

Independent Police Review Authority

Quarterly Report

July 1, 2014 – September 30, 2014

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

Quarterly Overview

During the past quarter, IPRA opened 437 investigations. These numbers include 115 instances where officers discharged their Tasers. Officer-involved shootings accounted for 13 investigations; up from 9 shootings during the previous quarter.

Between July and September, IPRA completed 542 investigations. The office continues to operate with the vacancies of a Supervising Investigator, 5 Intake Aides and 5 Investigators.

IPRA completed 27 sustained investigations. These are investigations where discipline was recommended by IPRA. There were 18 cases during the last quarter where mediation was deemed appropriate and 13 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 continues to be available for speaking opportunities with the community. The IPRA launched its satellite office pilot program where residents can make complaints in the community instead of coming to IPRA's main office at 1615 W. Chicago Avenue. The Lawndale Community Church (3837 W. Ogden) has allowed the IPRA use of space to be able to take complaints in the North Lawndale Community. Plans are underway to potentially open satellite offices in the Englewood and Austin communities. During the past quarter, IPRA spoke during a 37th Ward Community Meeting and met with West Side leaders at St. Stephens AME Church at 3042 W. Washington. The IPRA was also part of a Forum on Police Accountability attended by leaders from across the City; hosted delegations from both the Ukraine and Czech Republic; and appeared on the Wiley Resource Center Show aired on CAN-TV. The IPRA also attended the three monthly Police Board Meetings held during the past three months.

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
3Q 2014	1672	437	542	862

IPRA Investigations Opened by Incident Type⁶

	IPRA (COMPLAIN T S)	IPRA (NOTIFICATIONS)					
	INFO & CR	EXTRAORDINARY OCCURRENCE (EO)	HIT SHOOTING (U#)	NON-HIT SHOOTING	SHOOTING/ ANIMAL	TASER	OC DISCHARGE
Sept. 2007	195	4	4	3		3	2
4Q 2007	572	18	7	1		12	5
1Q 2008	475	16	8	12	18	31	16
2Q 2008	526	16	15	8	21	45	9
3Q 2008	563	8	14	10	20	52	13
4Q 2008	579	16	14	7	24	35	24
1Q 2009	553	11	9	9	25	39	14
2Q 2009	624	15	14	13	28	56	7
3Q 2009	657	21	18	16	18	63	22
4Q 2009	495	19	16	19	20	39	9
1Q 2010	482	13	12	14	29	74	15
2Q 2010	505	16	10	10	19	285	27
3Q 2010	576	15	11	10	30	285	16
4Q 2010	470	7	10	10	28	227	10
1Q 2011	377	17	15	12	27	155	10

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
3Q 2014	269	12	13	9	17	115	2

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

Between July 1, 2014 and September 30, 2014, IPRA issued 1,672 Log Numbers. Of these Log Numbers, IPRA retained 437 for resolution. IPRA forwarded the remaining 1,235 Log Numbers to the Internal Affairs Division of the Chicago Police Department for appropriate resolution.

Of the 437 Log Numbers retained by IPRA, IPRA classified 106 as Complaint Register Numbers. In addition, IPRA began Pre-affidavit Investigations for 163 of the Log Numbers retained by IPRA. The remainder of the retained Log Numbers consisted of 13 Log Numbers for shootings where an individual was hit by a bullet and a “U Number” was issued, 9 for shootings where no one was hit by a bullet, 17 for shots fired at animals, 115 for reported uses of tasers, 2 for reported uses of pepper spray,⁷ and 12 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. 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 July 1, 2014 and September 30 2014, IPRA closed 542 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 September, 2014, there were 862 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 July 1, 2014 and September 30, 2014, IPRA recommended that 110 investigations be closed as “not sustained.”

In addition, 136 cases were closed after a Pre-affidavit Investigation because the complainants refused to sign an affidavit. IPRA recommended that 66 investigations be closed as “unfounded,” and 7 be closed as “exonerated.”

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

Between July 1, 2014 and September 30, 2014, IPRA recommended that 27 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 July 1, 2014 and September 30, 2014, IPRA received complaints of alleged misconduct based on incidents in the following districts, as follows:

District 01 = 67	District 07 = 90	District 14 = 36	District 20 = 18
District 02 = 80	District 08 = 96	District 15 = 60	District 22 = 50
District 03 = 108	District 09 = 48	District 16 = 47	District 24 = 31
District 04 = 101	District 10 = 59	District 17 = 31	District 25 = 74
District 05 = 87	District 11 = 101	District 18 = 69	
District 06 = 96	District 12 = 71	District 19 = 64	
Outside City Limits = 22		Unknown location = 9	

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 July 1, 2014 and September 30, 2014, IPRA referred 1,251 cases to other agencies as follows:

Chicago Police Department – Internal Affairs Division = 1,235

Cook County State’s Attorney = 16

Federal Bureau of Investigations = 0

(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 1-25: 1 complaint each

Member 26: 2 complaints

District 002

Members 1-23: 1 complaint each

Members 24- 25: 2 complaints each

District 003

Members 1-27: 1 complaint each

Members 28- 30: 2 complaints each

District 004

Members 1-29: 1 complaint each

District 005

Members 1-20: 1 complaint each

Member 21: 2 complaints

District 006

Members 1-28: 1 complaint each

Member 29: 3 complaints

District 007

Members 1-27: 1 complaint each

Member 28: 2 complaints

District 008

Members 1-27: 1 complaint each

Member 28: 2 complaints

District 009

Members 1-8: 1 complaint each

Member 9: 2 complaints

District 010

Members 1-32: 1 complaint each

Members 33-34: 2 complaints each

District 011

Members 1-11: 1 complaint each

Members 12-16: 2 complaints each

Member 17: 3 complaints

District 012

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each

District 014

Members 1-11: 1 complaint each

Member 12: 2 complaints

District 015

Members 1-13: 1 complaint each

Member 14: 2 complaints

District 016

Members 1-6: 1 complaint each

Member 7: 2 complaints

District 017

Members 1-12: 1 complaint each

District 018

Members 1-20: 1 complaint each

Member 21: 2 complaints

District 019

Members 1-21: 1 complaint each

District 020

Members 1-9: 1 complaint each

Member 10: 2 complaints

District 022

Members 1-13: 1 complaint each

Member 14: 2 complaints

District 024

Members 1-15: 1 complaint each

District 025

Members 1-22: 1 complaint each

Members 23-24: 2 complaints each

Airport Law Enforcement Unit – North (050)

Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

Airport Law Enforcement Unit – South (051)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Mounted Patrol Unit (055)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Marine Unit (055)

Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

Special Investigations Unit (079)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Office of News Affairs (102)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Legal Affairs Section (114)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Human Resources Division (123)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Education and Training Division (124)

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

Inspections Division (126)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Research and Development Division (127)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Traffic Section (145)

Members 1-4: 1 complaint each

Records Inquiry Section (163)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Field Services Section (166)

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

Evidence and Recovered Property Section (167)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Central Detention (171)

Members 1-3: 1 complaint

Member 4: 2 complaints

Narcotics Section (189)

Members 1-40: 1 complaint each

Members 41-42: 2 complaints each

Intelligence Section (191)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Vice and Asset Forfeiture Division (192)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

Gang Investigation Division (193)

Members 1-7: 1 complaint each

Bureau of Patrol – Area Central (211)

Members 1-8: 1 complaint each

Member 9: 2 complaints

Bureau of Patrol – Area South (212)

Members 1-21: 1 complaint each

Members 22-28: 2 complaints each

Member 29: 3 complaints

Bureau of Patrol – Area North (213)

Members 1-16: 1 complaint each

Medical Services Section (231)

Member 1: 1 complaint each

Forensic Services – Evidence Technician Section (277)

Member 1: 1 complaint

Gang Enforcement – Area Central (311)

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

Member 6: 1 complaints

Gang Enforcement – Area South (312)

Members 1-12: 1 complaint each

Gang Enforcement – Area North (313)

Members 1-7: 1 complaint each

Member 8: 2 complaints

Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) Unit (353)

Member 1: 1 complaint each

Alternate Response Section (376)

Members 1-10: 1 complaint each

Member 11: 3 complaints

Gang Enforcement Division (393)

Members 1-2: 1 complaint each

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

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

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

Members 1-5: 1 complaint each

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

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 1-12: 1 complaint each

Member 13: 2 complaints

Bureau of Detectives – Area South (620)

Members 1-6: 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)

Members 1-12: 1 complaint each

Detective Division, Area 4 (640)¹

Member 1: 1 complaint each

Public Transportation Section (701)

Members 1-3: 1 complaint each

¹ Unit 640 is no longer in existence. Unit 640 has been renamed

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JULY 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1066622

Notification Date: December 16, 2013

Location: 6th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty CPD Officer and a Subject, it was alleged that the Officer threw the Subject off a Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) bus into the snow, directed profanities at him and punched/struck him about the face.

Finding: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **3-day Suspension** for the allegation that he punched/struck the Subject about the face; "**NOT SUSTAINED**" for the allegations that he threw the Subject off the CTA bus into the snow and directed profanities at the Subject.

Log/C.R. No. 1045029

Notification Date: April 28, 2011

Location: 2nd District

Complaint: Domestic Incident

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty CPD Officer and a Complainant; it was alleged that the Officer engaged in an unjustified verbal and physical altercation with the Complainant. During the altercation, it was alleged that the Officer slapped the Complainant about the face and had the Complainant falsely arrested for Domestic Battery. The involved Sergeant is alleged to have received allegations of misconduct against the Officer and failed to initiate an investigation into these allegations.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused; photographs, and court documents IPRA recommended the following:

Officer: A finding of "**NOT SUSTAINED**" for the allegations that the Officer engaged in an unjustified verbal and physical altercation with the Complainant, slapped the Complainant about the face, and had the Complainant falsely arrested for Domestic Battery.

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

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JULY 2014

allegation that he failed to initiate an investigation into the allegations of misconduct against the Officer.

Log/C.R. No. 1055541

Notification Date: July 15, 2012

Location: 16th District

Complaint: Domestic Incident

Summary: In an incident involving an off-duty CPD Officer and a minor/Victim, the Officer was alleged to have struck the minor/Victim with a piece of wood, punched the minor/Victim about the body, kicked the minor/Victim repeatedly about the body, grabbed the minor/Victim by the minor/Victim's hair and slammed the minor/Victim's head against the floor. It is further alleged that the Officer verbally abused the minor/Victim in that the Officer directed profanities at the minor/Victim, stated words to the effect of "You are not human and do not deserve food and water," handcuffed the minor/Victim to a door, left the premises after handcuffing the minor/Victim to a door, and photographed the minor/Victim while the minor/Victim was handcuffed to a door. Finally, it is alleged that on another occasion, the Officer verbally abused and threatened the minor/Victim.

Finding: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **5-day Suspension** for the allegations that the Officer handcuffed the minor/Victim to a door and left the premises after restraining the minor/Victim by handcuffing the minor/Victim to a door; "**NOT SUSTAINED**" for the allegations that the Officer struck the minor/Victim with a piece of wood, punched the minor/Victim about the body, kicked the minor/Victim repeatedly about the body, grabbed the minor/Victim by the minor/Victim's hair and slammed the minor/Victim's head against the floor, directed profanities at the minor/Victim, stated words to the effect of, "You are not human and do not deserve food and water," photographed the minor/Victim while the minor/Victim was handcuffed to a door, verbally abused and threatened the minor/Victim.

Log/C.R. No. 1042275

Notification Date: December 25, 2010

Location: 15th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JULY 2014

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers (Officer A and Field Training Officer (FTO) B), a Complainant/Victim, and another Victim (Victim), it was alleged that Officer A repeatedly struck the Victim about the body, struck the Complainant/Victim in the eye causing the Complainant/Victim's head to hit the glass of a restaurant window, placed the Complainant/Victim and the Victim in his police vehicle and drove them around without justification, threatened to drop the Complainant/Victim and the Victim off in a different neighborhood other than where they lived, and failed to complete and submit a field contact card. Also, it is alleged that FTO B failed to complete and submit a field contact card.

Finding:

Officer A: During mediation, Officer A agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **Violation Noted** for the allegation that he failed to complete and submit a field contact card; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that the Officer A repeatedly struck the Victim about the body, struck the Complainant/Victim in the eye causing the Complainant/Victim's head to hit the glass of the restaurant window, drove the Complainant/Victim and the Victim around in his police vehicle without justification and threatened to drop the Complainant/Victim and the Victim off in a different neighborhood other than where they lived.

FTO B: Based on statements from the accused Officers, the Complainant/Victim and the Victim; and department records, IPRA recommended a finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegation that FTO B failed to complete and submit a field contact card.

Log/C.R. No. 1033544

Notification Date: February 1, 2010

Location: 25th District

Complaint: Physical Altercation

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers (Officer A and Complainant/Officer B), it was alleged that while working a beat, Officer A engaged in an unjustified verbal and physical altercation with the Complainant/Officer B. During the altercation, it was alleged that Officer A directed profanities and language involving sexual orientation

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JULY 2014

at the Complainant/Officer B, shoved the Complainant/Officer B in the chest, and chest bumped the Complainant/Officer B. Complainant/Officer B is alleged to have engaged in an unjustified verbal and physical altercation when the Complainant/Officer B chest bumped and directed multiple profanities towards the Officer A. Finally, it was alleged that both the Officer A and the Complainant/Officer B brought discredit upon the department by engaging in an unjustified verbal and physical altercation in the presence of other department members.

Finding:

Officer A: During mediation, Officer A agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegations that Officer A engaged in unjustified physical and verbal altercation where Officer A directed profanities and language involving sexual orientation at the Complainant/Officer B, shoved the Complainant/Officer B in the chest, chest bumped the Complainant/Officer B, and brought discredit upon the department by engaging in an unjustified verbal and physical altercation in the presence of other department members.

Complainant/Officer B: Based on statements from the accused Officers, the witnesses; and department reports/records, IPRA recommended a finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **2-day Suspension** for the allegations that the Complainant/Officer B directed multiple profanities towards Officer A and brought discredit upon the department by engaging in an unjustified verbal and physical altercation in the presence of other Department members; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that the Complainant/Officer B engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Officer A.

Log/C.R. No. 1045628

Notification Date: May 24, 2011

Location: 6th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving three on-duty CPD members (Officer A, B and C) and a Complainant; it was alleged that, while responding to a domestic call, Officer A and B failed to secure Complainant's safety in that, while the Complainant was intoxicated, they transported the Complainant to an unsecured location, failed to

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JULY 2014

complete a contact card for their contact with the Complainant, and observed police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department. Also, it is alleged that Officer C struck the Complainant on the body with a baton, failed to complete a field contact card or tactical response report for Officer C's contact with the Complainant and failed to secure the Complainant's safety in that, while the Complainant was intoxicated, Officer C transported the Complainant to an unsecured location. It is further alleged that Officer C provided the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) with a false statement regarding the Complainant's conduct, Officer C's overall actions during the incident and Officer C's account that he did not strike the Complainant with a baton.

Findings:

Officer A: During mediation, Officer A agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegations that Officer A failed to secure the Complainant's safety in that, while the Complainant was intoxicated, Officer A transported the Complainant to an unsecured location, failed to complete a contact card for her contact with the Complainant, and observed police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department.

Officer B: During mediation, Officer B agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **3-day Suspension** for the allegations that Officer B failed to secure the Complainant's safety in that, while the Complainant was intoxicated, Officer B transported the Complainant to an unsecured location, failed to complete a contact card for her contact with the Complainant, and observed police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department.

Officer C: During mediation, Officer C agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **15-day Suspension** for the allegations that Officer C struck the Complainant on the body with a baton, failed to complete a field contact card or tactical response report for Officer C's contact with the Complainant, provided IPRA with a false statement, and failed to secure the Complainant's safety in that, while the Complainant was intoxicated, Officer C transported the Complainant to an unsecured location.

Log/C.R. No. 1067564

Notification Date: February 17, 2014

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JULY 2014

Location: 1st District

Complaint: Firearm Discharge

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty Sergeant, the Sergeant was alleged to have failed to secure his weapon and discharged his weapon inside the station.

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

Log/C.R. No. 1052620

Notification Date: March 16, 2012

Location: 20th District

Complaint: Physical Altercation

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty CPD Officer and a Sergeant, it was alleged that the Sergeant pushed the Officer, which resulted in the Officer falling backwards and striking the Officer's back on the edge of the desk. Also, it is alleged that the Sergeant directed profanities towards the Officer.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Sergeant, the Officer, the witnesses; and medical records, IPRA recommended the following:

Sergeant: A finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **3-day Suspension** for the allegations that the Sergeant pushed and directed profanities at the Officer.

Log/C.R. No. 1054393

Notification Date: May 30, 2012

Location: 4th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers (Officers A and B), and a Complainant, it was alleged that Officer A struck the Complainant on the right side of the face without justification, unlawfully searched the Complainant, and failed to document his contact with the Complainant. Officer B is alleged to have directed

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JULY 2014

profanities at the Complainant, unlawfully searched the Complainant, failed to document his contact with the Complainant, witnessed police misconduct and failed to report it to the Department.

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

Officer A: A finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **15-day Suspension** for the allegations that Officer A struck the Complainant on the right side of the face without justification, unlawfully searched the Complainant, and failed to document his contact with the Complainant.

Officer B: A finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **10-day Suspension** for the allegations that Officer B witnessed police misconduct and failed to report it to the department and failed to document his contact with the Complainant; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that Officer B directed profanities at the Complainant; **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegation that Officer B unlawfully searched the Complainant.

Log/C.R. No. 1040324

Notification Date: October 2, 2010

Location: 4th District

Complaint: Domestic Incident

Summary: In an incident involving an off-duty CPD Officer and a Complainant, it was alleged the Officer punched the Complainant in the face three times, pushed the Complainant, threatened the Complainant, accessed the Complainant's criminal history record information for non-department related purposes, and was arrested for two active criminal warrants for domestic battery.

Finding: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **7-day Suspension** for the allegations that the Officer accessed the Complainant's criminal history record information for non-department related purposes, and was arrested for two active criminal warrants for domestic battery; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that the Officer punched the Complainant about the face three times, pushed the Complainant and

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JULY 2014

threatened the Complainant.

Log/C.R. No. 1044541

Notification Date: April 6, 2011

Location: 4th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers (Officers A and B), an Unknown Officer, and a Subject; it was alleged that Officer A struck the Subject on the head with a flashlight, dragged the Subject out of the police vehicle, and kicked and/or stomped the Subject about the body. Officer B was alleged to have choked the Subject, struck the Subject about the face, dragged the Subject out of the police vehicle and kicked and/or stomped the Subject about the body. Finally, it is alleged that an Unknown Officer kicked the Subject.

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

Officer A: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **7-day Suspension** for the allegations that Officer A struck the Subject on the head with a flashlight and kicked and/or stomped the Subject about the body; “**EXONERATED**” for the allegation that Officer A dragged the Subject out of the police vehicle.

Officer B: A finding of “**SUSTAINED**” and a penalty of a **5-day Suspension** for the allegations that Officer B choked the Subject and struck the Subject about the face; “**EXONERATED**” for the allegation that Officer B dragged the Subject out of the police vehicle; “**UNFOUNDED**” for the allegation that Officer B kicked and/or stomped the Subject about the body.

Unknown Officer: A finding of “**NOT SUSTAINED**” for the allegation that the Unknown Officer kicked the Subject.

Log/C.R. No. 1060361

Notification Date: February 25, 2013

Location: 25th District

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JULY 2014

Complaint: Domestic Incident

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty CPD Officer and a minor/Victim, it was alleged that the Officer physically abused the minor/Victim when the Officer struck the minor/Victim about the thighs with a belt.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Officer and the witness; medical records, photographs and a report, IPRA recommended a finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for the allegation and a penalty of a **5-day Suspension**.

Log/C.R. No. 1040966

Notification Date: October 25, 2010

Location: Hillside, Illinois

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving an off-duty CPD Officer and a Complainant, it was alleged that the Officer verbally abused the Complainant by directing profanities at the Complainant, punched the Complainant on the face and struck the Complainant about the head and body. Also, it is alleged that the Officer was arrested by the Hillside Police Department for aggravated battery to a security guard and aggravated battery in a public place. It is further alleged that the Officer was found guilty of a misdemeanor battery. Finally, it is alleged that the Officer's overall actions brought discredit upon the Chicago Police Department.

Finding: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** for all the allegations and a penalty of a **30-day Suspension**.

Log/C.R. No. 1042847

Notification Date: January 20, 2011

Location: 11th District

Complaint: Neglect of Duty

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty CPD Lieutenant, it was alleged that the Lieutenant failed to collect, preserve, and submit evidence in a manner consistent with a Department General Order. It

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JULY 2014

is also alleged that the Lieutenant failed to wear a fresh pair of rubber gloves before touching evidence in violation of a Department General Order. Also, it is alleged that the Lieutenant violated a General Order when the Lieutenant failed to direct a department member who recovered the evidence to inventory the evidence and document the recovery in a supplementary report. Finally, it is alleged that the Lieutenant failed to implement all policies, goals, rules, regulations, orders, and directives of the Department by his overall actions in that the Lieutenant failed to properly supervise an unidentified officer who the Lieutenant believed recovered evidence from the subject.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused, the witnesses; department orders, and photographs, IPRA recommended a finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **10-day Suspension** for all the allegations.

Log/C.R. No. 1055533

Notification Date: July 14, 2012

Location: 1st District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty CPD Officer and a Complainant; it was alleged that the Officer misused her official position by placing her uniform shirts in the windshield of her personal vehicle. It is also alleged that when the Complainant inquired about the shirts in the windshield, the Officer struck the Complainant's camera causing the camera to strike the Complainant in the face. Finally, it is alleged that the Officer failed to complete a field contact card after having contact with the Complainant.

Finding: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **Violation Noted** for the allegations that the Officer misused her official position by placing her uniform shirts in the windshield of her personal vehicle and failed to complete a field contact card after having contact with the Complainant; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that the Officer struck the Complainant's camera causing the camera to strike the Complainant in the face.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JULY 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1060344

Notification Date: February 25, 2013

Location: 8th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving an off-duty CPD Officer and two Complainants (Complainant 1 and Complainant 2), it was alleged that the Officer engaged in an unjustified physical altercation while off-duty. During that altercation, it was alleged that the Officer pushed Complainant 1 to the ground, kicked Complainant 1 in the stomach, tackled Complainant 2 to the ground, kicked Complainant 2 about the head and body, and engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with Complainant 2. It is also alleged that the Officer was intoxicated in public, failed to cooperate with the investigation, failed to follow a direct order to return to the district to submit a breathalyzer, and failed to complete department reports relative to the Officer's physical contact with the Complainants. Finally, it is alleged that the Officer brought discredit to the Department by his overall conduct.

Finding: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **15-day Suspension** for the allegations that the Officer was intoxicated in public, failed to cooperate in an investigation, failed to follow a direct order to return to the district to submit to a breathalyzer test, failed to complete department records relative to the Officer's physical contact with the Complainants, and that the Officer brought discredit to the Department by his overall conduct; "**NOT SUSTAINED**" for the allegations that the Officer engaged in an unjustified physical altercation while off-duty, pushed Complainant 1 to the ground, kicked Complainant 1 in the stomach, tackled Complainant 2 to the ground, kicked Complainant 2 about the head and body, and engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with Complainant 2.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JULY 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1063371

Notification Date: July 8, 2013

Location: 2nd District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty CPD Officer and a Complainant, the Officer was alleged to have engaged in a verbal and physical altercation with the Complainant, struck the Complainant on the side of his faces, and directed profanities at the Complainant.

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

Log/C.R. No. 1032641

Notification Date: December 19, 2009

Location: 6th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty CPD Officer and a Complainant, the Officer was alleged to have thrown the Complainant to the ground, placed his knee on the Complainant's neck pinning him down, and failed to complete a tactical response report.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused and department records, IPRA recommended a finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **Reprimand** for the allegation that the Officer failed to complete a tactical response report; "**NOT SUSTAINED**" for the allegations that the Officer threw the Complainant to the ground and placed his knee on the Complainant's neck pinning him down.

Log/C.R. No. 1068354

Notification Date: April 2, 2014

Location: 3rd 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.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JULY 2014

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

Log/C.R. No. 1054693

Notification Date: June 12, 2012

Location: 4th District

Complaint: Neglect of Duty

Summary: In an incident involving an on-duty Commander, it was alleged that the Commander violated general orders by failing to submit an Illinois Department of Corrections Report of Extraordinary or Unusual Occurrences (IDOC-REUO) to the State of Illinois' Office of Jail and Detention Standards within 72 hours of an incident or its discovery when a Subject sustained an injury while the Subject was in custody, failing to ensure immediate notification by telephone to the operations command and the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding the Subject having sustained an injury while the Subject was in custody, failing to ensure that the IDOC-REUO was completed before the Commander's end of tour regarding the Subject having sustained an injury while the Subject was in custody, failed to forward a copy of the completed IDOC-REUO to the records inquiry section prior to the end of the Commander's shift, failed to forward to the district commander or the commanding officer of central detention the completed IDOC-REUO, failed to review the completed IDOC-REUO and all accompanying reports for completeness, accuracy, and indicate approval by placing the Commander's signature in the space below the shift commander approval line. Finally, it is alleged that the Commander failed to forward the completed IDOC-REUO and all pertinent reports to the responsible deputy chief of patrol division area, and failed to retain a copy of the IDOC-REUO package in the unit of occurrence in accordance with existing records-retention requirements regarding a Subject having sustained an injury while in custody.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused and department orders, IPRA recommended a finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **10-day Suspension** for all the allegations.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JULY 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1061081

Notification Date: March 31, 2013

Location: Harwood Heights, IL

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving an off-duty CPD Officer and two Complainants (Complainant 1 and Complainant 2), the Officer was alleged to have engaged in an unjustified physical and verbal altercation with the Complainants. During that altercation, it is alleged that the Officer was intoxicated while off-duty, had his weapon on him while he was intoxicated, failed to secure his weapon and pointed his weapon at the Complainants without justification. It is also alleged that the Officer pushed the barrel of his weapon into Complainant 1's head without justification, pushed the barrel of his weapon into Complainant 2's head without justification and accidentally discharged his weapon without justification when the complainant(s) attempted to take his gun from him.

Finding: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **160-day Suspension** for the allegations that he was intoxicated while off-duty, engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with the Complainants, had his weapon on him while he was intoxicated, failed to secure his weapon, pointed his weapon at the Complainants without justification, pushed the barrel of his weapon into Complainant 1's head without justification and pushed the barrel of his weapon into Complainant 2's head without justification; "**NOT SUSTAINED**" for the allegations that he engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with the Complainants and he discharged his weapon without justification.

Log/C.R. No. 1042663

Notification Date: January 12, 2011

Location: 7th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD Officers (Officer A and B), an Unknown Officer, a Complainant and three Subjects (Subject 1, 2, and 3). Officer A was alleged to have punched Subject 1 about the face, back, and body, slammed Subject 1 against the wall, dragged Subject 1 across the floor, slapped

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JULY 2014

Subject 1 about the face, directed profanities at Subject 1, directed profanities at Subject 2, and made racial comments to the individuals inside the residence. It also alleged that the Officer A was inattentive to duty because Subject 1 escaped from police custody, failed to make the required notifications relative to Subject 1's escape, and was inattentive to duty because he omitted the fact in departmental records that Subject 1 escaped from custody. Officer B is alleged to have kicked Subject 1 about the face and body, punched Subject 1 about the face, directed profanities at Subject 1, dragged Subject 1 across the ground, and observed police misconduct and failed to report it. Also, it is alleged that Officer B was inattentive to duty because Subject 1 escaped from police custody, was inattentive to duty because he omitted that Subject 1 escaped from police custody in departmental reports, and failed to make the required notifications relative to Subject 1's escape. Finally, it is alleged that an Unknown Officer punched Subject 3 and pushed the Complainant.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused, the Complainant, Subject 1; department records/reports, IPRA recommended the following:

Officer A: A finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **150-day Suspension** for the allegations that Officer A was inattentive to duty in that Subject 1 escaped from police custody, failed to make the required notifications relative to the escape of Subject 1, and was inattentive to duty in that Officer A omitted the fact that Subject 1 escaped from police custody in departmental records; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that he punched Subject 1 about the face, back, and body, slammed Subject 1 against the wall, dragged Subject 1 across the floor, slapped Subject 1 about the face, directed profanities at Subject 1, directed profanities at Subject 2, and made racial comments to the individuals inside the residence.

Officer B: A finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **150-day Suspension** for the allegations that the Officer B was inattentive to duty in that Subject 1 escaped from police custody, failed to make the required notifications relative to the escape of Subject 1, and was inattentive to duty in that Officer B omitted the fact that Subject 1 escaped from police custody in departmental records; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegations that Officer B kicked Subject 1 about the face and body, punched Subject 1 about the face,

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JULY 2014

directed profanities at Subject 1, dragged Subject 1 across the ground, and observed police misconduct and failed to report it.

Unknown Officer: A finding of “**NOT SUSTAINED**” for the allegations that the Unknown Officer punched Subject 3 and pushed the Complainant.

Log/C.R. No. 1036341

Notification Date: May 16, 2010

Location: 7th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving three on-duty CPD Officers (Officer A, B and C), and two juvenile/Subjects (juvenile/Subject 1 and juvenile/Subject 2), Officer A was alleged to have used improper force by punching juvenile/Subject 1, used improper force by punching juvenile/Subject 2, entered and searched juvenile/Subject 1's residence without justification, pointed his firearm at juvenile/Subject 1 without justification, pointed his firearm at juvenile/Subject 2 without justification, failed to complete a tactical response report regarding his physical contact with juvenile/Subject 1 and failed to complete a tactical response report regarding his physical contact with juvenile/Subject 2. Also, it is alleged that Officer A unlawfully detained juvenile/Subject 1, unlawfully detained juvenile/Subject 2, falsely arrested juvenile/Subject 1, falsely arrested juvenile/Subject 2, caused the malicious prosecution of juvenile/Subject 1 and caused the malicious prosecution of juvenile/Subject 2. Officer B and C are alleged to have violated several department general orders including failing to transport juvenile/Subject 1, who required medical care? to the nearest emergency room, failing to transport juvenile/Subject 2, who required medical care, to the nearest emergency room, and failed to prepare a written report to the commanding officer regarding misconduct observed against juvenile/Subject 2. Also, Officer B and C are alleged to have unlawfully detained juvenile/Subject 1, unlawfully detained the juvenile/Subject 2, falsely arrested juvenile/Subject 1, falsely arrested juvenile/Subject 2, failed to protect juvenile/Subject 1, failed to protect juvenile/Subject 2, maliciously prosecuted juvenile/Subject 1 and maliciously prosecuted juvenile/Subject 2.

Finding: During mediation, Officer A agreed to accept IPRA's

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

JULY 2014

finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **3-day Suspension** for the allegations that Officer A used improper force by punching juvenile/Subject 1, used improper force by punching juvenile/Subject 2, failed to complete a tactical response report regarding his physical contact with juvenile/Subject 1 and failed to complete a tactical response report regarding his physical contact with juvenile/Subject 2; **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that he searched juvenile/Subject 1's residence without justification, pointed his firearm at juvenile/Subject 1 without justification, pointed his firearm at juvenile/Subject 2 without justification, unlawfully detained juvenile/Subject 1, unlawfully detained juvenile/Subject 2, falsely arrested juvenile/Subject 1, falsely arrested juvenile/Subject 2, caused the malicious prosecution of juvenile/Subject 1, and caused the malicious prosecution of juvenile/Subject 2.

Officer B and C: During mediation Officer B and Officer C agreed to accept IPRA's finding of **"SUSTAINED"** and a penalty of a **Reprimand** for the allegations that they violated several department general orders including the they failed to transport juvenile/Subject 1, who required medical care, to the nearest emergency room, failed to transport juvenile/Subject 2, who required medical care, to the nearest emergency room, and failed to prepare a written report to the commanding officer regarding misconduct observed against juvenile/Subject 2; **"UNFOUNDED"** for the allegations that they unlawfully detained juvenile/Subject 1, unlawfully detained juvenile/Subject 2, falsely arrested juvenile/Subject 1, falsely arrested juvenile/Subject 2, failed to protect juvenile/Subject 1, failed to protect juvenile/Subject 2, maliciously prosecuted juvenile/Subject 1, and maliciously prosecuted juvenile/Subject 2.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

AUGUST 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1026051

Notification Date: May 4, 2009

Location: 13th District

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD members (Sergeant and Officer) and a Subject, it was alleged the Officer punched the Subject without justification and falsified a departmental report. The involved Sergeant is alleged to have observed or had knowledge of the alleged misconduct, but failed to initiate a complaint and falsified a departmental report.

Sergeant: During mediation, the Sergeant agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **Reprimand** for the allegations that he failed to initiate a complaint involving the alleged misconduct observed. "**NOT SUSTAINED**" for the allegation that he provided false information in a department report.

Officer: Based on statements from the accused and four witnesses; photographs, videos, and court documents IPRA recommended a finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **5-day suspension** for the allegation that he punched the Subject without justification; "**NOT SUSTAINED**" for the allegation that he provided false information in a department report.

Log/C.R. No. 1051669

Notification Date: February 3, 2012

Location: 13th District

Complaint: Unnecessary Physical Contact

Summary: In an incident involving two on-duty CPD members (Lieutenant and Officer), it was alleged that, while inside the 13th District police facility, the Lieutenant bumped the Officer with his shoulder, screamed and yelled at the Officer, displayed unprofessional behavior, and made racial remarks towards the Officer.

Finding: Based on statements from the accused Lieutenant, the Officer and six witnesses, IPRA recommended the following:

Lieutenant: A finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **5-day suspension** for the allegations that the Lieutenant screamed and

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

AUGUST 2014

yelled at the Officer, was unprofessional in his behavior, and made racial remarks toward the Officer; **"NOT SUSTAINED"** for the allegation that he intentionally bumped the Officer with his shoulder.

Abstracts of Sustained Cases

SEPTEMBER 2014

Log/C.R. No. 1069466

Notification Date: May 29, 2014

Location: Lake Geneva, Wisconsin

Complaint: Excessive Force

Summary: In an incident involving two off-duty CPD members (Sergeant and Officer), it was alleged that while visiting a resort in Lake Geneva, Wisconsin, the Sergeant struck the Officer in the face with his fist causing injury, failed to report the incident to CPD, and brought discredit upon the department. The Officer was alleged to have grabbed and squeezed the Sergeant's neck and brought discredit upon the department.

Findings:

Sergeant: During mediation, the Sergeant agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **3-day Suspension** for the allegations that he struck the Officer in the face with his fist, failed to report the incident to CPD, and brought discredit upon the department.

Officer: During mediation, the Officer agreed to accept IPRA's finding of "**SUSTAINED**" and a penalty of a **1-day Suspension** for the allegations that he grabbed and squeezed the Sergeant's neck and brought discredit upon the department.

Log/C.R. No. 1069967

Notification Date: June 24, 2014

Location: N/A

Complaint: Accidental Discharge of Weapon

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

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