reprimand.

Log/C.R. No. 1039963

Notification Date: September 20, 2010

Location: 9th District

Complaint: Domestic Incident

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty officer and a Complainant (acquaintance). It was alleged that the officer choked and head-locked the Complainant and, on separate occasions, grabbed the Complainant's wrists. Allegations also included the fact that, when the Officer was arrested for Domestic Battery. He brought discredit upon the department.

Finding: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "SUSTAINED" for all allegations, except for the allegation of grabbing the Complainant's wrist on separate occasions, which was "NOT SUSTAINED," and accepted a penalty of a 2-day Suspension.

Log/C.R. No. 1039158

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

MAY 2014

Notification Date: August 22, 2010

Location: 6th District

Complaint: Domestic Incident

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty CPD Officer and a Complainant (acquaintance). It was alleged that the on-duty CPD officer harassed the Complainant by going to her place of employment, leaving his district of assignment without authorization, and being inattentive to duty in that he was 4 miles outside of his assigned district and failed to notify the department of Office of Emergency Management and Communications (OEMC).

Finding: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for all allegations and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension**.

Log/C.R. No. 1035489

Notification Date: April 16, 2010

Location: 11th District

Complaint: Improper Search of a person

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers (Officers A and B) and a Subject, it was alleged that the accused Officers were inattentive to duty in that they failed to properly search and secure the Subject which resulted in the Subject's death.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officers, department records/reports, court documents, medical records, photographs, and video recordings, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: "**UNFOUNDED**" for the allegation that the Officer failed to search the subject. Further the Officer was "**EXONERATED**" for the allegation that he failed to secure the Subject.

Officer B: "**SUSTAINED**" for the allegation that the Officer failed to properly search the Subject and a penalty of a **20-day Suspension**. IPRA further concluded, the Officer was "**EXONERATED**" for the allegation that he failed to secure the Subject.

Log/C.R. No. 1029937

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

MAY 2014

Notification Date: September 9, 2009

Location: 17th District

Complaint: Unnecessary Physical Contact

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty CPD Officer and a Complainant, it was alleged that, while responding to the scene of a traffic accident involving the Officer's daughter, the officer pushed, directed profanities toward, and ridiculed the Complainant's Tow Truck Company. Other allegations made against the Officer were that he engaged in a verbal altercation with another Officer, directed profanities at a Sergeant, and failed to complete a Tactical Response Report (TRR).

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officer, Complainant, and five witnesses; department records/reports, and OEMC transmissions, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer: A finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for all allegations and a penalty of a **Reprimand**.

Log/C.R. No. 1027134

Notification Date: June 8, 2009

Location: 11th District

Complaint: Firearm Discharge

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty CPD Officer and a Subject, it was alleged that, while responding to an attempted carjacking, the Officer shot the Subject without justification and failed to follow departmental rules after being involved in a police shooting.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officer, Complainant and four witnesses; department records/reports, court documents, OEMC transmissions, and medical records, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer: A finding of "**SUSTAINED**" for the allegation that the Officer failed to follow departmental rules after being involved in a police shooting and a penalty of a **10-day Suspension**. IPRA further concluded, the allegation that the Officer shot subject without justification was "**UNFOUNDED**."

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1057766

Notification Date: October 14, 2012

Location: 18th District

Complaint: Physical Altercation

Summary: In an incident involving two off-duty CPD Officers (Officer A and Complainant/Officer B), it was alleged that Officer A directed profanities at Complainant/Officer B, pushed, choked and struck Complainant/Officer B in the head and face. Officer A is also alleged to have left the scene of the incident and failing to report it to the Department. Finally, Officer A is alleged to have brought discredit upon the Department when he engaged in a verbal and physical altercation. Complainant/Officer B is alleged to have directed profanities towards Officer A and punched Officer A in the face. Complainant/Officer B is also alleged to have brought discredit upon the department by engaging in a verbal altercation.

Finding:

Officer A: During mediation, Officer A agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension** for the allegations that Officer A pushed and punched Complainant/Officer B, leaving the scene and failing to report the incident to the Department, and bringing discredit upon the Department by engaging in a verbal and physical altercation; "**NOT SUSTAINED**" for the allegations that he directed profanities at Complainant/Officer B and choked Complainant/Officer B.

Complainant/Officer B: Based on statements from the accused Officer, the Complainant/Officer B, witnesses and department reports/records, IPRA recommended the following: a finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegations that Complainant/Officer B directed profanities towards Officer A, and for bringing discredit upon the Department by engaging in a verbal altercation; "**NOT SUSTAINED**" for the allegation that punched Officer A in the face.

Log/C.R. No. 1027978

Notification Date: July 6, 2009

Location: 6th District

Complaint: Physical Altercation

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers (Officer A and Officer B) and an off-duty CPD Officer (Officer C), it was alleged that, while the two on-duty officers were conducting an investigation, Officer C interfered with that investigation. It was also alleged that Officer C directed profanities at Officer A, pushed, punched and struck Officer A with his elbows. Also, it was alleged that Officer C resisted arrest and was found guilty in Court of two counts of Resisting/Obstructing a Peace Officer. Finally, it is alleged that Officer C brought discredit upon the department by interfering with Officer A's and B's investigation, pushing and directing profanities at Officer A and resisting arrest. Officer A is alleged to have slapped and directed profanities at Officer C. Officer B is alleged to have discharged OC spray at Officer C.

Finding: Based on statements from the Officers and witnesses, department reports/records, photographs, medical records, and court documents, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that Officer A directed profanities at Officer C; **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that Officer A slapped Officer C.

Officer B: A finding of **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that Officer B discharged OC spray at Officer C.

Officer C: A finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of **Separation** for the allegations that Officer C interfered with a police investigation, pushed and directed profanities at Officer A, resisted arrest, was found guilty of two counts of Resisting/Obstructing a peace officer, and brought discredit upon the Department by interfering with a police investigation, pushing and directing profanities and resisting arrest; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that Officer C punched and struck Officer A with his elbows.

Log/C.R. No. 1032768

Notification Date: December 26, 2009

Location: 2nd District

Complaint: Accidental Firearm Discharge

Summary: An off-duty CPD Officer was alleged to have accidentally discharged her firearm.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officer and a witness, department reports, and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” for the allegation that the Officer accidentally discharged her weapon and a penalty of **Violation Noted**.

Log/C.R. No. 1065812

Notification Date: October 30, 2013

Location: 18th District

Complaint: Unnecessary Physical Contact

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers (Officer A and Officer B), it was alleged, while on a prisoner detail, Officer A and Officer B engaged in a verbal and physical altercation with each other, thereby bringing discredit to the Department.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officers and witnesses, and a radio transmission IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegation that Officer A engaged in a verbal and physical altercation thereby bringing discredit to the Department.

Officer B: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegation that Officer B engaged in a verbal and physical altercation thereby bringing discredit to the Department.

Log/C.R. No. 1058767

Notification Date: December 2, 2012

Location: Burbank, IL

Complaint: Domestic incident

Summary: In an incident involving an off-duty CPD Officer and a Complainant, it was alleged that Officer engaged in a physical and verbal altercation with the Complainant, bit Complainant’s arm, and several counts of failing to secure his firearm, including when the Complainant retrieved his firearm from an unlocked motorcycle compartment, when the Complainant attempted to hide his firearm,

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

and when a witness retrieved the firearm from the ground during the altercation between the Officer and Complainant.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officer, a witness, the accused Officer's disciplinary history, department reports/records, and 911 calls, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer: A finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of **Separation** for the allegations that the Officer failed to secure his firearm; "**NO AFFIDAVIT**" for the allegations that Officer engaged in an unjustified verbal and physical altercation with Complainant and bit the Complainant's arm.

Log/C.R. No. 1058001

Notification Date: October 24, 2012

Location: 25th District

Complaint: Firearm Discharge

Summary: An off-duty CPD Officer was alleged to have failed to report that he discharged his firearm, failed to immediately identify himself as a police officer, failed to submit a report regarding the discharge of his firearm, impeded the investigation when he falsely reported that he did not discharge his firearm, and failed to properly secure his firearm after it discharged and malfunctioned. It is also alleged that the Officer provided several counts of false statements, including telling the first responding officers that he had discharged his firearm, telling the sergeant that he did not discharge his firearm, stating he never spoke to an uniformed sergeant, informing every officer that he spoke with that he discharged his firearm, and stating that he made a timely notification of the discharge of his firearm to the Department. Finally, it is alleged that the Officer brought discredit upon the Department regarding the circumstances of the discharge of his weapon.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officer and witnesses, department reports/records, photographs, and a video, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer: A finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of **Separation** for the allegations that the Officer failed to report that he discharged his firearm, impeded the investigation when he falsely reported that he did not discharge his firearm, provided false statements, and brought

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

discredit upon the Department regarding the circumstances of the discharge of his weapon; **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he failed to immediately identify himself as a police officer, failed to submit a report regarding the discharge of his firearm in a timely manner and failed to properly secure his firearm after he discharged it and it malfunctioned.

Log/C.R. No. 1057907

Notification Date: October 21, 2012

Location: 19th District

Complaint: Firearm Discharge

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers, it was alleged that Officer A accidentally discharged Officer B's firearm inside the roll call room. It is also alleged that Officer B failed to secure his firearm.

Finding: During mediation, the Officers agreed to accept IPRA's findings regarding the following:

Officer A: **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegation of accidentally discharging a firearm and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension**.

Officer B: **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegation of failing to secure his firearm and a penalty of a **Reprimand**.

Log/C.R. No. 1058936

Notification Date: December 10, 2012

Location: 3rd District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers (Officer A and Officer B), an on-duty CPD Sergeant and a Complainant, it was alleged that, while responding to a domestic dispute, Officer A and B directed profanities at the Complainant, grabbed, yanked and twisted Complainant's arm behind his back. It was further alleged that the Sergeant failed to register a complaint against Officers A and B on behalf of the Complainant.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Findings: Based on statements from the accused Officers, Sergeant, and Complainant, department reports/records, and medical records, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that profanities were directed at the Complainant; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he grabbed, yanked and twisted Complainant's arm behind his back.

Officer B: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that profanities were directed at the Complainant; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he grabbed, yanked and twisted Complainant's arm behind his back.

Sergeant : During mediation, the Sergeant agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **Violation Noted.** for the allegation of failing to register a complaint against Officers A and B on behalf of the Complainant.

Log/C.R. No. 1030064

Notification Date: September 12, 2009

Location: 1st District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving an off-duty Sergeant and a Complainant, it was alleged that Sergeant boarded a CTA bus and punched Complainant in his face, directed profanities at Complainant, failed to identify himself as a Department member and brought discredit upon the department. It was further alleged that Officer A made a false report in a statement to IPRA when he indicated that the Complainant did not want to sign a criminal complaint.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Sergeant, Officer, Complainant, witnesses, department records/reports, video, photographs, and medical records, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that he made a false report in a statement to IPRA.

Sergeant: A finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of **Separation** for the allegations that he punched the Complainant about his face, directed profanities at Complainant, and as a result of his actions

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

brought discredit upon the Department; **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that he failed to identify himself as a department member.

Log/C.R. No. 1036745

Notification Date: May 30, 2010

Location: 7th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving six on-duty CPD members, (Officers A, B, C, D, E, F), a Sergeant, and Complainant, it was alleged that Officers A, B, C, D, E, and F searched the Complainant's vehicle without justification, handcuffed Complainant too tightly, slammed Complainant's head against the Department vehicle, and directed profanities at Complainant. It was also alleged that Officer A and B refused to provide their names and star numbers. It was further alleged that the Sergeant failed to file a complaint on behalf of the Complainant and refused to identify himself upon request.

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

Officer A: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he searched the Complainant's vehicle without justification, handcuffed Complainant too tightly, slammed Complainant's head into the Department vehicle, directed profanities at Complainant, and refused to provide his name and star number upon request.

Officer B: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he searched the Complainant's vehicle without justification, slammed Complainant's head into the Department vehicle, handcuffed Complainant too tightly, directed profanities at Complainant, and refused to provide his name and star number upon request.

Officer C: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he searched the Complainant's vehicle without justification, slammed Complainant's head into the Department vehicle handcuffed Complainant too tightly, and directed profanities at Complainant.

Officer D: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he searched the Complainant's vehicle without justification, slammed

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Complainant's head into the Department vehicle, handcuffed Complainant too tightly, and directed profanities at Complainant.

Officer F: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that he searched the Complainant's vehicle without justification; **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he slammed Complainant's head into the Department vehicle, handcuffed Complainant too tightly, and directed profanities at Complainant.

Officer E: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that he searched the Complainant's vehicle without justification; **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegations that he slammed Complainant's head into the Department vehicle, handcuffed Complainant too tightly, and directed profanities at Complainant.

Sergeant: A finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **Reprimand** for the allegations that he failed to file a complaint on behalf of the Complainant and refused to identify himself upon request.

Log/C.R. No. 1056514

Notification Date: August 22, 2012

Location: 18th District

Complaint: Improper Search of a person

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers (Officer A and Officer B), a Detention Aide and a Subject, it was alleged that the accused Officers and Detention Aide were inattentive to duty in that they failed to properly search the Subject which resulted in the Subject attempting to hang himself while in lock-up.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officers, Detention Aide, witnesses; department records/reports, medical records, and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that the Officer failed to properly search the subject.

Officer B: **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that the Officer failed to properly search the subject.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Detention Aide: A finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegation that he was inattentive to duty in that he failed to properly search the Subject which resulted in the Subject attempting to hang himself while in lock-up.

Log/C.R. No. 1031565

Notification Date: November 4, 2009

Location: 8th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving four on-duty CPD Officers, (Officer A, Officer B, Officer C, and Officer D), and Complainant, it was alleged that Officer A struck Complainant about the head and body with a baton, choked Complainant with a baton, hit Complainant on her face with his hand, directed profanities toward the Complainant, failed to arrest an offender for child abduction, failed to complete a case report properly documenting the child abduction assignment, and failed to return the child to the Complainant/custodial parent, took and failed to inventory or return Complainant's cellular phone, and as a result brought discredit upon the Department. It is also alleged that Officers B, C, and D struck Complainant about her head and body with a baton, failed to arrest the offender for child abduction, failed to complete a case report properly documenting the child abduction assignment, and failed to return the child to the Complainant/custodial parent, and took and failed to return or inventory Complainant's cell phone.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officers, witness, Complainant; department records/reports, and medical records, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he struck Complainant about her head and body with a baton, choked Complainant with a baton, directed profanities toward the Complainant and brought discredit upon the Department; **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that he took and failed to return or inventory Complainant's cell phone; **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that he hit the Complainant on her face with his hand; **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension** for the allegations that he failed to arrest the offender for child abduction and failed to return the child to the Complainant/custodial parent; and failed to complete a case report properly documenting the child abduction assignment.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Officer B: A finding of “**UNFOUNDED**” for the allegations that he struck Complainant about her head and body with a baton, and failed to return or inventory Complainant’s cell phone; “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension** for the allegations that he failed to arrest the offender for child abduction, failed to return the child to the Complainant/custodial parent; and failed to complete a case report properly documenting the child abduction assignment.

Officer C: A finding of “**NOT SUSTAINED**” for the allegation that he struck Complainant about her head and body with a baton; “**UNFOUNDED**” for the allegation that he failed to return or inventory Complainant’s cell phone; “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension** for the allegations that he failed to arrest the offender for child abduction, failed to return the child to the Complainant/custodial parent; and failed to complete a case report documenting the child abduction assignment.

Officer D: A finding of “**NOT SUSTAINED**” for the allegation that he struck Complainant about her head and body with a baton; “**UNFOUNDED**” for the allegation that he failed to return or inventory Complainant’s cell phone; “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension** for the allegations that he failed to arrest the offender for child abduction, failed to return the child to the Complainant/custodial parent; and failed to complete a case report properly documenting the child abduction assignment.

Log/C.R. No. 1033791

Notification Date: February 9, 2010

Location: 1st & 2nd District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving four on-duty CPD Officers (Officer A, B, C, and D) a Sergeant, Complainant/Victim 1, Victim 2 and Victim 3 and Unknown Officers, it was alleged that Officer A and Officer B unreasonable seized and detained the Complainant/Victim 1 and submitted a false report when they stated that they transported the Complainant/Victim1. It is alleged that Officer C unreasonably seized, detained and improperly searched Victim 2, and took and failed to inventory Victim 3’s money. It is further alleged that Unknown Officers stripped search and choked Victim 2, broke Complainant/Victim 1’s wristwatch while detaining him and broke a flat

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

screen television and damaged Victim 3's apartment. The Sergeant is alleged to have directed that Complainant/Victim 1 be unreasonably detained while Victim 3's apartment was searched, authorized that Victim 2 be stripped search, took and failed to inventory Victim 3's money, failed to take before and after photographs while executing a search warrant, and several counts of being inattentive to duty, including being inattentive to duty because he failed to use a canine team or justify not using a canine team, failed to designate a search team that received training in using digital cameras, failed to ensure that the point of entry was secured in a reasonable manner, and failed to review the completed sketch of the premises. It is also alleged that the Sergeant failed to make every effort to leave the premises in the same condition as originally found

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officers, witnesses, Complainant/Victim 1, Victims' 2 and 3; department records/reports, and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he unreasonably seized and detained the Complainant/Victim1 and submitted a false report that he transported Complainant/Victim 1.

Officer B: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he unreasonably seized and detained the Complainant/Victim 1 and submitted a false report that he transported Complainant/Victim 1.

Officer C: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he unreasonably seized, detained and improperly searched Victim 2, and took and failed to inventory Victim 3's money.

Unknown Officers: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that the Unknown Officers stripped search and choked Victim 2, broke Complainant/Victim 1's wristwatch while detaining him, broke a flat screen television and damaged Victim 3's apartment.

Sergeant: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension** for the allegations that he directed that Complainant/Victim 1 be unreasonably detained while Victim 3's apartment was searched, failed to take before and after photographs when he executed a search warrant, was inattentive to duty in that he failed to use a canine team or justify not using a canine team, failed to review the completed sketch of the premises and failed to make every effort to leave the

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

premises in the same condition; **“UNFOUNDED”** for the allegation that he was inattentive to duty in that he failed to ensure that the point of entry was secured in a reasonable manner; **“NOT SUSTAINED”** for the allegations that he took and failed to inventory Victim 3’s money, authorized that Victim 2 be stripped searched, and was inattentive to duty in that he failed to designate a search team member who had received Department training in the use of digital cameras.

Log/C.R. No. 1020292

Notification Date: September 24, 2008

Location: 25th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving thirteen on-duty CPD members, (Officers A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M), a Lieutenant, Sergeant, and two Complainants/Victims (Victim 1 and Victim 2); it was alleged that the Lieutenant and Sergeant entered Victim 2’s residence without permission or a search warrant, damaged the front door, were inattentive to duty when they failed to ensure that Officer L completed a Tactical Response Report (TRR), were aware of police misconduct and failed to report it, provided IPRA with a false statement, and brought discredit upon the Department. It is also alleged that Officer A handcuffed Victim 2 without justification, damaged the front door, entered Victim 2’s residence without permission or a search warrant, was inattentive to duty when he failed to ensure the search warrant team executed the search warrant at the correct address and was aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department. It is further alleged that Officers B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, and L placed their knee on Victim 1’s back without justification, punched Victim 1 on his face and stomach, damaged the front door of Victim 2’s residence, entered Victim 2’s residence without permission or a search warrant and handcuffed Victim 2 without justification. Also, it is alleged that Officers G, H, J, K, and L were aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department; Officer I brought discredit upon the Department; Officer L was inattentive to duty because he failed to complete a TRR; Officer L, J, and K provided false statements to IPRA. It is further alleged that Officer M handcuffed Victim 2 without justification, damaged the front door of Victim 2’s residence, entered Victim 2’s residence without permission or a search warrant

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

and was aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused officers, a witness, Victim 1, Victim 2, a paramedic, department records/reports, medical records, and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Lieutenant: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that he provided a false statement to IPRA; **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that he damaged the front door of Victim 2's residence and that he was aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department; **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of **Reprimand** for the allegations that searched Victim 2's residence without permission or a search warrant, was inattentive to duty when he failed to ensure that Officer L completed a TRR and bringing discredit upon the Department because he entered Victim 2's residence without permission or a search warrant and failed to ensure that Officer L completed a TRR.

Sergeant: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that he provided a false statement to IPRA; **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that he was aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department; **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of **Reprimand** for the allegations that he entered Victim 2's residence without permission or a search warrant, damaged the front door to Victim 2's residence, failed to ensure that Officer L completed a TRR, and bringing discredit upon the Department.

Officer A: A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he provided a false statement to IPRA and that he entered Victim 2's residence without permission or a search warrant; **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he handcuffed Victim 2 without justification, damaged Victim 2's front door, and was aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department; **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of **Violation Noted** for the allegation that he was inattentive to duty in that he failed to ensure that the search warrant team executed the search warrant at the correct address.

Officer B: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he placed his knee on Victim 1's back without justification, punched Victim 1 on his face and stomach and damaged the front door of Victim 2's residence; **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that he entered Victim 2's residence without permission or a search warrant;

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

“NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that he handcuffed Victim 2 without justification.

Officer C: A finding of **“UNFOUNDED”** for the allegations that he placed his knee on Victim 1’s back without justification, punched Victim 1 on his face and stomach and damaged the front door of Victim 2’s residence; **“EXONERATED”** for the allegation that he entered Victim 2’s residence without permission or a search warrant; **“NOT SUSTAINED”** for the allegation that he handcuffed Victim 2 without justification.

Officer D: A finding of **“UNFOUNDED”** for all the allegations that he placed his knee on Victim 1’s back without justification, punched Victim 1 on the face and stomach, entered Victim 2’s residence without permission or a search warrant, damaged Victim 2’s front door, and handcuffed Victim 2 without justification.

Officer E: A finding of **“UNFOUNDED”** for all the allegations that he placed his knee on Victim 1’s back without justification, punched Victim 1 on the face and stomach, entered Victim 2’s residence without permission or a search warrant, damaged Victim 2’s front door, and handcuffed Victim 2 without justification.

Officer F: A finding of **“UNFOUNDED”** for all the allegations that he placed his knee on Victim 1’s back without justification, punched Victim 1 on the face and stomach, entered Victim 2’s residence without permission or a search warrant, damaged Victim 2’s front door, and handcuffed Victim 2 without justification.

Officer G and H: A finding of **“UNFOUNDED”** for the allegations that he placed his knee on Victim 1’s back without justification, punched Victim 1 on his face and stomach, damaged the front door of Victim 2’s residence, and handcuffed Victim 2 without justification; **“NOT SUSTAINED”** for the allegations that he entered Victim 2’s residence without permission or a search warrant and he was aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department.

Officer H: A finding of **“UNFOUNDED”** for the allegations that he placed his knee on Victim 1’s back without justification, punched Victim 1 on his face and stomach, damaged the front door of Victim 2’s residence, and handcuffed Victim 2 without justification; **“NOT SUSTAINED”** for the allegations that he entered Victim 2’s residence

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

without permission or a search warrant and he was aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department.

Officer I: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he placed his knee on Victim 1's back without justification, punched Victim 1 on his face and stomach, damaged the front door of Victim 2's residence, and handcuffed Victim 2 without justification; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that he brought discredit to the Department; **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of **Violation Noted** for the allegation that he entered Victim 2's residence without permission or a search warrant.

Officer J: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he placed his knee on Victim 1's back without justification, punched Victim 1 on his face and stomach, entered Victim 2's residence without permission or a search warrant and handcuffed Victim 2 without justification; **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that he damaged the front door of Victim 2's residence,; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he was aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department and provided a false statement to IPRA.

Officer K: A finding of **"EXONERATED"** for the allegation that he placed his knee on Victim 1's back without justification; **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he punched Victim 1 on his face and stomach, damaged the front door of Victim 2's residence, and handcuffed Victim 2 without justification; **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of **Violation Noted** for the allegation that he entered Victim 2's residence without permission or a search warrant; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he was aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department and provided a false statement to IPRA.

Officer L: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he placed his knee on Victim 1's back, punched Victim 1 on his stomach, damaged the front door of Victim 2's residence, entered Victim 2's residence without permission or a search warrant and handcuffed Victim 2 without justification; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he punched Victim 1 in his face, was aware of police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department, and provided a false statement to IPRA; **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of **Reprimand** for the allegation that he was inattentive to duty in that he failed to complete a TRR.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Officer M: A finding of “**UNFOUNDED**” for the allegations that he handcuffed Victim 2 without justification, entered Victim 2’s residence without permission or a search warrant, and damaged Victim 2’s front door. .

Log/C.R. No. 1028193

Notification Date: July 14, 2009

Location: Elgin, Illinois

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving forty-four on-duty CPD members (Officers A- Z and A1 – R1), a Lieutenant, a Sergeant, three Detectives (Detective 1, 2, and 3) and Victim, it was alleged that Officers A, B, C, D, L, U, V, W, X and the Lieutenant violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy. It is also alleged that Officer E, F, G, H, I, J, K, M, N, O, P, Q, R, S, Y, Z, A1, B1,C1, D1, E1, F1, G1, H1, I1, J1, K1, L1, M1, N1, O1, P1, Q1, R1, the Sergeant, Detective 1, Detective 2, and Detective 3 violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy, left their duty assignments without authorization, and failed to notify the OEMC that they were responding as assist units. Finally, it is alleged that Officer T violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy, left his duty assignments without authorization, failed to notify the OEMC that he was responding as an assist unit, violated Chicago Police Department’s use of deadly force policy by shooting the Victim without justification, and violated a Chicago Police Department General Order by failing to remain on the scene to report to the watch commander after discharging his weapon.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officers, witness, Victim; department records/reports, medical records, court documents, video, and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Lieutenant: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of **2-day Suspension** for the allegation Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy.

Sergeant: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension** for the allegations that he violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy, left his duty assignments without authorization, and failed to notify the OEMC that he was responding as an assist unit.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Officer A: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of **Violation Noted** for the allegation that he violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy.

Officer B, C, L, U, V,W and X: A finding of “**UNFOUNDED**” for the allegation that they violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy.

Officer D: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension** for the allegation that he violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy.

Officer E, F, K, M, N, O,A1, B1, C1, D1, E1, F1, I1, J1, K1 and R1 : A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension** for the allegations that they violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy, left their duty assignments without authorization, and failed to notify the OEMC that they were responding as assist units.

Officer G, H, I, J, O, P, Q, R, S, H1, L1, M1, N1, O1, and P1, Q1: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegations that they violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy, left their duty assignments without authorization, and failed to notify the OEMC that they were responding as assist units.

Detective 1, 2, and 3: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegations that they violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy, left their duty assignments without authorization, and failed to notify the OEMC that they were responding as assist units.

Officer Y and Z: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **Violation Noted** for the allegations that they violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy, left their duty assignments without authorization, and failed to notify the OEMC that they were responding as assist units.

Officer T: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension** for the allegations that he violated the Chicago Police Department’s pursuit policy, left his duty assignments without authorization, failed to notify the OEMC that he was responding as an assist unit, violated Chicago Police Department’s use of deadly force policy by shooting the Victim without justification, and violated a

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Chicago Police Department General Order by failing to remain on the scene to report to the watch commander after discharging his weapon.

Log/C.R. No. 1034643

Notification Date: March 16, 2010

Location: N/A

Complaint: Domestic Incident

Summary: In an incident involving an off-duty CPD officer and Complainant, it was alleged that the Officer pushed Complainant against a wall and then kicked and struck her on the back, legs, and head. It was also alleged that the Officer pushed Complainant to the ground and head butted her. Allegations also include breaking household items and throwing shoes at the Complainant. Also alleged was that on multiple occasions, Officer made personal contact, had numerous telephone conversations, and sent numerous texts to Complainant in violation of an Order of Protection. It was also alleged that Officer was inattentive to duty when he engaged in excessive personal telephone use while on duty, on multiple occasions threatened to call immigration, use resources and influences to have her deported and used her non-citizenship status to control, manipulate, and prevent her from taking their daughters outside without him. Also, it is alleged that he took Complainant's items without justification, filed a false report and had her arrested for domestic battery, erased photographs from her SIM card and failed to return the SIM card, took Complainant's money and failed to return it, and on several occasions physically, mentally, and emotionally abused her, his daughters, her son and her sisters' children. Finally, it is alleged that Officer had Complainant falsely arrested for theft.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officer and Complainant; department records/reports, court documents, and telephone records, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer: A finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **15-day Suspension** for the allegations that on multiple occasions he made personal contact with the Complainant in violation of an Order of Protection, had numerous telephone conversations with the Complainant in violation of an Order of Protection, sent numerous text messages to the Complainant in violation of an Order of Protection and was inattentive to duty because he engaged in excessive personal

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

telephone use while on-duty; **"NOT SUSTAINED "** for the allegations that he pushed Complainant against a wall and then kicked and struck her on the back, legs, and head pushed Complainant to the ground, head butted, broke household items and threw shoes at the Complainant, took Complainant's items without justification, filed a false report and had her arrested for domestic battery, had Complainant falsely arrested for theft, erased photographs from her SIM card and failed to return the SIM card, took Complainant's money and failed to return it, and on several occasions physically, mentally, and emotionally abused her, his daughters, her son and her sisters' children.

Log/C.R. No. 1048888

Notification Date: September 13, 2011

Location: 15th District

Complaint: Unnecessary Physical Contact

Summary: In an incident involving three on-duty CPD Officers (Officer A, B, and C), an Unknown on-duty CPD officer, a Complainant/Victim (Complainant/Victim 1), and another Victim (Victim 2); it was alleged that, while conducting a traffic stop, Officer A threatened, pushed, and stripped searched Victim 2 in public without proper authorization and improperly used Complainant/Victim 1's vehicle. It is also alleged that Officers B and C stripped searched Victim 2 in public without proper authorization and improperly used Complainant/Victim 1's vehicle. It is further alleged that an Unknown Officer stripped searched the Complainant/Victim 1 without proper authorization or justification.

Finding: During mediation, Officers A, B, and C agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegation that they improperly used Complainant/Victim 1's vehicle

Allegations against Unknown Officer were **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that she stripped searched the Complainant/Victim 1 without proper authorization.

Log/C.R. No. 1025620

Notification Date: April 17, 2009

Location: 8th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Summary: In an incident involving four on-duty CPD Officers (Officer A,B,C, D), an Unknown on-duty CPD officer, and four Victims (Victim 1,2,3, and 4); it was alleged that Officer A and B pushed Victim 1 to the ground, stepped on Victim 1's head and failed to report that a fellow officer used improper force against Victim 1. It is also alleged that Officer C kicked and punched Victim 2, Victim 3 and Victim 4; failed to report that a fellow officer used improper force against Victim 1, disobeyed a Department General Order, failed to document the encounter with Victim 1, and submitted a false oral report. Also, it is alleged that Officer D failed to report that a fellow officer used improper force against Victim 1, disobeyed a Department General Order, and failed to document the encounter with Victim 1. Finally, it is alleged that an Unknown Officer punched Victim 3 on his face.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officers, witness, Victim 1, 2, 3 and 4; department records/reports, medical records, and photographs, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A and B: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that they pushed Victim 1 to the ground, stepped on Victim 1's head and failed to report that a fellow officer used improper force against Victim 1.

Officer D: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he failed to report that a fellow officer used improper force against Victim 1, disobeyed a Department General Order, and failed to document the encounter with Victim 1.

Officer C: A finding of **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he kicked and punched Victim 3, kicked Victim 4, failed to report that a fellow officer used improper force against Victim 1 and disobeyed a Department General Order; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he kicked and punched Victim 2, punched Victim 4, and submitted a false oral report; **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **Reprimand** for the allegation that he failed to properly document the encounter with Victim 1.

Unknown Officer : A finding of **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that he punched Victim 3 on his face.

Log/C.R. No. 1066878

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JUNE 2014

Notification Date: January 5, 2014

Location: 6th District

Complaint: Accidental Taser Discharge

Summary: An on-duty CPD Officer was alleged to have accidentally discharged his Taser.

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

Violation Noted.