

City of Chicago
Independent Police Review Authority



Third Quarter Report
July 1, 2016 – September 30, 2016



October 14, 2016

To the Mayor, Members of City Council Committee on Public Safety, the City Clerk, the Legislative Reference Bureau and the Citizens of Chicago:

Enclosed is the public report regarding the operation of the Independent Police Review Authority for the Third Quarter of 2016 that is submitted herein pursuant to Municipal Code of Chicago, Section 2-57-110.

This report comes just days after the City Council enacted an ordinance that will establish a new civilian oversight agency to replace the Independent Police Review Authority. This ordinance has imbued the new agency, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA), with important new powers and duties geared toward effectiveness and transparency. Our leadership team has been and will continue to work toward a transition that is as swift and seamless as possible.

As outlined in the ordinance, COPA is established with the following mission:

to provide a just and efficient means to fairly and timely conduct investigations within its jurisdiction, including investigations of alleged police misconduct and to determine whether those allegations are well-founded, applying a preponderance of the evidence standard; to identify and address patterns of police misconduct; and, based on information obtained through such investigations, to make policy recommendations to improve the Chicago Police Department and reduce incidents of police misconduct.

In support of this mission, the first, and perhaps one of the most critical, factors to be defined for the new agency is the budget. In the new few weeks we will be working with the administration and City Council to ensure that COPA has sufficient resources to: staff the agency with a professional workforce and provide training and appropriate supervision; create an efficient and effective infrastructure that supports quality and timely investigations and fosters transparency; and eliminate systemic impediments to independence.

In addition, we have been working closely with the Department of Human Resources to develop and implement a comprehensive hiring plan to staff COPA with employees who are both qualified to do this important work and committed to the mission of providing fair and timely investigations.

In the coming days and weeks, you will be hearing more from us regarding this historical agency transition.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to serve.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of several loops and a long horizontal stroke, positioned below the word "Sincerely,".

This report is filed pursuant to Municipal Code of Chicago § 2-57-110, which requires the filing of quarterly reports. This quarterly report provides information for the period July 1, 2016, through September 30, 2016. The information contained in this report is accurate as of October 1, 2016. All public reports produced by the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) are available online at www.iprachicago.org/.

IPRA performs the intake function for all allegations of misconduct made against members of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). IPRA investigates allegations of excessive force, domestic violence, coercion, and bias-based verbal abuse. IPRA also investigates certain conduct even if no allegations have been made, including, all instances where (i) a CPD member discharges a firearm, stun gun, or Taser in a manner that could potentially strike someone and (ii) a person dies or sustains a serious injury while in police custody, or where an extraordinary occurrence occurs in a lockup facility.

I. Intake and Notification Overview

a. Opened Investigations

During the third quarter of 2016, IPRA received 1,213 misconduct complaints and incident notifications, representing a 6.1% decrease compared to Q2 2016 (total intake = 1,292). When compared to the third quarters of both 2015 (total intake = 1,443) and 2014 (total intake = 1,672), Q3 2016 complaints and incident notifications decreased by 15.9% and 27.4%, respectively. The factors contributing to the steady decline in complaints remain unclear. Of the 1,213 complaints and notifications received during Q3 2016, IPRA referred 864 complaints to CPD's Bureau of Internal Affairs (BIA), and retained 349 complaints and incident notifications for further investigation. The 349 complaints and incident notifications retained by IPRA for investigation during Q3 2016 represent a 6.1% increase over the number of complaints and incident notifications retained for investigation by IPRA during Q2 2016 (see figure 1 below for Q2 2016 numbers). Lastly, IPRA referred 8 matters to the Cook County State's Attorney and 38 matters to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Opened Investigations Retained by IPRA					
Investigation Type	Q3 2016	Q2 2016	Q1 2016	Q4 2015	Q3 2015
Complaint	190	175	181	203	213
Notification	159	154	99	120	174
Total	349	329	280	323	387

Figure 1: Investigations retained by IPRA (by number).

b. Complaint-based investigations opened in Q3 2016

Complaints involving allegations of the use of excessive force continue to represent the largest percentage of complaints IPRA retains and investigates.

Complaint-based Investigations					
Category	Q3 2016	Q2 2016	Q1 2016	Q4 2015	Q3 2015
Excessive Force	89	78	78	102	96
Domestic Violence	13	16	23	16	25
Bias-Based Verbal Abuse	19	14	22	15	27
Unnecessary Display of Weapon	14	10	11	11	12
Unnecessary Physical Contact	8	11	12	12	8
Civil Suits ¹	11	15	9	10	17
Miscellaneous ²	25	19	20	30	28
Proper Care	9	8	6	5	12
Escape	0	1	0	0	0
False Testimony in Court	0	1	0	0	0
Threats	0	1	0	1	0
Fourth Amendment	0	0	0	1	1
Shooting Conversion	0	1	3	2	0
Traffic Pursuit	1	0	0	0	0
Vehicle	1	0	0	0	0
Total	190	175	184	205	226

Figure 2: Complaint-based investigations opened by IPRA, categorized by allegation type (by number).

¹ Pursuant to MCC § 2-57-040(e), IPRA is authorized to review all cases settled by the Department of Law where a complaint register was filed against a department member, and if, in the opinion of the Chief Administrator, further investigation is warranted, conduct such investigation.

² Miscellaneous includes both miscellaneous and blank category codes. Blank category codes are allegations where IPRA has not yet determined the specific category that fits the allegation. Please note that for Q3 2016, there were no blank category codes.




Figure 3: Investigations opened between July 1, 2016 and September 30, 2016, categorized by allegation (by percentage).

c. Notification-based investigations opened in Q3 2016

i. Weapons Discharge Data

In addition to taking in complaints of misconduct, IPRA receives notifications from CPD related to incidents that fall within IPRA's investigatory jurisdiction. As outlined below, the year-over-year decline in officer-involved shooting incidents continued through the third quarter of this year, though there was an increase in firearm discharges between Q2 2016 and Q3 2016. (See figure 4 on the following page.)

Notifications and Complaints of Weapon Discharges					
Notification Type	Q3 2016	Q2 2016	Q1 2016	Q4 2015	Q3 2015
Firearm Discharge Striking an Individual	8	5	4	4	15
No Hit Shootings	7	5	7	9	7
Animal Destruction	9	12	9	9	20
Taser Discharges	131	125	78	95	116
OC Spray	4	7	3	3	6
Total	159	154	101	120	164
Complaint Type ³	Q3 2016	Q2 2016	Q1 2016	Q4 2015	Q3 2015
Accidental Firearm Discharge	1	2	2	3	1
Accidental Taser Discharge	3	4	8	5	7
Unjustified Taser Discharge	1	0	0	0	0
Total	5	6	10	8	8

Figure 4: Weapons-discharge investigations opened by IPRA (by number).

There were 15 officer-involved shooting incidents during the third quarter. Eight shootings resulted in injuries, and three of which were fatal and one of which was an officer suicide. Taser discharges continue to represent the majority of weapons notifications IPRA receives. Although the increase in Taser discharge notifications between Q2 2016 and Q3 2016 has been statistically minimal (4.8%), we have seen the volume of Taser discharge notifications increase dramatically since Q1 2016 (i.e., an increase of 67.9% between Q1 2016 and Q3 2016). This is most likely attributed to the Department's expansion of the Taser program throughout the course of this year.

³ Note: Accidental firearm and Taser discharges are included in Figure 1 above under Miscellaneous and Excessive Force categories, and are thus represented twice. We have broken them out into a separate table here to reflect that IPRA learns of weapon discharge incidents through notifications from the Department and through complaints, many of which are filed by supervisors in the Department.




Figure 5: Weapons-discharge Investigations opened between July 1, 2016 and September 30, 2016 (by percentage).

ii. Lockup Incidents and Motor Vehicle-related Deaths

IPRA received 18 notifications of extraordinary occurrences (EO) in lockup during the third quarter. This represents an increase of 50.0% over the previous quarter and an increase of 28.5% over Q3 2015. As of January 1, 2016, state law requires IPRA to investigate incidents related to officer-involved motor vehicle accidents that result in a fatality. During Q3 2016, there were no officer-involved motor vehicle-related deaths.

Notifications of Lockup Incidents and Motor Vehicle-related Death Incidents					
Notification Type	Q3 2016	Q2 2016	Q1 2016	Q4 2015	Q3 2015
Extraordinary Occurrences	18	12	10	9	14
Motor Vehicle-related Deaths	0	1	1	n/a	n/a

Figure 6: Notifications of extraordinary occurrences and motor vehicle-related deaths (by number).

II. Investigative Overview

a. Closed Investigations

During the third quarter, IPRA closed 116 investigations, which is a 28.0% decline from Q2 2016 and a 68.8% decline from Q3 2015. As discussed in previous quarterly reports, the

administration has introduced new policies and procedures intended to improve the quality and timeliness of the investigative process. However, due to prolonged uncertainty regarding the future of the agency and the resulting loss of staff, the agency faces significant challenges regarding its continued ability to close investigations in a timely manner.

In addition, since June 30, 2016, the agency has been without a permanent staff member in the Coordinator of Investigations position, which has principal responsibility for reviewing and making an initial determination about which cases can be closed due to the lack of a sworn affidavit or administratively closed. This staffing outage has also contributed to the decline in the case closure rate. We are working to resolve this staffing issue as soon as possible.

Total Closed Investigations				
Q3 2016	Q2 2016	Q1 2016	Q4 2015	Q3 2015
116	161	115	378	372

Figure 7: Total investigations IPRA closed (by number).

During Q3 2016, of the investigations that resulted in a finding, IPRA's quarterly sustained rate increased to 56.3%, up from 38.0% in Q2 2016 and 10.1% in Q3 2015. This increase in the sustained rate may be, at least in part, a result of the fact that, in light of the staffing challenges, the agency has focused its investigative resources on the complaints and incident notifications involving the more serious allegations of police misconduct.

Closed Investigations – Findings										
Findings	Q3 2016		Q2 2016		Q1 2016		Q4 2015		Q3 2015	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Sustained ⁴	18	56.3%	19	38.0%	4	15.4%	8	10.5%	12	10.1%
Not Sustained ⁵	8	25.0%	24	48.0%	10	38.5%	31	40.8%	51	42.9%
Unfounded ⁶	5	15.6%	6	12.0%	10	38.5%	35	46.1%	49	41.2%
Exonerated ⁷	1	3.1%	1	2.0%	2	7.7%	2	2.6%	7	5.9%
Total	32	100.0%	50	100.0%	26	100.0%	76	100.0%	119	100.0%

Figure 8: Findings from investigations closed (by number and percentage).

⁴ Sustained: The allegation was supported by sufficient evidence to justify disciplinary action. Recommendations of disciplinary action may range from violation noted to separation from the CPD. See Appendix C for all sustained case abstracts.

⁵ Not Sustained: The allegation is not supported by sufficient evidence, which could be used to prove or disprove the allegation.

⁶ Unfounded: The allegation was not based on the facts revealed through investigation, or the reported incident did not occur.

⁷ Exonerated: The incident occurred, but the action taken by the officer(s) was deemed lawful and proper.




Figure 9: Findings from investigations closed between July 1, 2016 and September 30, 2016 (by percentage).

During the same time period, IPRA closed 84 cases without a specific finding, a 24.3% decrease from Q2 2016. More specifically, this quarter, IPRA closed 69 investigations due to the lack of a signed affidavit and administratively closed 15 investigations.⁸ During Q2 2016, IPRA instituted new policies and procedures to ensure that investigations were not being closed without the appropriate level of preliminary investigation being conducted. Specifically, no investigation is closed for a lack of affidavit without being reviewed as a potential case in which to pursue an affidavit override. IPRA continued this process into Q3 2016. See figure 10 below for a breakdown of investigative findings.

Q3 2016 Closed Investigations – No findings										
No Findings	Q3 2016		Q2 2016		Q1 2016		Q4 2015		Q3 2015	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
No Affidavit	69	82.1%	53	47.3%	15	16.9%	82	27.2%	90	35.6%
Administratively Closed	15	17.9%	58	52.7%	74	83.1%	220	72.8%	163	64.4%
Total	84	100.0%	112	100%	89	100.0%	302	100.0%	253	100.0%

Figure 10: Results from investigations with no findings closed between July 1, 2016, and September 30, 2016.

⁸ Per Illinois Statute, IPRA is required to obtain a sworn affidavit to bring allegations of misconduct against an officer. See 50 ILCS 725/3.4 "Uniform Peace Officers' Disciplinary Act."

IPRA administratively closed approximately only 17.9% of all complaints and notifications without findings. These investigations include weapons discharge notifications with no apparent misconduct nor any allegation of misconduct on the part of the involved officer, and allegations that do not fall within IPRA's nor BIA's jurisdiction.⁹

b. Pending Investigations

As of September 30, 2016, IPRA had 1,152 pending investigations representing an increase of 25.3% over the number of pending investigations at the close of Q2 2016. Over one-third of the pending investigations relate to excessive force allegations, which are complex and often require significant analysis and investigative work.

There are 79 pending officer-involved shooting investigations involving an incident in which a member of the public was injured or killed. Much of the current increase in the pending caseload can be attributed to the need to deploy resources to investigate the growing number of Taser discharge notifications (due to increased usage of Tasers by the Department) and firearm discharge notifications that do not result in an injury or death (which IPRA is required to investigate per the Municipal Code of Chicago). This is reflected by the 720.0% increase in No Hit Shooting investigations since Q1 2016 and the 478.7% increase in Taser and OC Spray discharge investigations since Q1 2016.

As outlined in our ordinance, IPRA reviews settled civil matters involving officer misconduct. It is important to note that there has been a significant rise in the number of settled civil cases that are being forwarded to IPRA for review. The investigations arising from these matters are often among the most time-consuming for the agency to conduct due to the volume of litigation documents that must be critically reviewed.

Given that IPRA has continued to lose investigative and office support staff, and because we expect to lose more staff members in the coming months due to transition of the civilian oversight role to the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA), the senior leadership of IPRA expects that the number of pending investigations will continue to rise through Q4 2016. The Chief Administrator has requested additional resources from the City in order to mitigate this rising case load to the extent possible given the unusual and unprecedented status of the agency.

⁹ For example, if a citizen made a complaint against someone and they were a member of a non-CPD agency, IPRA would administratively close that investigation.

2016 Pending Investigations by Category						
Category	Q3 2016		Q2 2016		Q1 2016	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Excessive Force / Use of Force	416	36.1%	380	41.3%	346	45.3%
Taser, OC Spray Discharge	272	23.6%	139	15.1%	47	6.2%
Domestic Altercation or Incident	88	7.6%	97	10.6%	98	12.8%
Firearm Discharge that Strikes an Individual	79	6.9%	66	7.2%	75	9.8%
Verbal Abuse / Harassment	66	5.7%	59	6.4%	63	8.2%
Miscellaneous	67	5.8%	51	5.5%	45	5.9%
Civil Suits	45	3.9%	38	4.1%	25	3.3%
Weapon Display	42	3.6%	35	3.8%	38	5.0%
No Hit Shooting	41	3.6%	26	2.8%	5	0.7%
Proper Care	27	2.3%	21	2.3%	17	2.2%
No Injury	2	0.2%	3	0.3%	3	0.4%
Shooting Conversion	2	0.2%	2	0.2%	2	0.3%
False Arrest	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
False Testimony	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Motor Vehicle Fatalities	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Traffic Pursuits	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	1152	100.0%	919	100.0%	764	100.0%

Figure 11: Pending investigations as of the end of each quarter (by number and by percentage).




Figure 12: Pending investigations as of September 30, 2016.

c. Affidavit Overrides

Chief Administrator Fairley submitted five affidavit override requests during the third quarter. The Department granted four out of five requests, and the remaining request is pending a response from the Department.

III. Organizational Updates

A. Policy Recommendations

1. Use of Force

In our Q2 2016 report, IPRA discussed several recommendations regarding the Department's policy on the use of deadly force. In that report, we anticipated issuing a more comprehensive

report on the research we conducted in support of those recommendations. Since the time we issued our initial recommendations, the Department has released a draft of new use of force guidelines for its members and will receive comments from the public for a period of 45 days. We think that this collaborative dialogue with the community about the use of force guidelines is an important step towards increased transparency about the work of the Department and its members. We applaud these efforts by Superintendent Johnson and his team and look forward to working with the community and the Department to ensure that the use of force employed by members of the Department properly reflects the shared goals of the community and the Department.

2. Mediation

Over the course of this past quarter, IPRA worked with Sidley Austin LLP to review our internal mediation policy against those employed by other jurisdictions in the country. The review, analysis and proposed changes to the mediation and alternative dispute resolution programs in place for Chicago will be released a separate policy report during Q4 2016.

B. Advisory Letters

Pursuant to the Municipal Code of Chicago § 2-57-040, the Chief Administrator of the Independent Police Review Authority is empowered to and has a duty to make recommendations to the Superintendent, the Police Board, and the Chairman of the City Council committee on public safety concerning revisions in policy and operating procedures to increase the efficiency of the department. To fulfill the mission, as the conclusion of an investigation, IPRA may issue an Advisory Letter to the department if the investigation uncovered a problem that hinders the effectiveness of department operations and programs or if the investigation has identified a verifiable potential liability or risk that warrants attention by the department. To that end, during Q3 2016, IPRA issued and publicly posted on our website an advisory letter from the Chief Administrator to the Department regarding the use of the “box-in” vehicle tactic. Please see www.iprachicago.org/publications/ to view this letter.

At this time, the Department has not responded to any of the Advisory Letters issued by IPRA during 2016. However, pursuant to the establishing ordinance for COPA, the Department will be required to respond to COPA’s policy recommendations within 60 days.¹⁰

C. Organizational Development

¹⁰ Municipal Code of Chicago § 2-78-130(b).

1. Staffing: IPRA's 2016 budget appropriation accounted for a staff of 97 full-time employees (FTEs) which would include 59 investigators and 11 supervising investigators. As of September 30, 2016, IPRA staffing had fallen to only 74 FTEs. Among those 74, IPRA's investigative ranks have fallen to 44 investigators and 6 supervising investigators. This decline in staffing and the impending sunset of the agency has had a significantly negative impact on the agency's ability to conclude investigations in a timely manner. As such, at this time, IPRA's leadership is focused on concluding as many investigations as possible while maintaining the quality and integrity of the investigative process and determinations.

2. Training Opportunities: During Q3 2016, our staff received training on the following topics:

- Discovery in Criminal and Civil Matters
- Motor Vehicle Death Investigations
- Body Worn Cameras
- Fourth Amendment Issues in Investigations

In addition, five IPRA staff members attended the annual conference for the National Association of Civilian Oversight in Law Enforcement (NACOLE) in Albuquerque, New Mexico. One employee attended a week-long training in restorative justice practices hosted by the Community Justice for Youth Institute in the Back of the Yards Neighborhood.

D. Community Engagement

IPRA remains committed to its mission to address the public on the work and policies of our police accountability. Chief Administrator Fairley and other staff members represented IPRA at various community events this quarter to discuss IPRA's mission, intake complaints, and contribute to the public debate regarding police accountability.

The following are some of the highlights:

Date	Community Event	Location
July 5, 2016	28 th Ward Community Meeting	Chicago Hope (2130 W. Ogden)
July 6, 2016	IPRA Satellite Office – Investigator Availability	St. Sabina (1210 W. 78th Place)
July 13, 2017	IPRA Satellite Office – Investigator Availability	North Area Center (845 W. Wilson)

Date	Community Event	Location
July 14, 2016	CAPS 6th District Faith Based Meeting	6th District (7808 S. Halsted)
July 20, 2016	IPRA Satellite Office – Investigator Availability	Garfield Center (10 S. Kedzie)
July 27, 2016	IPRA Satellite Office – Investigator Availability	King Center (4314 S. Cottage Grove)
July 28, 2016	Community Meeting at Glorious Light Church	4351 S. Drexel
August 3, 2016	IPRA Satellite Office – Investigator Availability	St. Sabina (1210 W. 78th Place)
August 10, 2016	IPRA Satellite Office – Investigator Availability	North Area Center (845 W. Wilson)
August 16, 2016	Preservation of Life Campaign Park Rally & Basketball Game	Garfield Park (100 N. Central Park)
August 17, 2016	IPRA Satellite Office – Investigator Availability	Garfield Center (10 S. Kedzie)
August 18, 2016	CAPS 7 th District Advisory Council Meeting	7th District Station (1438 W. 63rd Street)
August 23, 2016	Preservation of Life Campaign (PLC) Town Hall	Malcolm X College (1900 W. Jackson)
August 24, 2016	IPRA Satellite Office – Investigator Availability	King Center (4314 S. Cottage Grove)
August 25, 2016	37 th Ward Community Meeting	37th Ward Office (4925 W. Chicago Ave)
September 7, 2016	IPRA Satellite Office – Investigator Availability	St. Sabina (1210 W. 78th Place)
September 14, 2016	IPRA Satellite Office – Investigator Availability	North Area Center (845 W. Wilson)
September 21, 2016	IPRA Satellite Office – Investigator Availability	Garfield Center (10 S. Kedzie)
September 26, 2016	15th District CAPS Advisory Committee Meeting	15th District (5701 W. Madison)
September 28, 2016	IPRA Satellite Office – Investigator Availability	King Center (4314 S. Cottage Grove)

Figure 13: The above chart describes IPRA's community outreach between July 1, 2016 and September 30, 2016.

E. Satellite Offices

IPRA continued its effort to provide opportunities to meet with complainants in communities across Chicago by maintaining its satellite office hours. Every Wednesday, IPRA investigators are present to accept new complaints, answer any questions community members may have regarding the agency and/or the investigative process, and provide updates on pending

investigations. IPRA investigative staff members are available at the below locations and during the following times:

Community Areas	Location	Date/Time
Auburn Gresham	St. Sabina Church 1210 W 78th Place 773.483.4300	First Wednesday of each month 5pm – 7pm
Uptown	North Area Center 845 W. Wilson Ave. 312.744.2580; TTY: 312.744.2081	Second Wednesday of each month 2pm – 4pm
East Garfield Park	Garfield Center 10 S. Kedzie Ave. 312.746.5400; TTY: 312.746.5445	Third Wednesday of each month 5pm – 7pm
Grand Boulevard	King Center 4314 S. Cottage Grove 312.747.2300; TTY: 312.744.5619	Fourth Wednesday of each month 2pm – 4pm

Figure 14: IPRA's satellite office schedule.

IV. Complaints by Unit & Officer

A. Complaints by Officer¹¹

District	Complaints		
	Q3 2016 (#)	Q2 2016 (#)	Change (%)
Unknown ¹²	55	71	22.5%
1	63	45	- 40.0%
2	54	79	31.6%
3	52	63	17.5%
4	50	69	27.5%
5	53	67	20.9%
6	60	86	30.2%
7	68	76	10.5%
8	65	75	13.3%
9	36	52	30.8%
10	58	48	- 20.8%
11	66	109	39.4%
12	45	63	28.6%
14	20	19	-5.3%
15	42	60	30.0%
16	36	48	25.0%
17	23	23	0.0%
18	47	42	- 11.9%
19	44	52	15.4%
20	23	24	4.2%
22	28	43	34.9%
24	19	22	13.6%
25	39	59	33.9%

Figure 15: Number of complaints per district of occurrence during the third quarter (in numerical order by Police District).¹³

District	Complaints
7	68
11	66
8	65
1	63
6	60
10	58
2	54
5	53
3	52
4	50
18	47
12	45
19	44
15	42
25	39
9	36
16	36
22	28
17	23
20	23
14	20
24	19

Figure 16: Number of complaints per district of occurrence during the third quarter (in descending order).

In Figures 15 and 16, **Lighter Grey** signifies those districts with a substantially lower number of complaints, **Grey** signifies those districts that are below average, **Red** signifies those districts that are above average, and **Dark Red** signifies those districts with a substantially higher number of complaints.

¹¹ To analyze the data, IPRA calculated the following descriptive statistics: Mean: 55.5; Median: 55.5; St. Dev: 22.45; Range: 90; Confidence level: 9.95.

¹² Though unknown at the time the complaint is lodged, IPRA will determine the district of occurrence during its preliminary investigation of the incident in question.

¹³ Please see Appendix A for a map of CPD police districts.




Figure 17: The above map represents the number of complaints filed per district.

Excluding unknown districts of occurrence, Figure 17 depicts the total number of complaints that occurred in each district during Q3 2016. The average is 45 complaints per district, which represents a decrease of 18.1% from Q2 2016, when the average was 55 complaints per districts.

B. Complaints by Unit of Assignment¹⁴

The following chart reflects the number of members per unit with the identified number of complaints.

Complaints per member by unit of assignment		
<u>District 1</u> 17 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints 1 member with 3 complaints	<u>District 2</u> 21 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints	<u>District 3</u> 31 members with 1 complaint each 6 members with 2 complaints each
<u>District 4</u> 14 members with 1 complaint each 2 members with 2 complaints each	<u>District 5</u> 28 members with 1 complaint each 4 members with 2 complaints each 1 member with 3 complaints 1 member with 5 complaints	<u>District 6</u> 31 members with 1 complaint each 5 members with 2 complaints each
<u>District 7</u> 21 members with 1 complaint each 2 member with 2 complaints each	<u>District 8</u> 32 members with 1 complaint each 3 member with 2 complaints each	<u>District 9</u> 15 members with 1 complaint each
<u>District 10</u> 23 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints	<u>District 11</u> 26 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints 1 member with 3 complaints	<u>District 12</u> 17 members with 1 complaint each
<u>District 14</u> 12 members with 1 complaint each 2 members with 2 complaints each	<u>District 15</u> 16 members with 1 complaint each	<u>District 16</u> 5 members with 1 complaint each
<u>District 17</u> 10 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints	<u>District 18</u> 29 members with 1 complaint each 3 members with 2 complaints each	<u>District 19</u> 22 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints
<u>District 20</u> 9 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints	<u>District 22</u> 16 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints	<u>District 24</u> 9 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints
<u>District 25</u> 28 members with 1 complaint each 3 members with 2 complaints each	<u>Recruitment Training Section (44)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint	<u>Airport Law Enforcement Section - North (50)</u> 6 members with 1 complaint each
<u>Airport Law Enforcement South (51)</u> 3 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Detail Unit (57)</u> 3 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Marine Operations Unit (59)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint 1 member with 2 complaints
<u>Special Investigations Section (79)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint	<u>Office of the Superintendent (111)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint	<u>Office of Crime Control Strategies (115)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint
<u>Human Resources Division (123)</u> 3 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Education and Training Division (124)</u> 3 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy Unit (135)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint


¹⁴ See Appendix B for additional data concerning complaints per member per unit. The above numbers are accurate as of September 30, 2016.

Complaints per member by unit of assignment		
<u>Traffic Section (145)</u> 5 members with 1 complaint each	<u>General Support (161)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint	<u>Records Inquiry (163)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint
<u>Field Services Section (166)</u> 3 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Evidence and Recovered Property Section (167)</u> 2 member with 1 complaint each	<u>Central Detention (171)</u> 6 members with 1 complaint each
<u>Narcotics Section (189)</u> 19 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Intelligence Section (191)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint	<u>Vice & Asset Forfeiture Division (192)</u> 2 members with 1 complaint each
<u>Gang Investigation Division (193)</u> 14 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints	<u>Bureau of Patrol – Area Central (211)</u> 4 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Bureau of Patrol – Area South (212)</u> 3 members with 1 complaint each
<u>Bureau of Patrol – Area North (213)</u> 7 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Timekeeping - Headquarters (222)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint	<u>Medical Section (231)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint
<u>Court Section (261)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint	<u>Forensic Services Evidence Technician Section (277)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint	<u>Gang Enforcement – Area Central (311)</u> 5 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints
<u>Gang Enforcement – Area South (312)</u> 9 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Gang Enforcement – Area North (313)</u> 4 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints	<u>Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) Unit (353)</u> 1 member with 2 complaints
<u>Alternate Response Section (376)</u> 10 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints	<u>Gang Enforcement Division (393)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint	<u>Detached Services – Miscellaneous Detail (543)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint
<u>Central Investigations Unit (606)</u> 5 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Central Investigations Unit (608)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint	<u>Bureau of Detectives – Area Central (610)</u> 15 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints
<u>Bureau of Detectives – Area South (620)</u> 4 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Bureau of Detectives – Area North (630)</u> 10 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints	<u>Public Transportation Section (701)</u> 2 members with 1 complaint each
<u>Transit Security Section (704)</u> 2 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Summer Mobile Patrol (714)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint	

Figure 18: Complaints per member per assigned unit.

Appendix A

The map below is a detailed map of the Department's Police Districts and Chicago's Community areas.



Appendix B¹⁵

Table 1

The table below describes the number of complaints lodged against members per unit and total complaints lodged against members in each unit (in order by unit number).

Unit Number	Unit Name	# of Assigned Officers	Officers with Complaints	Total Complaints	% of Officers with Complaints	Complaints per Officer
1	DISTRICT 1	293	19	22	6.48%	0.08
2	DISTRICT 2	351	22	23	6.27%	0.07
3	DISTRICT 3	345	37	43	10.72%	0.12
4	DISTRICT 4	350	16	18	4.57%	0.05
5	DISTRICT 5	326	34	44	10.43%	0.13
6	DISTRICT 6	362	36	41	9.94%	0.11
7	DISTRICT 7	440	23	25	5.23%	0.06
8	DISTRICT 8	378	35	38	9.26%	0.10
9	DISTRICT 9	348	15	15	4.31%	0.04
10	DISTRICT 10	363	24	25	6.61%	0.07
11	DISTRICT 11	448	28	31	6.25%	0.07
12	DISTRICT 12	336	17	17	5.06%	0.05
14	DISTRICT 14	238	14	16	5.88%	0.07
15	DISTRICT 15	336	16	16	4.76%	0.05
16	DISTRICT 16	223	5	5	2.24%	0.02
17	DISTRICT 17	237	11	12	4.64%	0.05
18	DISTRICT 18	339	32	35	9.44%	0.10
19	DISTRICT 19	381	23	24	6.04%	0.06
20	DISTRICT 20	225	10	11	4.44%	0.05
22	DISTRICT 22	263	17	18	6.46%	0.07
24	DISTRICT 24	283	10	11	3.53%	0.04
25	DISTRICT 25	344	31	34	9.01%	0.10
26	EXECUTIVE OFFICERS UNIT	0	0	0	n/a	n/a
44	RECRUIT TRAINING SECTION	305	1	1	0.33%	0.00
45	DISTRICT REINSTATEMENT UNIT	3	0	0	0.00%	0.00
50	AIRPORT LAW ENFORCEMENT SECTION - NORTH	120	6	6	5.00%	0.05
51	AIRPORT LAW ENFORCEMENT SECTION - SOUTH	41	3	3	7.32%	0.07
55	MOUNTED UNIT 26	26	0	0	0.00%	0.00
57	DETAIL UNIT 2	55	3	3	5.45%	0.05

¹⁵ The Department provided total number of officers by Unit as of October 4, 2016. IPRA did not validate the Department's provided numbers.

Unit Number	Unit Name	# of Assigned Officers	Officers with Complaints	Total Complaints	% of Officers with Complaints	Complaints per Officer
59	MARINE OPERATIONS UNIT	44	2	3	4.55%	0.07
60	HELICOPTER OPERATIONS UNIT	8	0	0	0.00%	0.00
79	SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS UNIT	28	1	1	3.57%	0.04
102	OFFICE OF NEWS	15	0	0	0.00%	0.00
111	OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT	18	1	1	5.56%	0.06
114	LEGAL AFFAIRS SECTION	29	0	0	0.00%	0.00
115	OFFICE OF CRIME CONTROL STRATEGIES	24	1	1	4.17%	0.04
116	DEPLOYMENT OPERATIONS CENTER	69	0	0	0.00%	0.00
120	BUREAU OF SUPPORT SERVICES	10	0	0	0.00%	0.00
121	BUREAU OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS	88	0	0	0.00%	0.00
122	FINANCE DIVISION 0	13	0	0	0.00%	0.00
123	HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION	64	3	3	4.69%	0.05
124	EDUCATION AND TRAINING DIVISION	165	3	3	1.82%	0.02
125	INFORMATION SERVICES DIVISION	75	0	0	0.00%	0.00
126	INSPECTION DIVISION 10	13	0	0	0.00%	0.00
127	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION	34	0	0	0.00%	0.00
128	PROFESSIONAL COUNSELING DIVISION	7	0	0	0.00%	0.00
129	MANAGEMENT AND LABOR AFFAIRS SECTION	4	0	0	0.00%	0.00
130	TECHNOLOGY AND RECORDS GROUP	1	0	0	0.00%	0.00
131	BUREAU OF ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT	2	0	0	0.00%	0.00
133	INFORMATION AND STRATEGIC SERVICES	4	0	0	0.00%	0.00
135	CHICAGO ALTERNATIVE POLICING STRATEGY (CAPS) DIVISION	10	1	1	10.00%	0.10
136	SPECIAL EVENTS UNIT	14	0	0	0.00%	0.00
140	OFFICE OF THE FIRST DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT	15	0	0	0.00%	0.00
141	SPECIAL FUNCTIONS DIVISION	12	0	0	0.00%	0.00
142	BUREAU OF PATROL	16	0	0	0.00%	0.00
145	TRAFFIC SECTION 56	35	6	7	17.14%	0.20
148	TRAFFIC COURT UNIT	3	0	0	0.00%	0.00
153	SPECIAL FUNCTIONS SUPPORT UNIT	17	0	0	0.00%	0.00
161	GENERAL SUPPORT DIVISION	12	1	1	8.33%	0.08
163	RECORDS INQUIRY SECTION	7	2	2	28.57%	0.29
166	FIELD SERVICES SECTION	125	1	1	0.80%	0.01
167	EVIDENCE AND RECOVERED	41	2	2	4.88%	0.05

Unit Number	Unit Name	# of Assigned Officers	Officers with Complaints	Total Complaints	% of Officers with Complaints	Complaints per Officer
	PROPERTY SECTION					
169	POLICE DOCUMENTS SECTION	5	0	0	0.00%	0.00
171	CENTRAL DETENTION UNIT	42	6	6	14.29%	0.14
172	EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLY	5	0	0	0.00%	0.00
177	FORENSIC SERVICES DIVISION	56	0	0	0.00%	0.00
179	REPRODUCTION AND GRAPHIC ARTS SECTION	7	0	0	0.00%	0.00
180	BUREAU OF DETECTIVES	34	0	0	0.00%	0.00
184	YOUTH INVESTIGATION DIVISION	6	0	0	0.00%	0.00
187	CRIMINAL REGISTRATION UNIT	14	0	0	0.00%	0.00
188	BUREAU OF ORGANIZED CRIME	10	0	0	0.00%	0.00
189	NARCOTICS DIVISION 239	358	19	19	5.31%	0.05
191	INTELLIGENCE SECTION 50	51	1	1	1.96%	0.02
192	VICE & ASSET FORFEITURE DIVISION	53	2	2	3.77%	0.04
193	GANG INVESTIGATION DIVISION	166	15	16	9.04%	0.10
196	ASSET FORFEITURE SECTION	31	0	0	0.00%	0.00
211	BUREAU OF PATROL - AREA CENTRAL	142	4	4	2.82%	0.03
212	BUREAU OF PATROL - AREA SOUTH	95	3	3	3.16%	0.03
213	BUREAU OF PATROL - AREA NORTH	103	7	7	6.80%	0.07
214	FREEDOM OF INFORMATION	0	0	0	n/a	n/a
222	TIMEKEEPING UNIT	5	1	1	20.00%	0.20
231	MEDICAL SECTION 2	15	1	1	6.67%	0.07
241	TROUBLED BUILDING SECTION	21	0	0	0.00%	0.00
261	COURT SECTION 4	54	1	1	1.85%	0.02
277	FORENSIC SERVICES EVIDENCE TECHNICIAN SECTION	77	1	1	1.30%	0.01
311	GANG ENFORCEMENT - AREA CENTRAL	64	6	7	9.38%	0.11
312	GANG ENFORCEMENT - AREA SOUTH	65	9	9	13.85%	0.14
313	GANG ENFORCEMENT - AREA NORTH	69	5	6	7.25%	0.09
341	CANINE UNIT 34	39	0	0	0.00%	0.00
353	SPECIAL WEAPONS AND TACTICS (SWAT) UNIT	66	1	2	1.52%	0.03
376	ALTERNATE RESPONSE SECTION	153	11	12	7.19%	0.08
384	JUVENILE INTERVENTION SUPPORT CENTER (JISC)	45	0	0	0.00%	0.00
393	GANG ENFORCEMENT DIVISION	49	1	1	2.04%	0.02
441	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES SECTION	17	0	0	0.00%	0.00
442	BOMB SQUAD 15	15	0	0	0.00%	0.00
541	FOP DETAIL 5	7	0	0	0.00%	0.00

Unit Number	Unit Name	# of Assigned Officers	Officers with Complaints	Total Complaints	% of Officers with Complaints	Complaints per Officer
542	DETACHED SERVICES - GOVERNMENT SECURITY	18	0	0	0.00%	0.00
543	DETACHED SERVICES - MISCELLANEOUS DETAIL	55	1	1	1.82%	0.02
545	PBPA SERGEANT 0	2	0	0	0.00%	0.00
549	INSPECTOR GENERAL DETAIL UNIT	1	0	0	0.00%	0.00
603	ARSON SECTION 17	22	0	0	0.00%	0.00
606	CENTRAL INVESTIGATIONS DIVISION	104	5	5	4.81%	0.05
608	MAJOR ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION UNIT	28	1	1	3.57%	0.04
610	DETECTIVE AREA - CENTRAL	277	16	17	5.78%	0.06
620	DETECTIVE AREA - SOUTH	243	4	4	1.65%	0.02
630	DETECTIVE AREA - NORTH	253	11	12	4.35%	0.05
701	PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SECTION	125	2	2	1.60%	0.02
702	CTA SECURITY UNIT	2	0	0	0.00%	0.00
704	TRANSIT SECURITY UNIT	39	2	2	5.13%	0.05
711	VIOLENCE REDUCTION INITIATIVE NORTH	12	0	0	0.00%	0.00
712	VIOLENCE REDUCTION INITIATIVE SOUTH	17	0	0	0.00%	0.00
714	SUMMER MOBILE PATROL	68	4	5	5.88%	0.07
720	GRANTS SECTION	2	0	0	0.00%	0.00

Table 2

The table below details number of complaints lodged against members per unit and total complaints lodged against members in each unit (in order from highest to lowest by percentage of members in unit with a complaint).

Unit Number	Unit Name	# of Assigned Officers	Officers with Complaints	Total Complaints	% of Officers with Complaints	Complaints per Officer
163	RECORDS INQUIRY SECTION	7	2	2	28.57%	0.29
222	TIMEKEEPING UNIT	5	1	1	20.00%	0.20
145	TRAFFIC SECTION 56	35	6	7	17.14%	0.20
171	CENTRAL DETENTION UNIT	42	6	6	14.29%	0.14
312	GANG ENFORCEMENT - AREA SOUTH	65	9	9	13.85%	0.14
3	DISTRICT 3	345	37	43	10.72%	0.12
5	DISTRICT 5	326	34	44	10.43%	0.13
135	CHICAGO ALTERNATIVE POLICING STRATEGY (CAPS) DIVISION	10	1	1	10.00%	0.10
6	DISTRICT 6	362	36	41	9.94%	0.11
18	DISTRICT 18	339	32	35	9.44%	0.10
311	GANG ENFORCEMENT - AREA CENTRAL	64	6	7	9.38%	0.11
8	DISTRICT 8	378	35	38	9.26%	0.10
193	GANG INVESTIGATION DIVISION	166	15	16	9.04%	0.10
25	DISTRICT 25	344	31	34	9.01%	0.10
161	GENERAL SUPPORT DIVISION	12	1	1	8.33%	0.08
51	AIRPORT LAW ENFORCEMENT SECTION - SOUTH	41	3	3	7.32%	0.07
313	GANG ENFORCEMENT - AREA NORTH	69	5	6	7.25%	0.09
376	ALTERNATE RESPONSE SECTION	153	11	12	7.19%	0.08
213	BUREAU OF PATROL - AREA NORTH	103	7	7	6.80%	0.07
231	MEDICAL SECTION 2	15	1	1	6.67%	0.07
10	DISTRICT 10	363	24	25	6.61%	0.07
1	DISTRICT 1	293	19	22	6.48%	0.08
22	DISTRICT 22	263	17	18	6.46%	0.07
2	DISTRICT 2	351	22	23	6.27%	0.07
11	DISTRICT 11	448	28	31	6.25%	0.07
19	DISTRICT 19	381	23	24	6.04%	0.06
14	DISTRICT 14	238	14	16	5.88%	0.07
714	SUMMER MOBILE PATROL	68	4	5	5.88%	0.07
610	DETECTIVE AREA - CENTRAL	277	16	17	5.78%	0.06
111	OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT	18	1	1	5.56%	0.06
57	DETAIL UNIT 2	55	3	3	5.45%	0.05

Unit Number	Unit Name	# of Assigned Officers	Officers with Complaints	Total Complaints	% of Officers with Complaints	Complaints per Officer
189	NARCOTICS DIVISION 239	358	19	19	5.31%	0.05
7	DISTRICT 7	440	23	25	5.23%	0.06
704	TRANSIT SECURITY UNIT	39	2	2	5.13%	0.05
12	DISTRICT 12	336	17	17	5.06%	0.05
50	AIRPORT LAW ENFORCEMENT SECTION - NORTH	120	6	6	5.00%	0.05
167	EVIDENCE AND RECOVERED PROPERTY SECTION	41	2	2	4.88%	0.05
606	CENTRAL INVESTIGATIONS DIVISION	104	5	5	4.81%	0.05
15	DISTRICT 15	336	16	16	4.76%	0.05
123	HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION	64	3	3	4.69%	0.05
17	DISTRICT 17	237	11	12	4.64%	0.05
4	DISTRICT 4	350	16	18	4.57%	0.05
59	MARINE OPERATIONS UNIT	44	2	3	4.55%	0.07
20	DISTRICT 20	225	10	11	4.44%	0.05
630	DETECTIVE AREA - NORTH	253	11	12	4.35%	0.05
9	DISTRICT 9	348	15	15	4.31%	0.04
115	OFFICE OF CRIME CONTROL STRATEGIES	24	1	1	4.17%	0.04
192	VICE & ASSET FORFEITURE DIVISION	53	2	2	3.77%	0.04
79	SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS UNIT	28	1	1	3.57%	0.04
608	MAJOR ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION UNIT	28	1	1	3.57%	0.04
24	DISTRICT 24	283	10	11	3.53%	0.04
212	BUREAU OF PATROL - AREA SOUTH	95	3	3	3.16%	0.03
211	BUREAU OF PATROL - AREA CENTRAL	142	4	4	2.82%	0.03
16	DISTRICT 16	223	5	5	2.24%	0.02
393	GANG ENFORCEMENT DIVISION	49	1	1	2.04%	0.02
191	INTELLIGENCE SECTION 50	51	1	1	1.96%	0.02
261	COURT SECTION 4	54	1	1	1.85%	0.02
124	EDUCATION AND TRAINING DIVISION	165	3	3	1.82%	0.02
543	DETACHED SERVICES - MISCELLANEOUS DETAIL	55	1	1	1.82%	0.02
620	DETECTIVE AREA - SOUTH	243	4	4	1.65%	0.02
701	PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SECTION	125	2	2	1.60%	0.02
353	SPECIAL WEAPONS AND TACTICS (SWAT) UNIT	66	1	2	1.52%	0.03
277	FORENSIC SERVICES EVIDENCE TECHNICIAN SECTION	77	1	1	1.30%	0.01
166	FIELD SERVICES SECTION	125	1	1	0.80%	0.01
44	RECRUIT TRAINING SECTION	305	1	1	0.33%	0.00

Unit Number	Unit Name	# of Assigned Officers	Officers with Complaints	Total Complaints	% of Officers with Complaints	Complaints per Officer
45	DISTRICT REINSTATEMENT UNIT	3	0	0	0.00%	0.00
55	MOUNTED UNIT 26	26	0	0	0.00%	0.00
60	HELICOPTER OPERATIONS UNIT	8	0	0	0.00%	0.00
102	OFFICE OF NEWS	15	0	0	0.00%	0.00
114	LEGAL AFFAIRS SECTION	29	0	0	0.00%	0.00
116	DEPLOYMENT OPERATIONS CENTER	69	0	0	0.00%	0.00
120	BUREAU OF SUPPORT SERVICES	10	0	0	0.00%	0.00
121	BUREAU OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS	88	0	0	0.00%	0.00
122	FINANCE DIVISION 0	13	0	0	0.00%	0.00
125	INFORMATION SERVICES DIVISION	75	0	0	0.00%	0.00
126	INSPECTION DIVISION 10	13	0	0	0.00%	0.00
127	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION	34	0	0	0.00%	0.00
128	PROFESSIONAL COUNSELING DIVISION	7	0	0	0.00%	0.00
129	MANAGEMENT AND LABOR AFFAIRS SECTION	4	0	0	0.00%	0.00
130	TECHNOLOGY AND RECORDS GROUP	1	0	0	0.00%	0.00
131	BUREAU OF ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT	2	0	0	0.00%	0.00
133	INFORMATION AND STRATEGIC SERVICES	4	0	0	0.00%	0.00
136	SPECIAL EVENTS UNIT	14	0	0	0.00%	0.00
140	OFFICE OF THE FIRST DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT	15	0	0	0.00%	0.00
141	SPECIAL FUNCTIONS DIVISION	12	0	0	0.00%	0.00
142	BUREAU OF PATROL	16	0	0	0.00%	0.00
148	TRAFFIC COURT UNIT	3	0	0	0.00%	0.00
153	SPECIAL FUNCTIONS SUPPORT UNIT	17	0	0	0.00%	0.00
169	POLICE DOCUMENTS SECTION	5	0	0	0.00%	0.00
172	EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLY	5	0	0	0.00%	0.00
177	FORENSIC SERVICES DIVISION	56	0	0	0.00%	0.00
179	REPRODUCTION AND GRAPHIC ARTS SECTION	7	0	0	0.00%	0.00
180	BUREAU OF DETECTIVES	34	0	0	0.00%	0.00
184	YOUTH INVESTIGATION DIVISION	6	0	0	0.00%	0.00
187	CRIMINAL REGISTRATION UNIT	14	0	0	0.00%	0.00
188	BUREAU OF ORGANIZED CRIME	10	0	0	0.00%	0.00
196	ASSET FORFEITURE SECTION	31	0	0	0.00%	0.00
241	TROUBLED BUILDING SECTION	21	0	0	0.00%	0.00
341	CANINE UNIT 34	39	0	0	0.00%	0.00
384	JUVENILE INTERVENTION SUPPORT	45	0	0	0.00%	0.00

Unit Number	Unit Name	# of Assigned Officers	Officers with Complaints	Total Complaints	% of Officers with Complaints	Complaints per Officer
	CENTER (JISC)					
441	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES SECTION	17	0	0	0.00%	0.00
442	BOMB SQUAD 15	15	0	0	0.00%	0.00
541	FOP DETAIL 5	7	0	0	0.00%	0.00
542	DETACHED SERVICES - GOVERNMENT SECURITY	18	0	0	0.00%	0.00
545	PBPA SERGEANT 0	2	0	0	0.00%	0.00
549	INSPECTOR GENERAL DETAIL UNIT	1	0	0	0.00%	0.00
603	ARSON SECTION 17	22	0	0	0.00%	0.00
702	CTA SECURITY UNIT	2	0	0	0.00%	0.00
711	VIOLENCE REDUCTION INITIATIVE NORTH	12	0	0	0.00%	0.00
712	VIOLENCE REDUCTION INITIATIVE SOUTH	17	0	0	0.00%	0.00
720	GRANTS SECTION	2	0	0	0.00%	0.00
26	EXECUTIVE OFFICERS UNIT	0	0	0	n/a	n/a
214	FREEDOM OF INFORMATION	0	0	0	n/a	n/a

Appendix C

ABSTRACTS OF SUSTAINED CASES

July 2016

Log# 1037527

Notification Date: June 26, 2010

Location: 16th District

Complaint Type: Excessive Force

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 39, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1998

Officer B: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 48, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1994

Officer C: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 33, Off-Duty, Civilian Dress, Year of Appointment – 2006

Subject 1: Male/White, 30

Subject 2: Female/White, 23

Summary: In an incident involving Officer C, it was alleged that Officer C physically attacked the Subjects. Officer A responded to the 911 call for help. It was further alleged that Officer A allowed Officer C to leave the scene of the incident after Officer C identified himself as a CPD officer. In addition, the Subjects allege that Officer B conspired with Officer A to cover-up the incident.

Finding(s): Based on department rules, general orders, and special orders; the US Constitution; statements to IPRA from the accused officers, subjects, and witnesses, IPRA recommends the following:

Officer A:

- **Allegation 1: Violated the Subjects' 14th Amendment rights by failing to provide them with police service**
 - A finding of Unfounded
- **Allegation 2: Conspired to cover up the criminal attack against the Subjects**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- **Allegation 3: Failed to document his encounter with Officer C**

- A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 4: Gave a false statement regarding his contact with Officer C**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **SEPARATION** was recommended for the Sustained allegations.

Officer B:

- **Allegation 1: Violated the Subjects' 14th Amendment rights by failing to provide them with police service**
 - A finding of Unfounded
- **Allegation 2: Conspired to cover up the criminal attack against the Subjects**
 - A finding of Unfounded
- **Allegation 3: Failed to properly document his encounter with Officer C**
 - A finding of Unfounded

Officer C:

- **Allegation 1: Displayed and pointed his handgun at the Subjects without justification**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Pushed Subject 2**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 3: Choked Subject 2**
 - A finding of Unfounded
- **Allegation 4: Placed the barrel of his handgun inside Subject 2's mouth**
 - A finding of Unfounded
- **Allegation 5: Struck Subject 1 about his head, face, and body with his handgun**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 6: Violated the Subjects' 4th Amendment rights**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 7: Conspired with Officer A to cover up his attack on the Subjects**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- **Allegation 8: Directed profanities towards the Subjects**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 9: Failed to document his encounter with the Subjects**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **SEPARATION** was recommended for the Sustained

allegations.

Log# 1060844

Notification Date: March 19, 2013

Location: Outside City of Chicago

Complaint Type: Firearm Discharge

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 40, Civilian Dress, Year of Appointment – 1997

Subject 1: Male/Black, 31

Summary: In an incident involving Officer A, it was alleged that Officer A disobeyed Chicago Police Department's use of deadly force policy by discharging his weapon and striking Subject 1, and firing into a moving vehicle.

Finding(s): Based on a department general order; statements to IPRA from the accused officer and witness officers; ballistics evidence; medical examiner's report; photographs of the subject's vehicle; and department reports, IPRA recommends the following:

Officer A:

- **Allegation 1: Disobeyed the Chicago Police Department's use of deadly force policy by discharging his weapon and striking the subject without justification**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Disobeyed the Chicago Police Department's use of deadly force policy in that he fired into a moving vehicle without justification**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **SEPARATION** was recommended for the Sustained allegations.

Log# 1063129

Notification Date: June 16, 2013

Location: 25th District

Complaint Type: Domestic Incident

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 33, Off-Duty, Not In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2002

Subject 1: Female/White, 31

Subject 2: Female/White

Summary: In an incident involving Officer A, it was alleged that Officer A made harassing phone calls to Subject 1's place of employment; made harassing phone calls to the dance studio where Officer A and Subject 1's child in common was a student, as well as threatened to remove the child from the dance studio and her day care program; used profanity to refer Subject 2; and sent harassing text messages to Subject 1.

Finding(s): Based on department rules, screenshots of text messages and emails between Subject 1 and Officer A, Department general orders, and special orders; and statements to IPRA from the accused officers and subjects, IPRA recommends the following:

Officer A:

- **Allegation 1: Engaged in unjustified verbal altercation with Subject 1 while on or off-duty when he repeatedly called Subject 1's place of employment**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Brought discredit to the Department when he made phone calls identifying himself as a Chicago Police officer when conducting non-department business**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 3: Use profanity towards Subject 2**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 4: Engaged in unjustified verbal altercation with Subject 1 while on or off-duty when he sent harassing text messages to Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **A 5-DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the Sustained

allegations.

Log# 1063961

Notification Date: August 1, 2013

Location: 11th District

Complaint Type: Excessive Force

Detention Aide A: Chicago Police Department Detention Aide, Male/Black, 47, Off-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1994

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 47, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1991

Subject 1: Male/Black, 53

Summary: In an incident involving Detention Aide A and Officer A, it was alleged that Detention Aide punched and kicked Subject 1; failed to complete any and all documents regarding his contact with Subject 1; failed to render medical assistance to Subject 1; and allowed Subject 1 to bond out without making proper notifications. It was alleged that Officer A observed misconduct and failed to make proper notifications; failed to complete any and all documents relating to the incident involving Subject 1; failed to render medical assistance to Subject 1; and allowed Subject 1 to bond out without making proper notifications.

Finding(s): Based on department rules; statements to IPRA from the accused officers, witness officers; and Department General Orders and special orders, IPRA recommends the following:

Detention Aide

- **Allegation 1: Disrespected and mistreated Subject 1 while on duty and participated in action which brought discredit upon the Department when he punched Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Disrespected and mistreated Subject 1 while on duty and participated in action which brought discredit upon the Department when he kicked Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 3: Was inattentive to his duty when he failed to complete department reports related to his contact with Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained

Detention Aide

-
- **Allegation 4: Was inattentive to his duty when he failed to render medical assistance to Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 5: Was inattentive to his duty when he allowed Subject 1 to bond out without making proper notifications**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **A 120 DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the Sustained allegations

Officer A:

- **Allegation 1: Was inattentive to his duty when he observed misconduct and failed to report it**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Was inattentive to his duty when he failed to complete department reports related to his contact with Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 4: Was inattentive to his duty when he failed to render medical assistance to Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 3: Was inattentive to his duty when he allowed Subject 1 to bond out without making proper notifications**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **A 15-DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the Sustained allegations

Log# 1067362

Notification Date: February 6, 2014

Location: 10th District

Complaint Type: Excessive Force

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 38, On-Duty, In uniform, Year of Appointment – 2006

Officer B: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 37, On-Duty, In uniform, Year of Appointment – 2001

Officer C: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Hispanic, 35, On-Duty, In uniform, Year of Appointment – 2004

Officer D: Chicago Police Officer, Male/ White, 37, On-Duty, In uniform, Year of Appointment – 2004

Officer E: Chicago Police Officer, Male/ White, 32, On-Duty, In uniform, Year of Appointment – 2005

Officer F: Chicago Police Officer, Male/ White, 33, On-Duty, In uniform, Year of Appointment – 2004

Subject 1: Female/Black, 55

Subject 2: Male/Black, 24

Subject 3: Female/Black

Summary: In an incident involving Officers it was alleged that the Officers illegally entered and searched Subject 1's residence. In addition, it was alleged that Officers A, C, and D grabbed and handcuffed Subject 1, as well as, unreasonably seized items belonging to Subjects 2 and 3. Furthermore, it was alleged that Officer B coerced Subject 1 by threatening her, and failed to supervise the entire search.

Finding(s): Based on the US Constitution; department rules and orders; statements to IPRA from the accused officers and subject; department reports; and consent to search sheets, IPRA recommends the following:

Officer A:

- **Allegation 1: Entered and searched Subject 1's residence without a search warrant or an exception to the search warrant requirements**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Grabbing and slamming Subject 1 against the wall**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 3: Handcuffing Subject 1 in a rough manner and too tightly**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 4: Unreasonably seizing items belonging to Subjects 2 and 3 during an illegal search**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 5: Making a false report, written or oral**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **SEPARATION** was recommended for the Sustained allegations.

Officer B:

- **Allegation 1: Entered and searched Subject 1's residence without a search warrant or an exception to the search warrant requirements**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Coercing Subject 1 by threatening to arrest/prosecute her if she did not cooperate with the illegal search by signing a Consent to Search form**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 3: Failing to have a participating member in the search attired in the prescribed seasonal field uniform**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 4: Failing to ensure the Consent to Search form specifically indicated the scope of the search**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 5: Failing to ensure that Subject 1 had authority to give consent to search Subject 2's bedroom**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 6: Failing to supervise the entire consent to search incident**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 7: Approving an Original Case Incident Report documenting information that he knew was false**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **SEPARATION** was recommended for the Sustained allegations.

Officer C:

- **Allegation 1: Entered and searched Subject 1's residence without a search warrant or an exception to the search warrant requirements**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Grabbing and slamming Subject 1 against the wall**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 3: Handcuffing Subject 1 in a rough manner and too tightly**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 4: Unreasonably seizing items belonging to Subjects 2 and 3 during an illegal search**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 5: Making a false report, written or oral**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **SEPARATION** was recommended for the Sustained allegations.

Officer D:

- **Allegation 1: Entered and searched Subject 1's residence without a search warrant or an exception to the search warrant requirements**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Grabbing and slamming Subject 1 against the wall**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 3: Handcuffing Subject 1 in a rough manner and too tightly**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 4: Unreasonably seizing items belonging to Subjects 2 and 3 during an illegal search**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 5: Making a false report, written or oral**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **SEPARATION** was recommended for the Sustained allegations.

Officer E:

- **Allegation 1: Entered and searched Subject 1's residence without a search warrant or an exception to the search warrant requirements**
 - A finding of Unfounded
- **Allegation 2: Grabbing and slamming Subject 1 against the wall**
 - A finding of Unfounded
- **Allegation 3: Handcuffing Subject 1 in a rough manner and too tightly**
 - A finding of Unfounded
- **Allegation 4: Unreasonably seizing items belonging to Subjects 2 and 3 during an illegal search**
 - A finding of Unfounded

Officer F:

- **Allegation 1: Entered and searched Subject 1's residence without a search warrant or an exception to the search warrant requirements**
 - A finding of Unfounded
- **Allegation 2: Grabbing and slamming Subject 1 against the wall**
 - A finding of Unfounded
- **Allegation 3: Handcuffing Subject 1 in a rough manner and too tightly**
 - A finding of Unfounded
- **Allegation 4: Unreasonably seizing items belonging to Subjects 2 and 3 during an illegal search**
 - A finding of Unfounded

Log# 1068265

Notification Date: March 28, 2014

Location: 16th District

Complaint Type: Domestic Incident

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 35, Off-Duty, Civilian Dress, Year of Appointment – 2002

Subject 1: Female/White, 33

Summary: In an incident involving Officer A, it was alleged that Officer A was in contempt of a court ruling after finding that Officer A harassed Subject 1 by sending her magazine subscriptions that she had not requested, as well as, showing up near Subject 1's residence without first contacting her.

Finding(s): Based on department rules; statements to IPRA from the accused officer and subject; a court order, and an agreed order of protection, IPRA recommends the following:

Officer A:

- **Allegation 1: Violated Department rules of impeding Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department, and disrespect or maltreatment of any person while on or off duty**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Violated a court order in violation of a Department rule**
 - A finding of Unfounded
- **Allegation 3: Violated Department rule of impeding Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of a **15 DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the Sustained allegations.

Log# 1069136

Notification Date: May 13, 2014

Location: 9th District

Complaint Type: Illegal/False Arrest

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 46, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1999

Officer B: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 30, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2009

Subject 1: Male/Black, 34

Summary: In an incident involving Officers A and B, it was alleged that Officer A and B handcuffed Subject 1, placed him into the back of their unmarked vehicle, and drove Subject 1 four miles away. Then, the Officers removed Subject 1 from the back of the vehicle and drove away.

Finding(s): Based on department rules, general orders, and special orders; the 4th Amendment of the US Constitution; GPS Records; and statements to IPRA from the accused officers and subject, IPRA recommends the following:

Officer A:

- **Allegation 1: Seized/arrested Subject 1 without justification**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Handcuffed Subject 1 too tightly**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 3: Use profanity towards Subject 1 when asked to loosen the handcuffs**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 4: Failed to immediately transport Subject 1 to the district of arrest**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 5: Transported Subject 1 via Department vehicle from one location to another without justification**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 6: Transported Subject 1 via Department vehicle from one location to another against his will**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 7: Slapped Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 8: Punched Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 9: Abandoned/left Subject 1 at an undesired location**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 10: Failed to complete a Contact Card documenting the officer's contact with Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 11: Failed to notify OEMC of an on-view incident the officer responded to involving Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 12: Failed to notify OEMC of the officer's change in availability status when he transported Subject 1 via Department vehicle**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 13: Falsely reported officer's duty/work status to OEMC during his contact with Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 14: Falsely reported officer's location to OEMC during his contact with Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 15: Failed to notify the officer's immediate supervisor of the reason Subject 1 should be released without charged**
 - A finding of Sustained

- **Allegation 16: Failed to notify the officer's unit commander of the reason Subject 1 should be released without charged**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 17: Failed to complete the necessary reports in related to Subject 1 being released without charging**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 18: Failed to report misconduct committed by co-accused officer in relation to his contact with Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **SEPARATION** was recommended for the Sustained allegations.

Officer B:

- **Allegation 1: Seized/arrested Subject 1 without justification**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Handcuffed Subject 1 too tightly**
 - A finding of Unfounded
- **Allegation 3: Failed to immediately transport Subject 1 to the district of arrest**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 4: Transported Subject 1 via Department vehicle from one location to another without justification**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 5: Transported Subject 1 via Department vehicle from one location to another against his will**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 6: Left Subject 1 at an undesired location**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 7: Failed to complete a Contact Card documenting the officer's contact with Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 8: Failed to notify OEMC of an on-view incident the officer responded to involving Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 9: Failed to notify OEMC of the officer's change in availability status when he transported Subject 1 via Department vehicle**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 10: Falsely reported officer's duty/work status to OEMC during his contact with Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 11: Falsely reported officer's location to OEMC during his contact with Subject 1**

- A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 12: Failed to notify the officer's immediate supervisor of the reason Subject 1 should be released without charged**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 13: Failed to notify the officer's unit commander of the reason Subject 1 should be released without charged**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 14: Failed to complete the necessary reports in related to Subject 1 being released without charging**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 15: Failed to report misconduct committed by co-accused officer in relation to his contact with Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **SEPARATION** was recommended for the Sustained allegations.

Log# 1073693

Notification Date: February 7, 2016

Location: 5th District

Complaint Type: Officer Involved Shooting

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Hispanic, 46, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1999

Officer B: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 44, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1995

Subject 1: Male/Black, 35

Summary: In an incident involving Officer A and officer B, it was alleged that Officers A and B fired their weapons at Subject 1 without justification while Subject 1 attempted to flee and posed no imminent threat

Finding(s): Based on department rules; Department general orders and special orders; statements to IPRA from the accused officers and subjects; medical records; and Department reports, IPRA recommends the following:

Officer A:

- **Allegation 1: Used excessive force when he fired his weapon at Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **SEPARATION** was recommended for the Sustained allegations.

Officer B:

- **Allegation 1: Used excessive force when he fired his weapon at Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **SEPARATION** was recommended for the Sustained allegations.

August 2016

Log# 1066466

Notification Date: December 6, 2013

Location: 7th District

Complaint Type: Misdemeanor Arrest

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 41, Off-Duty, Civilian Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1996

Subject 1: Female/Black, 40

Summary: In an incident involving Officer A, it was alleged that Officer A committed domestic battery resulting in Officer A's arrest.

Finding(s): Based on the arrest report; police reports; incident scene photographs; OEMC transmissions; and department rules and general orders, IPRA recommends the following:

Officer A:

- **Allegation 1: Struck Subject 1 about the face during a domestic altercation**
 - Pursuant to Section 3.4 of the Uniform Peace Officers' Disciplinary Act, this allegation could not be further investigated due to no signed affidavit.
- **Allegation 2: Forced his way into Subject 1's unit**
 - Pursuant to Section 3.4 of the Uniform Peace Officers' Disciplinary Act, this allegation could not be further investigated due to no signed affidavit.
- **Allegation 3: Broke down Subject 1's bathroom door**
 - Pursuant to Section 3.4 of the Uniform Peace Officers' Disciplinary Act, this allegation could not be further investigated due to no signed affidavit.
- **Allegation 4: Resisted arrest by refusing to follow repeated commands to show his hands**
 - Pursuant to Section 3.4 of the Uniform Peace Officers' Disciplinary Act, this allegation could not be further investigated due to no signed affidavit.
- **Allegation 5: Arrested and Charged with assault**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 6: Intoxicated while off-duty**
 - A finding of Sustained

During mediation, Officer A agreed to accept IPRA's penalty of a **2-DAY SUSPENSION** for the Sustained allegations.

Log# 1066725

Notification Date: December 22, 2013

Location: 6th District

Complaint Type: Firearm Discharge with Hits – On-Duty

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Hispanic, 38, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2006

Officer B: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 33, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2004

Subject 1: Male/Black, 18

Subject 2: Male/Black, 18

Summary: In an incident involving Officers A and B and other officers, it was alleged that Officer A used deadly force by firing his weapon 16 times at a moving car in order to stop its driver from running over a citizen whom Officer A believed was being dragged. In addition, it was alleged that Officer B failed to complete and submit a Tactical Response Report (TRR) regarding his use of force during an encounter with one of the youths that was arrested during this incident.

Finding(s): Based on the in-car camera video recording; department rules; general orders; and statements to IPRA from the accused and witness officers, subjects, and witnesses, IPRA recommends the following:

Officer A:

- **Allegation 1: Used deadly force in violation of General Order 03-02-03, II, B & III, C; and in violation of Rule 2**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Unlawfully and unnecessarily discharged his weapon into a vehicle that was moving away from him, in violation of Rule 38**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **SEPARATION** was recommended for the Sustained allegations.

Officer B:

- **Allegation 1: Failed to complete and submit a TRR reporting his use of force during his encounter with a witness in violation of Rule 6**
 - A finding of Unfounded

Log# 1069888

Notification Date: June 19, 2014

Location: 10th District

Complaint Type: Excessive Force

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Hispanic, 37, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2007

Officer B: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 35, Unknown if On-Duty, Civilian Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2006

Subject 1: Male/Black, 21

Summary: In an incident where Subject 1 was detained by Officers A and B, a physical altercation ensued as the Officers attempted to place Subject 1 into custody. Subsequently Subject 1 was placed into custody. It was further alleged that the Officers directed profanities to Subject 1's family.

Finding(s): Based on the incident reports, Subject 1 pleading guilty to a narcotics offence, a general order, and statements to IPRA from the accused officers, subject, and witnesses, IPRA recommends the following:

- Officer A:**
- **Allegation 1: Choked Subject 1 while he was handcuffed in violation of Rule 8**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
 - **Allegation 2: Slammed Subject 1's head onto a police vehicle in violation of Rule 8**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
 - **Allegation 3: Threw Subject 1 to the ground in violation of Rule 8**
 - A finding of Exonerated
 - **Allegation 4: Directed profanities at Subject 1's family in violation of Rule 2**
 - A finding of Sustained
 - **Allegation 5: Struck Subject 1 about the chest with a closed fist in violation of Rule 8**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
 - **Allegation 6: Unnecessarily pointed his weapon at Subject 1's family in violation of Rule 38**
 - A finding of Not Sustained

A penalty of **A 1-DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the Sustained allegation.

- Officer B:**
- **Allegation 1: Choked Subject 1 while he was handcuffed in violation of Rule 8**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
 - **Allegation 2: Slammed Subject 1's head onto a police vehicle in violation of Rule 8**

- A finding of Unfounded
- **Allegation 3: Threw Subject 1 to the ground in violation of Rule 8**
 - A finding of Unfounded
- **Allegation 4: Directed profanities at Subject 1's family in violation of Rule 2**
 - A finding of Unfounded
- **Allegation 5: Struck Subject 1 about the chest with a closed fist in violation of Rule 8**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- **Allegation 6: Unnecessarily pointed his weapon at Subject 1's family in violation of Rule 38**
 - A finding of Not Sustained

Log# 1075057

Notification Date: May 7, 2015

Location: Multiple Districts

Complaint Type: Domestic

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Hispanic, 37, Off-Duty, Not In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2002

Subject 1: Female/White, 31

Summary: In an incident involving Officer A, it was alleged that Officer A used his office to locate and obtain information regarding a civilian friend of Subject 1; drove his personal vehicle to place of residence of said civilian and photograph himself making a threatening gesture towards the residence; verbally harassed, threatened and directed profanities at Subject 1 in person and via email and text message, including making threats against her friends and family members, and making several derogatory racial comments; made a false report in verifying documents to a court of law which contained statements he knew to be untrue; physically attacked Subject 1 in his personal vehicle and threatened to end his own life; placed Subject 1 in danger by pulling his weapon in his personal vehicle and informing her that it did not have a safety; coerced Subject 1 into disclosing information about her friends and past relationships; illegally accessed Subject 1's computer; threatened to kill himself and other in the event he lost his job; pinned Subject 1 and prevented her from moving; threatened to call authorities and make false statements in order to have Subject 1 removed from his apartment and

their son removed from her care; told Subject 1 she should end her own life; threatened to have Subject 1 physically attacked once she was no longer pregnant with their child; threatened to rape Subject 1's sister and her sister's roommates; stalked Subject 1 and sent her pictures of himself in his vehicle in different location; and attempted to coerce Subject 1 to terminate IPRA's investigation into these allegations.

Finding(s):

Based on department rules, general orders, and special orders; statements to IPRA from the subject; statements to IPRA from the accused officer; text messages and photographs provided by the subject; and an investigation into Officer A's use of LEADS, IPRA recommends the following:

Officer A:

- **Allegation 1, Count 1: Violated the law when he conducted one or more LEADS investigations for personal purposes**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 1, Count 2: Violated the law when he conducted one or more LEADS investigations for personal purposes**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 1, Count 3: Disobeyed an order or directive when he conducted one or more LEADS investigations for personal purposes**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 1, Count 4: Used his office for personal gain or influence when he conducted one or more LEADS investigations for personal purposes**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Disrespected and mistreated Subject 1 by sending her a photograph of himself making a threatening gesture towards the place of residence of one of her friends**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 3: Engaged in unjustified verbal altercations with Subject 1 when he repeatedly directed profanities towards her via text and email**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 4: Engaged in unjustified verbal altercations with Subject 1 when he repeatedly made disparaging racial comments to her about African-Americans and other nationalities to her via email and text message**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 5: Engaged in unjustified verbal altercations with Subject 1 when he repeatedly made threats against her and her family via email and text message**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 6: Engaged in unjustified verbal altercations with Subject 1 when he repeatedly made threats against her friends via email and**

text message

- A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 7: Engaged in unjustified verbal altercations with Subject 1 when he repeatedly made harassing remarks about her and her family via email and text message**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 8, Count 1: Made a false written or oral report when he made a false report in verifying documents to a court of law**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 8, Count 2: Violated the law when he knowingly provided false information to a court of law**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 9: Engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Subject 1 when he grabbed her by her jacket collar and pinned her against a car door**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 10: Engaged in an unjustified altercation with Subject 1 when he pulled his gun and threatened to kill himself**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- **Allegation 11: Engaged in an unjustified altercation with Subject 1 when he pulled his gun in close proximity to Subject 1 and informed her that it did not have a safety, placing her life in danger**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- **Allegation 12: Engaged in an unjustified altercation with Subject 1 when he coerced her into providing him information about her past relationships**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- **Allegation 13: Used his office for personal gain when he illegally accessed Subject 1's computer**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- **Allegation 14: Participated in actions which bring discredit upon the Department and engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with Subject 1 when he threatened to kill himself and others if he were to lose his job**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- **Allegation 15: Engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Subject 1 when he pinned her, not allowing her to move**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- **Allegation 16: Engaged in an unjustified altercation with Subject 1 when he threatened to make false statements to authorities to have her removed from his residence and their son taken away from her**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- **Allegation 17: Engaged in an unjustified altercation with Subject 1 when he posted a "countdown" on G-chat and left intimidating comments with the intention to cause emotional distress**
 - A finding of Not Sustained

- **Allegation 18: Disrespected and mistreated Subject 1 and engaged in an unjustified altercation with Subject 1 when he told her the only weapon she needed was a noose around her neck so she could kill herself**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- **Allegation 19: Engaged in an unjustified altercation with Subject 1 when he told her he had several people ready to attach her once she was no longer pregnant**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- **Allegation 20: Engaged in an unjustified altercation with Subject 1 when he threaten to rape her sister and her sisters roommates**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- **Allegation 21: Engaged in an unjustified altercation with Subject 1 when he stalked her and sent her pictures from various locations to demonstrate he knew her whereabouts**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- **Allegation 22: Engaged in an unjustified altercation with Subject 1 when he attempted to coerce her into terminating IPRA's investigation into these allegations**
 - A finding of Not Sustained

A penalty of **SEPARATION** was recommended for the Sustained allegations.

Log# 1078329

Notification Date: December 5, 2015

Location: 5th District

Complaint Type: Excessive Force

Sergeant B: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 38, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1998

Lieutenant B: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 42, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1993

Lieutenant A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 44, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1994

Lieutenant C:	Chicago Police Officer, Male/Hispanic, 56, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1982
Sergeant C:	Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 42, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1997
Sergeant A:	Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 61, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1991
Officer A:	Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 48, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1996
Officer B:	Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 38, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1999
Officer C:	Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 48, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1993
Officer D:	Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 49, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1997
Officer E:	Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 49, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1990
Detention Aide A:	Detention Aide, Male/Black, 47, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1992
Subject 1:	Male/Black, 42
Summary:	<p>In an incident where Subject 1 was arrested following a physical altercation with his mother, Subject 1 was taken to the 5th District station where his behavior was, at times, erratic and uncooperative. The next morning, Subject 1 refused to cooperate and six Department members entered Subject 1's cell in an attempt to obtain his cooperation from a "display of force." At Sergeant A's request, Officer A discharged his taser. Then, the group of Officers used physical force to take Subject 1 to the floor and restrain him in handcuffs and leg shackles. Detention Aide A then removed Subject 1 from his cell pulling his handcuffs and dragging him. The other Department members followed and watched as Detention Aide A continued to drag Subject 1 down the a hallway.</p> <p>After that, Detention Aide A called medical support to remove the taser</p>

probes, paramedics took Subject 1 to the hospital, and Officers D and E accompanied Subject 1 to the hospital. At the hospital, Subject 1 struggled violently with medical staff and officers and attempted to flee. Once the officers gained control of Subject 1, the medical staff administered a sedative to Subject 1. Subject 1 had a negative reaction to the drug causing his death later that day.

Finding(s): Based on the 5th District lockup video recordings, civil suit depositions; Department rules; general and special orders; statements to IPRA from the accused officers and witnesses; and from the totality of circumstances, IPRA recommends the following:

Sergeant B:

- **Allegation 1: Violation of Rule 6 in that he failed to follow the provisions of Special Order S04-20-01 and General Order G06-01-01 when he failed to bring Subject 1 for medical and/or mental health treatment**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **A 120-DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the Sustained allegation.

Lieutenant B:

- **Allegation 1: Violation of Rule 6 in that he failed to follow the provisions of Special Order S04-20-01 and S06-01 when he failed to make medical and/or mental health treatment available for Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Maltreated Subject 1 by allowing him to walk around the lockup area with his pants down**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- **Allegation 3: Failed to follow the provisions of Special Order 06-01 by not allowing Subject 1's father to see his son while Subject 1 was in custody**
 - A finding of Exonerated
- **Allegation 4: Violation of Rule 6 in that he failed to follow the provisions of General Order G04-09-02 regarding Exposure to Communicable Disease**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **A 28-DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the Sustained allegation.

Lieutenant A:

- **Allegation 1: Knew Subject 1 needed medical and/or mental health treatment and refused to make it available for him**
 - A finding of Unfounded

Lieutenant C:

- **Allegation 1: Knew Subject 1 needed medical and/or mental health treatment and refused to make it available for him**
 - A finding of Unfounded

Sergeant C:

- **Allegation 1: Failed to make medical and/or mental health treatment available for Subject 1**
 - A finding of Unfounded
- **Allegation 2: Used excessive force on Subject 1**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- **Allegation 3: Violation of Rules 3, 6, and 8 in that he failed to follow the provisions of General Order G06-01-01 when he failed to intervene when Detention Aide A physically maltreated Subject 1 by dragging him while he was handcuffed and shackled.**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 4: Violation of Rule 22 in that he observed misconduct and failed to report it when Detention Aide A dragged Subject 1 from his cell and down the hallway while he was handcuffed and shackled.**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **A 28-DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the Sustained allegation.

Sergeant A:

- **Allegation 1: Violation of Rule 6 in that he failed to follow the provisions of Special Orders S04-20-01 and S06-01 when he failed to make medical and/or mental health treatment available for Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Violation of Rule 6 in that he failed to follow the provisions of Special Order S06-01-02 when he instructed Officer A to bring a taser into the lockup facility**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 3: Used excessive force on Subject 1**
 - A finding of Not Sustained

- **Allegation 4: Violation of Rules 3, 6, and 8 in that he failed to follow the provisions of General Order G06-01-01 and Special Order S06-01 when he failed to intervene when Detention Aide A physically maltreated Subject 1 by dragging him while he was handcuffed and shackled**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 5: Violation of Rule 22 in that he observed misconduct and failed to report it when Detention Aide A dragged Subject 1 from his cell and down the hallway while he handcuffed and shackled**
 - A finding of Sustained

IPRA would have recommended a penalty of **SEPARATION**; however, Sergeant A retired in 2014. Thus, IPRA recommends that the Department take any and all possible action to prevent him from future employment with the City of Chicago.

Officer A:

- **Allegation 1: Used excessive force on Subject 1**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Violation of Rules 3, 6, and 8 in that he failed to follow the provisions of General Order G06-01-01 when he failed to intervene when Detention Aide A physically maltreated Subject 1 by dragging him while he was handcuffed and shackled**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 3: Violation of Rule 22 in that he observed misconduct and failed to report it when Detention Aide A dragged Subject 1 from his cell and down the hallway while he was handcuffed and shackled**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **A 28-DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the Sustained allegation.

Officer B:

- **Allegation 1: Used excessive force on Subject 1**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Violation of Rules 3, 6, and 8 in that he failed to follow the provisions of General Order G06-01-01 when he failed to intervene when Detention Aide A physically maltreated Subject 1 by dragging him while he was handcuffed and shackled**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 3: Violation of Rule 22 in that he observed misconduct and failed to report it when Detention Aide A dragged Subject 1 from his**

cell and down the hallway while he was handcuffed and shackled

- A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **A 28-DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the Sustained allegation.

Officer C:

- **Allegation 1: Used excessive force on Subject 1**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Failed to intervene when Detention Aide A dragged Subject 1 from his cell and down the hallway while he was handcuffed and shackled**
 - A finding of Not Sustained
- **Allegation 3: Observed misconduct and failed to report it when Detention Aide A dragged Subject 1 from his cell and down the hallway while he was handcuffed and shackled**
 - A finding of Not Sustained

Officer D:

- **Allegation 1: Used excessive force on Subject 1**
 - A finding of Not Sustained

Officer E:

- **Allegation 1: Used excessive force on Subject 1**
 - A finding of Not Sustained

Detention Aide A:

- **Allegation 1: Violation of Rules 6 and 8 in that he failed to follow the provisions of General Order G03-02 when he physically maltreated Subject 1 by dragging him from his cell while he was handcuffed and shackled**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Violation of Rules 6 and 8 in that he failed to follow the provisions of General Order G03-02 when he physically maltreated Subject 1 by dragging him down the hallway while he was handcuffed and shackled**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 3: Violation of Rule 2 in that by his overall actions and conduct he brought discredit upon the Department**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of a **90-DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the Sustained

allegation.

Log# 1081232

Notification Date: July 01, 2016

Location: City of Chicago

Complaint Type: Accidental Taser Discharge

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Hispanic, 33, On-Duty, In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2006

Summary: In an incident involving Officer A, it was alleged that Officer A accidentally discharged his taser while responding to a “burglary in progress.” Officer A hit a wall with the taser and no one was injured.

Finding(s): Based on a department general order; statements to IPRA from the accused officer and witness officers; and department reports, IPRA recommends the following:

Officer A:

- **Allegation 1: Accidentally discharged his Department issued taser**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **A NOTED VIOLATION** was recommended for the Sustained allegation.

Log# 1081377

Notification Date: July 9, 2016

Location: 16th District

Complaint Type: Accidental Taser Discharge

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 46, On-Duty In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1995

Summary: In an incident involving Officer A, it was alleged that Officer A accidentally discharged his taser while performing a “spark test.” Officer A did not hit anyone when the taser discharges and no one was injured.

Finding(s): Based on a department general order; statements to IPRA from the accused officer and witness officers; and department reports, IPRA recommends the following:

- Officer A:**
- **Allegation 1: Accidentally discharged his Department issued taser**
 - A finding of Not Sustained

A penalty of **A NOTED VIOLATION** was recommended for the Sustained allegation.

September 2016

Log# 1054335

Notification Date: May 25, 2012

Location: 008

Complaint Type: Domestic

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 42, Off-Duty, Not In-Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1995

Subject 1: Female/Black, 46

Summary: In an incident involving Officer A, it was alleged that Officer A got into a domestic altercation with Subject 1 for which he was arrested, and that he violated an Order of Protection when he contacted Subject 1 multiple times via telephone.

Finding(s): Based on department rules, general orders, and special orders; photographs; court documents; statements to IPRA from the subject; statements to IPRA from the accused officer, IPRA recommends the following:

Officer A:

- **Allegation 1: Violated Rule 9 when he engaged in an unjustified verbal and physical altercation with Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Violated the law when he was arrested for Domestic Battery against Subject 1**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 3: Violated the law when he violated an Order of Protection by calling Subject 1 multiple times after its entry**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **A 20 DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the Sustained allegations.

Log# 1069929

Notification Date: June 21, 2014

Location: 10th District

Complaint Type: Excessive Force

Detention Aide A: Detention Aide, Male/Black, 51, On-Duty, Full Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1994

Detention Aide B: Detention Aide, Male/Hispanic, 36, On-Duty, Full Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2012

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 37, On-Duty, Full Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2009

Officer B: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 34, On-Duty, Full Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2006

Subject 1: Male/Hispanic, 25

Summary: In an incident involving Detention Aide A, it was alleged that Detention Aide A slapped and pushed Subject 1. Detention Aide B, Officer A, and Officer B were witnesses to this incident.

Finding(s): Based on the surveillance video; statements to IPRA from the accused detention aides, accused officers, and subject; initiation report; and department rules, IPRA recommends the following:

Detention Aide

A:

- **Allegation 1: Slapped Subject 1 about the head, in violation of Rule 8**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation 2: Pushed Subject 1 to the floor, in violation of Rule 8**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **A 90-DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the Sustained allegations.

Detention Aide

B:

- **Allegation 1: Failed to intervene and/or ensure Subject 1's safety during a confrontation between Detention Aide A and Subject 1, in violation of Rule 5**
 - A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **A 5-DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the Sustained allegation.

Officer A:

- **Allegation 1: Failed to intervene and/or ensure Subject 1's safety during a confrontation between Detention Aide A and Subject 1, in violation of Rule 5**
 - A finding of Unfounded

Officer B:

- **Allegation 1: Failed to intervene and/or ensure Subject 1's safety during a confrontation between Detention Aide A and Subject 1, in violation of Rule 5**
 - A finding of Unfounded