

#### ABSTRACTS OF SUSTAINED CASES

#### August 2017

Notification Date: Location: Complaint Type:	27 January 2015 25 <sup>th</sup> District Conduct Unbecoming
Officer A:	Chicago Police Officer, Male/Asian Pacific Islander, 34, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2006
Officer B:	Chicago Police Officer, M/White, 34, On- Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment - 2012
Complainant:	Male/Black, 50
Subject:	M/White, 32
Summary:	Officer A imitated a traffic stop of Subject during which he made threatening remarks and removed his vest. Additionally, he is alleged to have made disparaging comments during Subject's arrest.
Finding(s):	Based on departmental policies, departmental documents, officers' statements, witness statements, video recordings and CPD employees IPRA recommends the following:
Officer A:	<ul> <li>Allegation #1: Officer A threatened the Subject, by removing his vest and stating words to the effect of, "I will kick your ass," in violation of Rule 9 and Rule2.</li> <li>A finding of Sustained.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Allegation #2: Officer A stated words to the effect of "Stop bitching", in violation of Rule 9 and Rule 2.</li> <li>A finding of Sustained.</li> </ul>



- Allegation #3: Officer A stated words to the effect of "Tell your bitch to be quiet," in violation of Rule 9 and Rule 2.
   A finding of Sustained.
- Allegation #4: Officer A grabbed and threw Subject to the ground, in violation of Rule 8 and Rule 2.
  - $\circ \quad A \ finding \ of \ Unfounded.$
- Allegation #5: Officer A pushed Subject's face down on the ground, in violation of Rule 8 and Rule 2.
   A finding of Unfounded.

A penalty of **25 DAYS SUSPENSION** was recommended for the sustained allegations.

Officer B:
 Allegation #1: Officer B observed misconduct, when Officer A threatened the Subject, by removing his vest and stating words to the effect of "I will kick your ass" and failed to report the same, in violation of Rule 6, G.O. 08-01-02.
 A finding of Sustained.

A penalty of **6 DAYS SUSPENSION** was recommended for the sustained allegations.



Notification Date: Location: Complaint Type:	01 May 2015 09 <sup>th</sup> District Firearm Discharge With Hits/On Duty
Officer A:	Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 46, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1994
Officer B:	Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 41, In Uniform, Year of Appointment - 1999
Complainant:	Male/S, 58
Subject 1:	Male/Black, 24
Subject 2:	Unknown
Subject 3:	Unknown
Victim A:	Unknown
Victim B:	Unknown
Victim C:	Male/Black, 40
Victim D:	Female/Black, 39
Summary:	On 01 May 2015, at approximately 0204 hours, at XXXX S. Vincennes Ave, Subject 1, Subject 2 and Subject 3 were involved in the armed robbery of Victim A and Victim B. Victim B was shot multiple times. Subject 1, Subject 2 and Subject 3 fled the scene. Later that day, Subject 1 was involved in another robbery of a phone which belonged to Victim C and Victim D. Shortly after, offenders' car was surrounded by police vehicles. Officer A approached the car and commanded that Subject 1 step out of the car and while doing so Office A noticed a handgun sticking out of Subject 1's waistband. Officer A ordered Subject 1 to drop the food. After Subject 1 dropped the food, he charged at Officer A, striking him in the chest with his body. Officer A fell backwards and his weapon discharged one round, which Officer A described as an accidental firing.



Finding(s):	Based on departmental procedures, departmental documents, officers' statements, witness statements, In Car cameras and video recordings IPRA recommends the following:
Officer A:	<ul> <li>Allegation #1: Officer A was inattentive to duty when he accidentally discharged his firearm, which resulted in Subject 1 sustaining a gunshot wound, in the he violated Rule 10 of the Chicago Police Department's Rules and Regulations Policy.</li> <li>A finding of Unfounded</li> </ul>
	No Penalty recommended.
Officer B:	• Was inattentive to duty when he endangered Victim C and Victim D, by positioning his vehicle, with them inside of it, in front of and/or near the offenders' vehicle, in that he

and Regulations Policy.A finding of Sustained.

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

violated Rule 10 of the Chicago Police Department's Rules



Notification Date: Location:	20 October 2015 24 <sup>th</sup> District
Complaint Type:	Firearm Discharge
Officer A:	Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 31, Off-Duty, Not in Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2013
Complainant:	Male/White, 51
Summary:	On 20 October 2015, at approximately 0010 hours, off-duty Officer A was inside his residence located at XXXX N. Oakley Ave when he accidentally discharged his weapon.
Finding(s):	Based on departmental procedures, officer statement, and departmental documents, IPRA recommends the following:
Officer A:	<ul> <li>Allegation #1: was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his weapon.</li> <li>A finding of Sustained.</li> <li>Allegation #2: failed to make an oral report to the desk</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>sergeant at the district of occurrence and to follow such oral report with a written report on the prescribed form, whenever a firearm is discharged by a member.</li> <li>A finding of Sustained.</li> </ul>

A penalty of **1 DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the sustained allegations.



Notification Date: Location:	29 October 2015 16 <sup>th</sup> District
<b>Complaint Type:</b>	Excessive Force/Off Duty - Injury
Officer A:	Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 44, Off-Duty, Not In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1999
Officer B:	Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 45, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment - 2002
Complainant:	Male/White, 46
Sergeant A:	Female/White, 45
Summary:	On October 29, 2015, complainant walked to the residence of Officer A and his wife Sergeant A. Complainant wished to speak with the couple regarding an altercation that occurred earlier in the day between their dogs. A heated argument ensued between complainant and Officer A. Complainant alleged that during this argument, Officer A physically and verbally abused him. Police Officers responded to the scene and complainant alleged that responding Officer C stated to him, "The guy [Officer A] was right to hit you."
Finding(s):	Based on departmental policies, officer statements, video recording and witness statement, IPRA recommends the following:
Officer A:	<ul> <li>Allegation #1: Officer A repeatedly struck Complainant about the right side of the head with his fist, in violation of Rules2, 3, 6, 8, 9 and 10.</li> <li>A finding of Not Sustained.</li> <li>Allegation #2: Called Complainant a "dumb Pollack motherfucker," in violation of Rules 2, 3, and 9.</li> <li>A finding of Not Sustained.</li> <li>Allegation #3: Was intoxicated during his contact with complainant, in violation of Rules 2, 3, and 15.</li> <li>A finding of Unfounded.</li> <li>Allegation #4: Engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation</li> </ul>
	• Anegation #4: Engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with Complainant by stating to him, "Who the fuck do you



think you are to come to my house where I just showed you nothing but respect and you're gonna motherfuck my wife in front of my kid. What kind of man are you? You're nothin' but a pussy. If you don't get off my property, I'm gonna throw you outta here," in violation of Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9.

• A finding of Sustained

A penalty of **REPRIMAND** was recommended for the sustained allegations.

Officer B:
Allegation #1: Was rude and unprofessional in that following his response to the scene of a dog bite incident, he told Complainant, "The guy [Officer A] was right to hit you," in violation of Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9.
A finding of Not Sustained.

No Penalty recommended.



Notification Date:	16 January 2016
Location:	12 <sup>th</sup> District
Complaint Type:	Unnecessary Display of Weapon/Off Duty
Officer A:	Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 38, Off-Duty, Not In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2013
Officer B:	Chicago Police Officer, Male/S, 39, Off-Duty, Not In Uniform, Year of Appointment, 2003
Complainant 1:	Male/S, 43
Complainant 2:	Male/White, 41
Summary:	On January 16, 2016 Chicago police officers responded to a 911 report of threats by off-duty Chicago police officers at Spectrum Bar located at XXX S. Halsted Street, Chicago, Illinois.
Finding(s):	Based on departmental policies, officers' statements, other departmental documents, medical records, complainant statement, witnesses' statements and video recordings IPRA recommends the following:
Officer A:	<ul> <li>Allegation #1: Engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with Complainant 2, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 9.</li> <li>A finding of Sustained.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Allegation #2: Was in possession of his weapon while intoxicated, in violation of Rule2; Rule 6 and relation to Chicago Police Department Directive, Uniform, and Property U04-02; and Rule 15.</li> <li>A finding of Sustained.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Allegation #3: Stated words to the effect of "Do you want me to use this on you?" while placing his hand on his weapon, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 9.</li> <li>A finding of Sustained.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Allegation #4: Displayed his weapon, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 38.</li> <li>A finding of Sustained.</li> </ul>



A penalty of **120 DAYS SUSPENSION** was recommended for the sustained allegations.

- Officer B: • Allegation #1: verbally abused Complainant 2, in violation of Rule 2, Rule 8, and Rule 9.
  - A finding of Sustained.

A penalty of **5 DAYS SUSPENSION** was recommended for the sustained allegation.



Notification Date: Location: Complaint Type:	26 February 2016 19 <sup>th</sup> District Racial/Ethnic
Officer A:	Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 57, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2000
Complainant:	Female/S, 57
Summary:	On February 23, 2016, Officer A performed Park duties. Complainant alleged that Officer failed to follow his duties and respond to her message sent via in-car Portable Data Terminal. Complainant also alleged Officer A said something along the lines of, "I am a worker, not like these white jack-offs."
Finding(s):	Based on departmental procedures, officers' statements, and departmental documents, IPRA recommends the following:
Officer A:	<ul> <li>Allegation #1: stated to Complainant, something to the effect of "I am not like these white jack-offs," in violation of Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9.</li> <li>A finding of Sustained.</li> </ul> A penalty of 1 DAY SUSPENSION was recommended for the sustained allegation.



Notification Date: Location: Complaint Type:	26 August 2016 17 <sup>th</sup> District Neglect of Duty
Officer A:	Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 45, Off-Duty, Not In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2013
Complainant:	Female/White, 58
Summary:	On August 26, 2016, at approximately 11:45 a.m., Officer A was cleaning his duty weapon at his residence at XXXX N. Monticello and inadvertently pulled the trigger while aligning his sights causing the weapon to discharge.
Finding(s):	Based on departmental policies, departmental documents, and the officer statement and audio recordings IPRA recommends the following:
Officer A:	<ul> <li>Allegation #1: was careless in the handling of his duty weapon when he discharged a round which struck a residence across the street.</li> <li>A finding of Sustained.</li> </ul>
	A penalty of 20 DAYS SUSPENSION was recommended for the

sustained allegation.



Notification Date: Location: Complaint Type:	02 May 2017 04 <sup>th</sup> District Neglect of Duty
Officer A:	Chicago Police Officer, Female/Black, 29, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2016
Complainant:	Male/White, 40
Summary:	On 02 May 2017, at 1525 hours, at the location of XXXX Ogden Ave., Officer A was preparing for her tour of duty in the 10 <sup>th</sup> District Station locker room and she accidentally discharged the Taser while trying to holster the device. No injuries were reported.
Finding(s):	Based on departmental policies, departmental documents, and the officer statement IPRA recommends the following:
Officer A:	<ul> <li>Allegation #1: was inattentive to duty in that she failed to properly handle a Taser causing it to discharge, in violation of Rule 10 "Inattention to duty."</li> <li>A finding of Sustained.</li> </ul>

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