



July 14, 2017

Re: Second Quarter 2017 Agency Operations

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


During the Second Quarter of 2017, the Independent Police Review Authority ("IPRA") continued operations while anticipating the closing of the agency in only a few weeks. The current agency operations have been streamlined while the new agency, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability ("COPA") is being created.

Plans in support of the COPA startup are coming to life as we speak and we are on track to meet our September 15, 2017 launch date. Our hiring process is almost complete and training is well underway. We just completed Session I of COPA Academy with 36 participating members of the COPA Investigative and Legal staff. Session II of COPA Academy will commence this month.

We are planning an event to coincide with the official agency launch so look for further details in the next few weeks.

As always, please let us know if you have any comments or suggestions.

Respectfully,



Sharon R. Fairley
Chief Administrator

City of Chicago
Independent Police Review Authority



Second Quarter Report
April 1, 2017 – June 30, 2017

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 April 1, 2017, through June 30, 2017. The information contained in this report is accurate as of July 1, 2017. All public reports produced by the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) are available online at www.iprachicago.org/category/quarterly-reports/.

IPRA performs the intake function for all allegations of misconduct made against members of the Chicago Police Department (the Department). 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 Department member discharges a firearm, stun gun, or Taser in a manner that could potentially strike someone, or (ii) a person dies or sustains a serious injury while in police custody, or where an extraordinary occurrence occurs in a lockup facility.

Second Quarter 2017 Report¹

I. Intake and Notification Overview

a. Opened Investigations

During the second quarter of 2017, IPRA received 1,095 misconduct complaints and incident notifications, representing a 0.7% decline compared to Q1 2017 (total intake = 1,103) and a 15.2% decline from Q2 2016 (total intake = 1,292). Of the 1,095 complaints and notifications received during Q2 2017, IPRA referred 789 complaints to the Department's Bureau of Internal Affairs (BIA), and retained 306 complaints and incident notifications for further investigation. The complaints and incident notifications retained by IPRA for investigation during Q2 2017 represent an increase of 22.4% from the number of complaints and incident notifications retained for investigation by IPRA during Q1 2017 (total retention = 250). Lastly, IPRA referred one (1) matter to the Cook County State's Attorney, provided information about five (5) matters to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and referred eighteen (18) matters to the City of Chicago Office of Inspector General.

Opened Investigations Retained by IPRA					
Investigation Type	Q2 2017	Q1 2017	Q4 2016	Q3 2016	Q2 2016
Complaint	175	153	167	190	175
Notification	131	97	125	159	154
Total	306	250	292	349	329

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

b. Complaint-based investigations opened in Q2 2017

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

¹ The purpose of these reports is to provide a quarterly snapshot of IPRA's complaint intake, investigative caseload, and investigative findings at the time of publication. Also, IPRA can only classify an investigation by one category code. Thus, an investigation could include excessive force and racial bias, but would only be classified under one of those codes. Historically, specific points of data were inconsistently entered and applied in IPRA's case management system. Where possible, staff identified and addressed those inconsistencies or relied on other data that appear to be more reliable and accurate. However, without reviewing each individual data point for each investigation, it is impossible to say with certainty whether historical data is accurate or complete.

Complaint-based Investigations					
Category	Q2 2017	Q1 2017	Q4 2016	Q3 2016	Q2 2016
Excessive Force	85	71	71	89	78
Proper Care	26	6	7	9	8
Domestic Violence	17	15	17	13	16
Unnecessary Physical Contact	13	19	21	8	11
Bias-Based Verbal Abuse	13	15	13	19	14
Civil Suits ²	9	13	10	11	15
Unnecessary Display of Weapon	6	8	9	14	10
Miscellaneous ³	4	3	19	25	19
Vehicle	1	2	0	1	0
Fourth Amendment	1	0	0	0	0
Abuse of Authority	0	1	0	0	0
Escape	0	0	0	0	1
False Testimony in Court	0	0	0	0	1
Threats	0	0	0	0	1
Shooting Conversion	0	0	0	0	1
Traffic Pursuit	0	0	0	1 ⁴	0
Total	175	153	167	190	175

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

² 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.

³ 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 at the time the data was queried for this report.

⁴ This incident has been re-classified as a notification of an officer-involved vehicle accident. It is counted for in Figure 6, as well.




Figure 3: Complaint investigations opened between April 1, 2017 and June 30, 2017, categorized by allegation (by percentage).

c. Notification-based investigations opened in Q2 2017

i. Weapons Discharge Data

In addition to taking in complaints of misconduct, IPRA receives notifications and complaints from the Department related to incidents that fall within IPRA's investigatory jurisdiction, such as weapon discharge incidents. There were nine (9) officer-involved shooting incidents during Q2 2017. A total of seven (7) shootings resulted in injuries to civilians or to officers, and of those, one (1) resulted in a civilian fatality, and one (1) incident was an officer-involved suicide.

Taser discharges continue to represent the majority of weapons notifications IPRA receives, with taser discharges representing 79.4% of all weapon discharge notifications. The increase in taser discharge notifications between Q1 2017 and Q2 2017 has been substantial (i.e., an increase of 36.8%). However, the year-over-year comparison suggests that taser usage is comparable to Q2 2016 (i.e., a reduction of 16.8%).

Notifications and Complaints of Weapon Discharges					
Notification Type	Q2 2017	Q1 2017	Q4 2016	Q3 2016	Q2 2016
Firearm Discharge Striking an Individual	7	6	7	8	5
No Hit Shootings	2	0	4	7	5
Animal Destruction	7	5	5	9	12
Taser Discharges	104	76	104	131	125
OC Spray	11	10	5	4	7
Total	131	97	125	159	154
Complaint Type ⁵	Q2 2017	Q1 2017	Q4 2016	Q3 2016	Q2 2016
Accidental Firearm Discharge	1	0	1	1	2
Accidental Taser Discharge	6	6	3	3	4
Complaint re: Taser Discharge	0	0	0	1	0
Total	6	6	4	5	6

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

⁵ Note: Accidental firearm and taser discharges are included in Figure 2 above in the Excessive Force category, 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 Department-initiated complaints.




Figure 5: Weapons-discharge notifications received between April 1, 2017 and June 30, 2017 (by percentage).

ii. Lockup Incidents and Motor Vehicle-related Deaths

IPRA received 28 notifications of extraordinary occurrences (EO) in lockup during Q2 2017. This represents a substantial increase of 366.7% from Q1 2017 and an increase of 133.3% over Q2 2016. During Q2 2017, IPRA received notification of only one officer-involved motor vehicle-related death incident.⁶

⁶ As of January 1, 2016, state law requires IPRA to investigate incidents related to officer-involved motor vehicle fatalities, if the law enforcement officer was engaged in law enforcement activity involving the individual or the individual's vehicle in the process of apprehension or an attempt to apprehend. . See 50 ILCS 727 "Police and Community Relations Improvement Act."

Notifications of Lockup Incidents and Motor Vehicle-related Death Incidents					
Notification Type	Q2 2017	Q1 2017	Q4 2016	Q3 2016	Q2 2016
Extraordinary Occurrences	28	6	17	18	12
Motor Vehicle-related Deaths	1	0	0	2	1
Total	29	6	17	20	13

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

II. Investigative Overview

a. Closed Investigations

During the second quarter, IPRA closed 210 investigations, which represents a decrease of 37.1% from Q1 2017 and an increase of 30.4% from Q2 2016.

Total Closed Investigations				
Q2 2017	Q1 2017	Q4 2016	Q3 2016	Q2 2016
210	334	534	116	161

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

Of its investigations that resulted in a finding, IPRA sustained rate was 40.0% in Q2 2017, a slight decrease from 42.2% in Q1 2017 and a slight increase from 38.0% in Q2 2016.

Closed Investigations – Findings										
Findings	Q2 2017		Q1 2017		Q4 2016		Q3 2016		Q2 2016	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Sustained ⁷	16	40.0%	19	42.2%	9	30.0%	18	56.3%	19	38.0%
Not Sustained ⁸	14	35.0%	14	31.1%	14	46.7%	8	25.0%	24	48.0%
Unfounded ⁹	9	22.5%	11	24.4%	7	23.3%	5	15.6%	6	12.0%
Exonerated ¹⁰	1	2.5%	1	2.2%	0	0.0%	1	3.1%	1	2.0%
Total	40	100.0%	45	100.0%	30	100.0%	32	100.0%	50	100.0%

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

⁷ 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 Department. See Appendix C for all sustained case abstracts.

⁸ Not Sustained: The allegation is not supported by sufficient evidence, which could be used to prove or disprove the allegation.

⁹ Unfounded: The allegation was not based on the facts revealed through investigation, or the reported incident did not occur.

¹⁰ Exonerated: The incident occurred, but the action taken by the officer(s) was deemed lawful and proper.




Figure 9: Findings from investigations closed between April 1, 2017 and June 30, 2017 (by percentage).

Among the investigations that were closed without specific findings, 16.0% were closed for lack of an affidavit.^{11,12} Of the remaining cases, 62.4% were administratively closed, and many of these were weapons discharge notifications with no apparent misconduct nor any allegation of misconduct on the part of the involved officer.¹³

¹¹ 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.”

¹² 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 in Q2 2017.

¹³ For example, if a citizen made a complaint against someone and the person they made a complaint against was not a member of the Department (but rather an officer with a law enforcement agency outside the City of Chicago), IPRA would administratively close that investigation for lack of jurisdiction and refer the case to the appropriate agency.

Q2 2017 Closed Investigations – No findings										
No Findings	Q2 2017		Q1 2017		Q4 2016		Q3 2016		Q2 2016	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
No Affidavit	28	16.5%	69	23.9%	63	12.5%	69	82.1%	53	47.7%
Administratively Closed	106	62.4%	95	32.8%	441	87.5%	15	17.9%	58	52.3%
Administratively Terminated	31	18.2%	117	40.5%	--	--	--	--	--	--
No Finding ¹⁴	5	2.9%	8	2.8%	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	170	100.0%	289	100.0%	504	100.0%	84	100.0%	111	100.0%

Figure 10: Results from investigations with no findings closed between April 1, 2017 and June 30, 2017.

b. Affidavit Override Requests

Chief Administrator Fairley submitted one (1) affidavit override request during the second quarter. The Department granted the request.

c. Pending Investigations

As of June 30, 2017, IPRA had 918 pending investigations, representing an increase of 11.7% over Q1 2017. There are 73 pending officer-involved shooting investigations involving an incident in which a member of the public was struck.

Given that IPRA has continued to lose investigative and office support staff, the senior leadership of IPRA is making all efforts to manage IPRA's caseload to reduce the number of cases that COPA must take on that were initiated under the IPRA banner.

2017 Pending Investigations by Category										
Category	Q2 2017		Q1 2017		Q4 2016		Q3 2016		Q2 2016	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Excessive Force / Use of Force	433	47.17%	409	49.80%	500	55.00%	416	36.10%	380	41.30%
Domestic Altercation or Incident	93	10.13%	88	10.70%	91	10.00%	88	7.60%	97	10.60%
Firearm Discharge that Strikes an Individual	73	7.95%	71	8.60%	74	8.10%	79	6.90%	66	7.20%
Verbal Abuse / Harassment	70	7.63%	64	7.80%	73	8.00%	66	5.70%	59	6.40%

¹⁴ For 2017, all investigations closed without findings were officer-involved shootings that IPRA deemed to be In Policy. Given that there were no allegations of misconduct brought by involved parties or by IPRA, these cases were closed "No Finding."

Taser, OC Spray Discharge	68	7.41%	38	4.60%	21	2.30%	272	23.60%	139	15.10%
Civil Suits	66	7.19%	61	7.40%	51	5.60%	45	3.90%	38	4.10%
Proper Care	36	3.92%	22	2.70%	27	3.00%	27	2.30%	21	2.30%
Weapon Display	33	3.59%	31	3.80%	40	4.40%	42	3.60%	35	3.80%
Arrest-Related	14	1.53%	9	1.10%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Animal Destruction	9	0.98%	6	0.70%	5	0.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
No Hit Shooting	7	0.76%	7	0.90%	15	1.70%	41	3.60%	26	2.80%
Miscellaneous	7	0.76%	6	0.70%	2	0.20%	67	5.80%	51	5.50%
Motor Vehicle Fatalities	5	0.54%	5	0.60%	4	0.40%	2	0.20%	0	0.00%
No Injury	2	0.22%	2	0.20%	2	0.20%	2	0.20%	3	0.30%
Shooting Conversion	1	0.11%	1	0.10%	2	0.20%	2	0.20%	2	0.20%
False Testimony	1	0.11%	1	0.10%	1	0.10%	1	0.10%	1	0.10%
False Arrest	0	0.00%	1	0.10%	1	0.10%	1	0.10%	1	0.10%
Traffic Pursuits	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.10%	0	0.00%
Total	918	100%	822	100%	909	100%	1,152	100%	919	100%

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




Figure 12: Pending investigations as of June 30, 2017.

III. Organizational Updates

a. Notifications

In our Q4 2016 report, we reported some challenges in receiving timely notifications from CPD regarding weapons discharge incidents. At the time, CPD took 50 minutes on average to notify IPRA of a firearm discharge.

The patterns we observed in 2016 have continued into 2017. Notifications have taken 22 minutes to nearly two hours (1 hour and 47 minutes). Since making the recommendation last year, none of the notifications have met our previously-recommended length of less than 10 minutes.

We recommend that CPD:

1. Perform a process analysis to determine how to improve notification timeliness;
2. Create a uniform subject line and contents for all CPIC notifications;
3. Formalize a protocol that requires that updated notifications are sent when the facts become known that materially change the nature of the incident (e.g., when it becomes clear that an officer has discharged a weapon); and
4. Collaborate with OEMC to notify IPRA (and, in the future, COPA)
 - a. within 10 minutes for all firearm discharges;
 - b. within 20 minutes for all motor vehicle incidents that could potentially result in death; and
 - c. to the extent the incident doesn't fall within the scope of (a) above, within 20 minutes for all incidents that could potentially fall under "officer involved death" as defined by the Police and Community Relations Improvement Act, 50 ILCS 727.

IV. Complaints by Unit & Officer

A. Complaints by District¹⁵

District	Complaints		
	Q2 2017 (#)	Q1 2017 (#)	Change (%)
Unknown ¹⁶	44	74	-40.5%
1	57	47	21.3%
2	64	69	-7.2%
3	57	43	32.6%
4	56	50	12.0%
5	56	40	40.0%
6	60	54	11.1%
7	50	52	-3.8%
8	42	55	-23.6%
9	51	37	37.8%
10	65	42	54.8%
11	88	89	-1.1%
12	53	42	26.2%
14	8	12	-33.3%
15	53	43	23.3%
16	63	33	90.9%
17	21	16	31.3%
18	40	55	-27.3%
19	43	39	10.3%
20	18	19	-5.3%
22	42	33	27.3%
24	18	14	28.6%
25	46	43	7.0%
Total	1,095	1,001	--

Figure 16: Number of complaints per district of occurrence during Q2 2017 (in numerical order by Police District).¹⁷

District	Complaints
11	88
10	65
2	64
16	63
6	60
1	57
3	57
4	56
5	56
12	53
15	53
9	51
7	50
25	46
19	43
8	42
22	42
18	40
17	21
20	18
24	18
14	8

Figure 17: Number of complaints per district of occurrence during Q2 2017 (in descending order).

¹⁵ To analyze the data, IPRA calculated the following descriptive statistics: Mean: 47.8; Median 52; St. Dev: 18.5; Range: 80; Confidence level (95%): 8.2.

¹⁶ 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.

¹⁷ Please see Appendix A for a map of the Department's police districts.

In Figures 17 and 18, **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.




Figure 18: The above map represents the number of complaints filed per district.

Excluding unknown districts of occurrence, Figure 18 depicts the total number of complaints that occurred in each district during Q2 2017. The average is 47.8 complaints per district, which represents an increase of 13.5% from Q1 2017, when the average was 42.1 complaints per district.

B. Complaints by Unit of Assignment¹⁸

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> 30 members with 1 complaint each 4 members with 2 complaints each	<u>District 2</u> 26 members with 1 complaint each 4 members with 2 complaints each	<u>District 3</u> 35 members with 1 complaint each 4 members with 2 complaints each
<u>District 4</u> 22 members with 1 complaint each 2 members with 2 complaints each	<u>District 5</u> 35 members with 1 complaint each 4 members with 2 complaints each 1 member with 3 complaints 1 member with 4 complaints	<u>District 6</u> 32 members with 1 complaint each 2 members with 2 complaints each
<u>District 7</u> 40 members with 1 complaint each 4 members with 2 complaints each	<u>District 8</u> 18 members with 1 complaint each 2 members with 2 complaints each	<u>District 9</u> 18 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints
<u>District 10</u> 37 members with 1 complaint each 4 members with 2 complaints each	<u>District 11</u> 41 members with 1 complaint each 7 members with 2 complaints each 1 member with 3 complaints 1 member with 5 complaints	<u>District 12</u> 21 members with 1 complaint each 2 members with 2 complaints each
<u>District 14</u> 6 members with 1 complaint each	<u>District 15</u> 27 members with 1 complaint each 3 members with 2 complaints each	<u>District 16</u> 24 members with 1 complaint each 4 members with 2 complaints each
<u>District 17</u> 16 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints	<u>District 18</u> 26 members with 1 complaint each 2 members with 2 complaints each	<u>District 19</u> 23 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints
<u>District 20</u> 13 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints	<u>District 22</u> 25 members with 1 complaint each 3 members with 2 complaints each	<u>District 24</u> 17 members with 1 complaint each
<u>District 25</u> 30 members with 1 complaint each 2 members with 2 complaints each	<u>Recruitment Training Section (44)</u> 2 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints	<u>District Re-instatement Unit (45)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint
<u>Airport Law Enforcement Section - North (50)</u> 5 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Airport Law Enforcement Section - South (51)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint	<u>Detail Unit (57)</u> 6 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints
<u>Marine Operations Unit (59)</u> 2 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Special Investigations Section (79)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint 1 member with 2 complaints	<u>Office of Communications (102)</u> 2 members with 1 complaint each
<u>Bureau of Internal Affairs (121)</u> 3 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Human Resources Division (123)</u> 2 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Education and Training (124)</u> 4 members with 1 complaint each

¹⁸ See Appendix B for additional data concerning complaints per member per unit. The above numbers are accurate as of July 1, 2017.

Complaints per member by unit of assignment		
<u>Information Services Division (125)</u> 3 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Research and Development Section (127)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint	<u>Community Relations Division (135)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint
<u>Office of the First Deputy Superintendent (140)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint	<u>Traffic Section (145)</u> 2 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints	<u>Traffic Court Unit (148)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint
<u>Unit 156 (156)¹⁹</u> 1 member with 1 complaint	<u>Field Services Section (166)</u> 5 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Evidence and Recovered Property Section (167)</u> 4 members with 1 complaint each
<u>Central Detention (171)</u> 2 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Forensic Services Division (177)</u> 2 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Bureau of Detectives (180)</u> 2 members with 1 complaint each
<u>Narcotics Section (189)</u> 15 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints	<u>Intelligence Section (191)</u> 2 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Vice and Asset Forfeiture Division (192)</u> 2 members with 1 complaint each
<u>Gang Investigation Division (193)</u> 16 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Asset Forfeiture Investigation Section (196)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint	<u>Bureau of Patrol – Area Central (211)</u> 12 members with 1 complaint each 2 members with 2 complaints each
<u>Bureau of Patrol – Area South (212)</u> 9 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Bureau of Patrol – Area North (213)</u> 4 members with 1 complaint each	<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> 2 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Gang Enforcement – Area Central (311)</u> 12 members with 1 complaint each
<u>Gang Enforcement – Area South (312)</u> 5 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Gang Enforcement – Area North (313)</u> 4 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 3 complaints	<u>Canine Unit (341)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint
<u>Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) Unit (353)</u> 13 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Alternate Response Section (376)</u> 7 members with 1 complaint each 1 member with 2 complaints	<u>Juvenile Intervention Support Center (384)</u> 2 members with 1 complaint each
<u>Detached Services – Miscellaneous Detail (543)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint	<u>Central Investigations Unit (606)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint	<u>Major Accident Investigation Unit (608)</u> 3 members with 1 complaint each
<u>Bureau of Detectives – Area Central (610)</u> 18 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Bureau of Detectives – Area South (620)</u> 10 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Bureau of Detectives – Area North (630)</u> 16 members with 1 complaint each
<u>Public Transportation Section (701)</u> 3 members with 1 complaint each	<u>Transit Security Unit (704)</u> 1 member with 1 complaint	<u>Summer Mobile Patrol (714)</u> 11 members with 1 complaint each

Figure 19: Complaints per member by assigned unit.


¹⁹ This unit no longer exists. The related complaint is a civil matter for an incident that occurred prior to this quarter. The complaint, however, was filed during Q2 2017.

Appendix A

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

City of Chicago Police Districts and Community Areas

Rahm Emanuel, Mayor
Garry McCarthy, Superintendent



Appendix B²⁰

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	294	34	38	11.6%	0.13
2	DISTRICT 2	316	30	34	9.5%	0.11
3	DISTRICT 3	317	44	43	13.9%	0.14
4	DISTRICT 4	325	24	26	7.4%	0.08
5	DISTRICT 5	332	41	50	12.3%	0.15
6	DISTRICT 6	351	34	36	9.7%	0.10
7	DISTRICT 7	393	44	50	11.2%	0.13
8	DISTRICT 8	364	20	22	5.5%	0.06
9	DISTRICT 9	324	19	20	5.9%	0.06
10	DISTRICT 10	330	41	45	12.4%	0.14
11	DISTRICT 11	421	50	63	11.9%	0.15
12	DISTRICT 12	319	23	25	7.2%	0.08
14	DISTRICT 14	232	6	6	2.6%	0.03
15	DISTRICT 15	314	30	33	9.6%	0.11
16	DISTRICT 16	247	28	32	11.3%	0.13
17	DISTRICT 17	227	17	18	7.5%	0.08
18	DISTRICT 18	326	28	30	8.6%	0.09
19	DISTRICT 19	375	24	24	6.4%	0.06
20	DISTRICT 20	239	14	15	5.9%	0.06
22	DISTRICT 22	245	28	31	11.4%	0.13
24	DISTRICT 24	259	17	17	6.6%	0.07
25	DISTRICT 25	333	32	34	9.6%	0.10
44	RECRUIT TRAINING SECTION	390	3	4	0.8%	0.01
45	DISTRICT REINSTATEMENT UNIT	2	1	1	50.0%	0.50

²⁰ The Department provided total number of officers by Unit as of April 4, 2017. IPRA did not validate the numbers provided by the Department.

Unit Number	Unit Name	# of Assigned Officers	Officers with Complaints	Total Complaints	% of Officers with Complaints	Complaints per Officer
50	AIRPORT LAW ENFORCEMENT SECTION - NORTH	116	5	5	4.3%	0.04
51	AIRPORT LAW ENFORCEMENT SECTION - SOUTH	43	1	1	2.3%	0.02
55	MOUNTED UNIT 26	25	0	0	0.0%	0.00
57	DETAIL UNIT 2	109	7	8	6.4%	0.07
59	MARINE OPERATIONS UNIT	39	2	2	5.1%	0.05
60	HELICOPTER OPERATIONS UNIT	8	0	0	0.0%	0.00
79	SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS UNIT	24	2	3	8.3%	0.13
102	OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS	26	2	2	7.7%	0.08
111	OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT	15	0	0	0.0%	0.00
114	LEGAL AFFAIRS SECTION	23	0	0	0.0%	0.00
115	CRIME CONTROL STRATEGIES SECION	29	0	0	0.0%	0.00
116	DEPLOYMENT OPERATIONS CENTER	66	0	0	0.0%	0.00
120	BUREAU OF ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT	9	0	0	0.0%	0.00
121	BUREAU OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS	79	3	3	3.8%	0.04
122	FINANCE DIVISION	14	0	0	0.0%	0.00
123	HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION	78	2	2	2.6%	0.03
124	EDUCATION AND TRAINING DIVISION	184	4	4	2.2%	0.02
125	INFORMATION SERVICES DIVISION	63	3	3	4.8%	0.05
126	INSPECTION DIVISION	11	0	0	0.0%	0.00

Unit Number	Unit Name	# of Assigned Officers	Officers with Complaints	Total Complaints	% of Officers with Complaints	Complaints per Officer
127	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION	30	1	1	3.3%	0.03
128	PROFESSIONAL COUNSELING DIVISION	6	0	0	0.0%	0.00
129	MANAGEMENT AND LABOR AFFAIRS SECTION	7	0	0	0.0%	0.00
130	BUREAU OF TECHNICAL SERVICES	3	0	0	0.0%	0.00
131	INTEGRITY SECTION	5	0	0	0.0%	0.00
133	INFORMATION AND STRATEGIC SERVICES	6	0	0	0.0%	0.00
135	COMMUNITY RELATIONS DIVISION	10	1	1	10.0%	0.10
136	SPECIAL EVENTS UNIT	11	0	0	0.0%	0.00
140	OFFICE OF THE FIRST DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT	18	1	1	5.6%	0.06
141	SPECIAL FUNCTIONS DIVISION	8	0	0	0.0%	0.00
142	BUREAU OF PATROL	16	0	0	0.0%	0.00
145	TRAFFIC SECTION	37	3	4	8.1%	0.11
148	TRAFFIC COURT UNIT	2	1	1	50.0%	0.50
153	SPECIAL FUNCTIONS SUPPORT UNIT	15	0	0	0.0%	0.00
156	UNIT 156	n/a	1	1	n/a	n/a
161	GENERAL SUPPORT DIVISION	10	0	0	0.0%	0.00
162	RECORDS DIVISION	3	0	0	0.0%	0.00
163	RECORDS INQUIRY SECTION	6	0	0	0.0%	0.00
166	FIELD SERVICES SECTION	121	5	5	4.1%	0.04
167	EVIDENCE AND RECOVERED PROPERTY SECTION	37	4	4	10.8%	0.11
169	POLICE DOCUMENTS SECTION	4	0	0	0.0%	0.00
171	CENTRAL DETENTION UNIT	40	2	2	5.0%	0.05
172	EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLY	5	0	0	0.0%	0.00

Unit Number	Unit Name	# of Assigned Officers	Officers with Complaints	Total Complaints	% of Officers with Complaints	Complaints per Officer
177	FORENSIC SERVICES DIVISION	54	2	2	3.7%	0.04
180	BUREAU OF DETECTIVES	36	2	2	5.6%	0.06
184	YOUTH INVESTIGATION DIVISION	5	0	0	0.0%	0.00
187	CRIMINAL REGISTRATION UNIT	12	0	0	0.0%	0.00
188	BUREAU OF ORGANIZED CRIME	11	0	0	0.0%	0.00
189	NARCOTICS DIVISION	328	16	17	4.9%	0.05
191	INTELLIGENCE SECTION	43	2	2	4.7%	0.05
192	VICE & ASSET FORFEITURE DIVISION	48	2	2	4.2%	0.04
193	GANG INVESTIGATION DIVISION	201	16	16	8.0%	0.08
196	ASSET FORFEITURE SECTION	31	1	1	3.2%	0.03
211	BUREAU OF PATROL - AREA CENTRAL	184	14	16	7.6%	0.09
212	BUREAU OF PATROL - AREA SOUTH	88	9	9	10.2%	0.10
213	BUREAU OF PATROL - AREA NORTH	102	4	4	3.9%	0.04
222	TIMEKEEPING UNIT	5	0	0	0.0%	0.00
231	MEDICAL SECTION	13	1	1	7.7%	0.08
241	TROUBLED BUILDING SECTION	22	0	0	0.0%	0.00
261	COURT SECTION	45	1	1	2.2%	0.02
276	OEMC - DETAIL SECTION	2	0	0	0.0%	0.00
277	FORENSIC SERVICES EVIDENCE TECHNICIAN SECTION	81	1	2	1.2%	0.02
311	GANG ENFORCEMENT - AREA CENTRAL	66	12	12	18.2%	0.18

Unit Number	Unit Name	# of Assigned Officers	Officers with Complaints	Total Complaints	% of Officers with Complaints	Complaints per Officer
312	GANG ENFORCEMENT - AREA SOUTH	80	5	5	6.3%	0.06
313	GANG ENFORCEMENT - AREA NORTH	73	5	7	6.8%	0.10
341	CANINE UNIT	33	1	1	3.0%	0.03
353	SPECIAL WEAPONS AND TACTICS (SWAT) UNIT	70	13	13	18.6%	0.19
376	ALTERNATE RESPONSE SECTION	138	8	9	5.8%	0.07
384	JUVENILE INTERVENTION SUPPORT CENTER (JISC)	45	2	2	4.4%	0.04
441	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES SECTION	15	0	0	0.0%	0.00
442	BOMB SQUAD	13	0	0	0.0%	0.00
541	FOP DETAIL	6	0	0	0.0%	0.00
542	DETACHED SERVICES - GOVERNMENT SECURITY	18	0	0	0.0%	0.00
543	DETACHED SERVICES - MISCELLANEOUS DETAIL	64	1	1	1.6%	0.02
545	PBPA SERGEANT	2	0	0	0.0%	0.00
549	INSPECTOR GENERAL DETAIL UNIT	1	0	0	0.0%	0.00
603	ARSON SECTION	20	0	0	0.0%	0.00
606	CENTRAL INVESTIGATIONS DIVISION	87	1	1	1.1%	0.01
608	MAJOR ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION UNIT	39	3	3	7.7%	0.08
610	DETECTIVE AREA - CENTRAL	351	18	18	5.1%	0.05
620	DETECTIVE AREA - SOUTH	249	10	10	4.0%	0.04
630	DETECTIVE AREA - NORTH	341	16	16	4.7%	0.05
701	PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SECTION	123	3	3	2.4%	0.02
702	CTA SECURITY UNIT	2	0	0	0.0%	0.00
704	TRANSIT SECURITY UNIT	33	1	1	3.0%	0.03

Unit Number	Unit Name	# of Assigned Officers	Officers with Complaints	Total Complaints	% of Officers with Complaints	Complaints per Officer
711	VIOLENCE REDUCTION INITIATIVE NORTH	10	0	0	0.0%	0.00
712	VIOLENCE REDUCTION INITIATIVE SOUTH	17	0	0	0.0%	0.00
714	SUMMER MOBILE PATROL	102	11	11	10.8%	0.11
720	GRANTS SECTION	1	0	0	0.0%	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
45	DISTRICT REINSTATEMENT UNIT	2	1	1	50.0%	0.50
148	TRAFFIC COURT UNIT	2	1	1	50.0%	0.50
353	SPECIAL WEAPONS AND TACTICS (SWAT) UNIT	70	13	13	18.6%	0.19
311	GANG ENFORCEMENT - AREA CENTRAL	66	12	12	18.2%	0.18
3	DISTRICT 3	317	44	43	13.9%	0.14
10	DISTRICT 10	330	41	45	12.4%	0.14
5	DISTRICT 5	332	41	50	12.3%	0.15
11	DISTRICT 11	421	50	63	11.9%	0.15
1	DISTRICT 1	294	34	38	11.6%	0.13
22	DISTRICT 22	245	28	31	11.4%	0.13
16	DISTRICT 16	247	28	32	11.3%	0.13
7	DISTRICT 7	393	44	50	11.2%	0.13
167	EVIDENCE AND RECOVERED PROPERTY SECTION	37	4	4	10.8%	0.11
714	SUMMER MOBILE PATROL	102	11	11	10.8%	0.11
212	BUREAU OF PATROL - AREA SOUTH	88	9	9	10.2%	0.10
135	COMMUNITY RELATIONS DIVISION	10	1	1	10.0%	0.10
6	DISTRICT 6	351	34	36	9.7%	0.10
25	DISTRICT 25	333	32	34	9.6%	0.10
15	DISTRICT 15	314	30	33	9.6%	0.11
2	DISTRICT 2	316	30	34	9.5%	0.11
18	DISTRICT 18	326	28	30	8.6%	0.09
79	SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS UNIT	24	2	3	8.3%	0.13
145	TRAFFIC SECTION	37	3	4	8.1%	0.11

193	GANG INVESTIGATION DIVISION	201	16	16	8.0%	0.08
102	OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS	26	2	2	7.7%	0.08
231	MEDICAL SECTION	13	1	1	7.7%	0.08
608	MAJOR ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION UNIT	39	3	3	7.7%	0.08
211	BUREAU OF PATROL - AREA CENTRAL	184	14	16	7.6%	0.09
17	DISTRICT 17	227	17	18	7.5%	0.08
4	DISTRICT 4	325	24	26	7.4%	0.08
12	DISTRICT 12	319	23	25	7.2%	0.08
313	GANG ENFORCEMENT - AREA NORTH	73	5	7	6.8%	0.10
24	DISTRICT 24	259	17	17	6.6%	0.07
57	DETAIL UNIT 2	109	7	8	6.4%	0.07
19	DISTRICT 19	375	24	24	6.4%	0.06
312	GANG ENFORCEMENT - AREA SOUTH	80	5	5	6.3%	0.06
9	DISTRICT 9	324	19	20	5.9%	0.06
20	DISTRICT 20	239	14	15	5.9%	0.06
376	ALTERNATE RESPONSE SECTION	138	8	9	5.8%	0.07
140	OFFICE OF THE FIRST DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT	18	1	1	5.6%	0.06
180	BUREAU OF DETECTIVES	36	2	2	5.6%	0.06
8	DISTRICT 8	364	20	22	5.5%	0.06
59	MARINE OPERATIONS UNIT	39	2	2	5.1%	0.05
610	DETECTIVE AREA - CENTRAL	351	18	18	5.1%	0.05
171	CENTRAL DETENTION UNIT	40	2	2	5.0%	0.05
189	NARCOTICS DIVISION	328	16	17	4.9%	0.05
125	INFORMATION SERVICES DIVISION	63	3	3	4.8%	0.05
630	DETECTIVE AREA - NORTH	341	16	16	4.7%	0.05
191	INTELLIGENCE SECTION	43	2	2	4.7%	0.05
384	JUVENILE INTERVENTION SUPPORT CENTER (JISC)	45	2	2	4.4%	0.04
50	AIRPORT LAW ENFORCEMENT SECTION - NORTH	116	5	5	4.3%	0.04
192	VICE & ASSET FORFEITURE DIVISION	48	2	2	4.2%	0.04
166	FIELD SERVICES SECTION	121	5	5	4.1%	0.04

620	DETECTIVE AREA - SOUTH	249	10	10	4.0%	0.04
213	BUREAU OF PATROL - AREA NORTH	102	4	4	3.9%	0.04
121	BUREAU OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS	79	3	3	3.8%	0.04
177	FORENSIC SERVICES DIVISION	54	2	2	3.7%	0.04
127	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION	30	1	1	3.3%	0.03
196	ASSET FORFEITURE SECTION	31	1	1	3.2%	0.03
341	CANINE UNIT	33	1	1	3.0%	0.03
704	TRANSIT SECURITY UNIT	33	1	1	3.0%	0.03
14	DISTRICT 14	232	6	6	2.6%	0.03
123	HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION	78	2	2	2.6%	0.03
701	PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SECTION	123	3	3	2.4%	0.02
51	AIRPORT LAW ENFORCEMENT SECTION - SOUTH	43	1	1	2.3%	0.02
261	COURT SECTION	45	1	1	2.2%	0.02
124	EDUCATION AND TRAINING DIVISION	184	4	4	2.2%	0.02
543	DETACHED SERVICES - MISCELLANEOUS DETAIL	64	1	1	1.6%	0.02
277	FORENSIC SERVICES EVIDENCE TECHNICIAN SECTION	81	1	2	1.2%	0.02
606	CENTRAL INVESTIGATIONS DIVISION	87	1	1	1.1%	0.01
44	RECRUIT TRAINING SECTION	390	3	4	0.8%	0.01
55	MOUNTED UNIT 26	25	0	0	0.0%	0.00
60	HELICOPTER OPERATIONS UNIT	8	0	0	0.0%	0.00
111	OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT	15	0	0	0.0%	0.00
114	LEGAL AFFAIRS SECTION	23	0	0	0.0%	0.00
115	CRIME CONTROL STRATEGIES SECION	29	0	0	0.0%	0.00
116	DEPLOYMENT OPERATIONS CENTER	66	0	0	0.0%	0.00
120	BUREAU OF ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT	9	0	0	0.0%	0.00
122	FINANCE DIVISION	14	0	0	0.0%	0.00
126	INSPECTION DIVISION	11	0	0	0.0%	0.00
128	PROFESSIONAL COUNSELING DIVISION	6	0	0	0.0%	0.00

129	MANAGEMENT AND LABOR AFFAIRS SECTION	7	0	0	0.0%	0.00
130	BUREAU OF TECHNICAL SERVICES	3	0	0	0.0%	0.00
131	INTEGRITY SECTION	5	0	0	0.0%	0.00
133	INFORMATION AND STRATEGIC SERVICES	6	0	0	0.0%	0.00
136	SPECIAL EVENTS UNIT	11	0	0	0.0%	0.00
141	SPECIAL FUNCTIONS DIVISION	8	0	0	0.0%	0.00
142	BUREAU OF PATROL	16	0	0	0.0%	0.00
153	SPECIAL FUNCTIONS SUPPORT UNIT	15	0	0	0.0%	0.00
161	GENERAL SUPPORT DIVISION	10	0	0	0.0%	0.00
162	RECORDS DIVISION	3	0	0	0.0%	0.00
163	RECORDS INQUIRY SECTION	6	0	0	0.0%	0.00
169	POLICE DOCUMENTS SECTION	4	0	0	0.0%	0.00
172	EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLY	5	0	0	0.0%	0.00
184	YOUTH INVESTIGATION DIVISION	5	0	0	0.0%	0.00
187	CRIMINAL REGISTRATION UNIT	12	0	0	0.0%	0.00
188	BUREAU OF ORGANIZED CRIME	11	0	0	0.0%	0.00
222	TIMEKEEPING UNIT	5	0	0	0.0%	0.00
241	TROUBLED BUILDING SECTION	22	0	0	0.0%	0.00
276	OEMC - DETAIL SECTION	2	0	0	0.0%	0.00
441	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES SECTION	15	0	0	0.0%	0.00
442	BOMB SQUAD	13	0	0	0.0%	0.00
541	FOP DETAIL	6	0	0	0.0%	0.00
542	DETACHED SERVICES - GOVERNMENT SECURITY	18	0	0	0.0%	0.00
545	PBPA SERGEANT	2	0	0	0.0%	0.00
549	INSPECTOR GENERAL DETAIL UNIT	1	0	0	0.0%	0.00
603	ARSON SECTION	20	0	0	0.0%	0.00
702	CTA SECURITY UNIT	2	0	0	0.0%	0.00
711	VIOLENCE REDUCTION INITIATIVE NORTH	10	0	0	0.0%	0.00
712	VIOLENCE REDUCTION INITIATIVE SOUTH	17	0	0	0.0%	0.00
720	GRANTS SECTION	1	0	0	0.0%	0.00
156	UNIT 156	n/a	1	1	n/a	n/a

Appendix C

ABSTRACTS OF SUSTAINED CASES

April 2017

Log# 1075697

Notification Date: 16 June 2015
Location: 10th District
Complaint Type: Miscellaneous, Taser Discharge

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Female/White, 43, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2002

Complainant: Male/White, 47

Summary: Complainant alleged that Officer A deployed her Taser at an arrestee. As Officer A held onto the arrestee, she attempted to return her Taser to her holster. In attempting to return the Taser to her holster, Officer A accidentally deployed her Taser striking herself in the right foot.

Finding(s): Based on departmental procedures, departmental documents, and officer statement, IPRA recommends the following:

- Officer A:**
- **Allegation #1: Officer A was inattentive to duty in that she did not properly handle her Taser causing it to discharge, in violation of rule 10.**
 - A finding of Sustained.

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

Log# 1076865

Notification Date: 25 August 2015
Location: 16th District
Complaint Type: Miscellaneous, Taser Discharge

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Female/White, 44, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1998

Complainant: White/Male, 47

Summary: Complainant related that Officer A was in the radio room when she accidentally pressed the Taser trigger causing it to discharge. No injuries were reported.

Finding(s): Based on departmental policies, departmental documents and officer statement, IPRA recommends the following:

- Officer A:**
- **Allegation #1: Inattentive to duty in that Officer A failed to properly handle a Taser causing it to discharge.**
 - A finding of Sustained.

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

Log# 1079617

Notification Date: 11 March 2016
Location: 19th District
Complaint Type: Miscellaneous, Taser Discharge

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Female/White, 46, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1997

Complainant: Male/White, 48

Summary: Complainant alleges that on 11 March 2016, at 1835 hours, at the location of XXXX N. Lake Shore Drive, A Hospital, Officer A was inattentive to duty in that she failed to properly handle a Taser causing it to discharge, in violation of Rule 10.

Finding(s): Based on departmental procedures, officer statement, and departmental documents, IPRA recommends the following:

- Officer A:**
- **Allegation #1: Inattentive to duty in that Officer A did not properly handle her Taser causing it to discharge.**
 - A finding of Sustained.

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

Log# 1079959

Notification Date: 05 April 2016

Location: 17th District
Complaint Type: Racial/Ethnic

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Female/Hispanic, 51, Off-Duty, Not In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2005

Subject: Male/White, 32

Summary: Subject and the off-duty Officer A had a motor vehicle accident in which Subject rear-ended Officer's A vehicle. A verbal altercation derived between the involved parties. During the altercation, Subject alleges Officer A referred to him with a racial slur "nigger".

Finding(s): Based on departmental policies, officer statements, witness statement, and complainant statements, IPRA recommends the following:

- Officer A:**
- **Allegation #1: Directed a racial slur toward Subject by referring to him as a "nigger".**
 - A finding of Sustained.
 - **Allegation #2: Directed profanity toward Subject.**
 - A finding of Unfounded.
 - **Allegation #3: Failed to identify herself as a Chicago Police Officer.**
 - A finding of Unfounded.

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

Log# 1080158

Notification Date: 18 April 2016
Location: 2nd District
Complaint Type: Neglect of Duty

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Female/Black, 59, Off-Duty, Not In Uniform, Year of Appointment - 2000

Complainant: White/Male, 40

Summary: Officer A was off-duty and inside her residence when she reportedly unintentionally discharged a live round from her

service weapon. There were no injuries.

Finding(s): Based on departmental policies, departmental documents and officer statement, IPRA recommends the following:

- Officer A:**
- **Allegation #1: Officer A was inattentive to duty in that she carelessly handled her firearm and discharged a live round, in violation of rule 10.**
 - A finding of Sustained.

A penalty of **25-DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the sustained allegation.

Log# 1080335

Notification Date: 30 April 2016
Location: 6th District
Complaint Type: Miscellaneous, Taser Discharge

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Female/Black, 41, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2015

Complainant A: Male/Black, 49

Summary: Complainant A alleged that Officer A had an accidental discharge of a Taser while putting the Taser into the holster. No injuries were reported.

Finding(s): Based on departmental policies, and departmental documents, IPRA recommends the following:

- Officer A:**
- **Allegation #1: Inattentive to duty in that Officer A did not properly handle her Taser causing it to discharge.**
 - A finding of Sustained.

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

Log# 1083654

Notification Date: 12 January 2017

Location: 6th District
Complaint Type: Miscellaneous, Taser Discharge

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Female/Black, 53, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1996

Complainant A: Male/White, 41

Summary: Complainant A related that Officer A dropped her Taser inside the female supervisor's locker room, and she accidentally pulled the trigger when she recovered her Taser from the floor.

Finding(s): Based on departmental policies, and departmental documents, IPRA recommends the following:

Officer A:

- **Allegation #1: Inattentive to duty in that Officer A did not properly handle her Taser causing it to discharge.**
 - A finding of Sustained.

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

Log# 1084264

Notification Date: 01 March 2017
Location: 2nd District
Complaint Type: Miscellaneous, Taser Discharge

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Female/Unknown, 53, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1989

Complainant: Black/Male, 49

Summary: Complainant alleged that Officer A was inattentive to duty in that she failed to properly handle a Taser causing it to discharge, in violation of Rules 6 and 10 and Uniform and Property Policy U04-02-04.

Finding(s): Based on departmental policies, officer statement, and other departmental documents, IPRA recommends the following:

Officer A:

- **Allegation #1: Inattentive to duty in that Officer A did not properly handle her Taser causing it to discharge.**
 - A finding of Sustained.

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

Log# 1084347

Notification Date: 08 March 2017
Location: 18th District
Complaint Type: Miscellaneous, Taser Discharge

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Female/Black, 62, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2001

Complainant: White/Female, 49

Summary: Complainant related that after checking out a Taser for duty, Officer A accidentally pulled the trigger of the Taser instead of pushing the arc button while performing a spark test in order to check the Taser for proper functioning.

Finding(s): Based on departmental policies, departmental documents, and the officer statement, IPRA recommends the following:

Officer A:

- **Allegation #1: Inattentive to duty in that Officer A did not properly handle her Taser causing it to discharge.**
 - A finding of Sustained.

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

Log# 1084692

Notification Date: 04 April 2017
Location: 8th District
Complaint Type: Use of Profanity

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 55, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1994

Complainant: N/A

Subject: Male/Black, 28

Summary: Subject made allegations of excessive force against the arresting officers under Log Number 1081109. During the investigation under Log Number 1081109, in-car video revealed that Subject was verbally abused by Officer A.

Finding(s): Based on departmental policies, officer statements, video recording and witness statement, IPRA recommends the following:

Officer A:

- **Allegation #1: Officer A directed profanity at Subject by referring to him as a “motherfucker”.**
 - A finding of Sustained.
- **Allegation #2: Directed profanity at Subject by referring to him as a “fucking piece of shit”.**
 - A finding of Sustained.
- **Allegation #3: Directed profanity at Subject by referring to him as a “bitch”.**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation #4: Verbally abused Subject by falsely telling Subject his friend was shot by the police.**
 - A finding of Sustained
- **Allegation #5: Verbally abused Subject by falsely telling Subject his friend was dead.**
 - A finding of Sustained

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

May 2017

Log# 1073112

Notification Date: 26 December 2014
Location: 1st District
Complaint Type: Domestic Altercation – Physical Abuse

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 26, Off-Duty, Not In Uniform,
Year of Appointment – 2013

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

Complainant: White/Female, 47

Subject: Black/Female, 30

Summary: Subject alleged that on December 26, 2014, Officer A picked her up and slammed “her” to the floor during a domestic altercation. Throughout the investigation, an incident on December 27, 2014 was discovered in which Subject alleged in a 911 call that Officer A had physically abused her.

- Officer A:**
- **Allegation #1: Engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Subject.**
 - A finding of Sustained.
 - **Allegation #2: Would not allow Subject to take her coat and removed it from her.**
 - A finding of Not Sustained.
 - **Allegation #3: Picked Subject up and “slammed” her to the floor.**
 - A finding of Not Sustained.
 - **Allegation #4: Searched Subject’s pockets.**
 - A finding of Not Sustained.
 - **Allegation #5: “Snatched” Subject’s keys and a soda can from her hands.**
 - A finding of Not Sustained.
 - **Allegation #6: On 27 December 2014, at approximately 1320 hours, inside the residence at XXXX S. Martin Luther King Jr Drive, #XXXX, Officer A engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Subject.**
 - A finding of Not Sustained.

A penalty of **45-DAYS SUSPENSION** was recommended for the sustained allegation.

- Officer B:**
- **Allegation #1: On 26 December 2014, at approximately 1630 hours, at A Hospital, XXXX S. Michigan, Officer B received allegations of misconduct against a Chicago Police Officer from Subject and failed to notify a supervisor as required by General Order 08-01-02, II, B.1.**
 - A finding of Not Sustained.

No penalty recommended for the Not Sustained allegation.

Log# 1079908

Notification Date: 01 April 2016
Location: 25th District
Complaint Type: Miscellaneous, Taser Discharge

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Hispanic, 43, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1998

Complainant: Hispanic/Female, 46

Summary: Complainant alleged that Officer A was sitting in his vehicle and had removed his Taser and placed it on his car door arm rest while writing a traffic crash report. As Officer A proceeded to exit his vehicle and while opening the door, the Taser fell off the arm rest and as he attempted to catch it, the Taser Discharged.

Finding(s): Based on officer statement, departmental reports and procedures, IPRA recommends the following:

- Officer A:**
- **Allegation #1: Officer A was inattentive to duty in that he failed to properly handle his Taser causing it to discharge.**
 - A finding of Sustained.

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

Log# 1081140

Notification Date: 25 June 2016
Location: 18th District
Complaint Type: Miscellaneous, Taser Discharge

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Female/Black, 54, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1995

Complainant: Female/White, 60

Summary: Complainant alleged that Officer A dropped her Taser to the floor as she was removing it from the holster to conduct a spark test.

Finding(s): Based on the police officer statement and departmental procedures, IPRA recommends the following:

- Officer A:**
- **Allegation #1: Officer A was inattentive to duty, in that she discharged her Taser, deploying both cartridges.**
 - A finding of Sustained.

A penalty of **2-DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the sustained allegation.

Log# 1081904

Notification Date: 18 August 2016
Location: 4th District
Complaint Type: Unnecessary Display of Weapon, On-Duty

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Hispanic, 39, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2001

Officer B: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Hispanic, 32, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 2010

Complainant: Male/Black, 27

Subject 1: Male/Black, 27
Subject 2: Female/Black, 26

Summary: Officer A initiated a traffic stop of Subject 1 at XXXX E. 91st Street for disobedience of traffic codes, failure to stop at a stop sign, and using an alley as a through street. Subject 1's girlfriend, Subject 2, was seated in the front passenger side of Subject 1's vehicle and was present throughout the traffic stop. Upon pulling Subject 1 over, Officer A immediately exited his marked police vehicle with his gun drawn and pointed at or in the direction of Subject 1 and Subject 2, who remained seated in their vehicle. After Subject 1 exited the vehicle, Officer A instantly placed him in handcuffs, a state he remained in for approximately 25 minutes.

Finding(s): Based on departmental policies, departmental documents, officer statements, BWC cameras, In-car Cameras, witness statements, and victim statements, IPRA recommends the following:

Officer A:

- **Allegation #1: Violated the 4th Amendment rights when he stopped, detained and handcuffed Subject 1 for an extended period of time without justification.**
 - A finding of Sustained.
- **Allegation #2: Unnecessarily displayed and pointed his weapon at Subject 1 during a traffic stop.**
 - A finding of Sustained.
- **Allegation #3: Unnecessarily displayed and pointed his weapon at Subject 2.**
 - A finding of Sustained.
- **Allegation #4: Failed to appear to a traffic court on 12 October 2016 regarding the traffic stop and issued citations against Subject 1.**
 - A finding of Not Sustained.

A penalty of a **16-DAY SUSPENSION** was recommended for the sustained allegations.

Officer B:

- **Allegation #1: When Subject 1 asked if he was under arrest, Officer B informed him that he was under arrest without having sufficient information regarding Subject 1 detainment or him being handcuffed.**
 - A finding of Exonerated.

No penalty recommended for the Exonerated allegation.

Log# 1084467

Notification Date: 17 March 2017
Location: 1st District
Complaint Type: Miscellaneous, Taser Discharge

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/White, 61, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1989

Complainant: White/Female, 48

Summary: Complainant alleged that while conducting a spark test during his tour of duty, Officer A inadvertently applied pressure to the Taser trigger resulting in probe discharge. No injuries or property damage reported.

Finding(s): Based on officer statement, departmental reports and procedures, IPRA recommends the following:

Officer A:

- **Allegation #1: Officer A was inattentive to duty in that he did not properly handle his Taser causing it to discharge.**
 - A finding of Sustained.

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

Log# 1084483

Notification Date: 19 March 2017
Location: 2nd District
Complaint Type: Miscellaneous, Taser Discharge

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 46, On-Duty, In Uniform, Year of Appointment – 1997

Complainant: Black/Male, 51

Summary: Complainant related that Officer A accidentally discharged his Taser while conducting a Spark Test in the 002nd District station parking lot.

Finding(s): Based on officer statement, departmental records and procedures, IPRA recommends the following:

Officer A:

- **Allegation #1: Inattentive to duty in that he did not properly handle his Taser causing it to discharge.**
 - A finding of Sustained.

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

June 2017

Log# 1079675

Notification Date: 15 March 2016
Location: 2nd District

Complaint Type: Miscellaneous – Taser Discharge

Officer A: Chicago Police Officer, Male/Black, 54, On-Duty, In Uniform,
Year of Appointment – 1998

Complainant: Male/White, 45

Summary: Complainant related that while Officer A was trying to secure his holster, he pulled the trigger of his assigned Taser. No Injuries or damages occurred.

Officer A

- **Allegation #1: Violation of Rule 10, “Inattention to duty”, in that on 15 March 2016, at 2303 hours, at the location of XXXX S. Wentworth Ave., Officer A was inattentive to duty in that he did not properly handle a Taser causing it to discharge.**

- A finding of Sustained.

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