



Independent Police Review Authority

ANNUAL REPORT 2009 - 2010

Richard M. Daley
Mayor
City of Chicago



Ilana B.R. Rosenzweig
Chief Administrator
Independent Police Review Authority

INDEPENDENT POLICE REVIEW AUTHORITY

Annual Report 2009 – 2010

Ilana B.R. Rosenzweig
Chief Administrator

MESSAGE FROM THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR.....	6
INTEGRITY OF INVESTIGATIONS	10
Investigative Resources	10
Investigative Training	11
Improvements to Investigative Procedures	15
Investigations of Officer Involved Shootings	18
Innovations	20
RECOMMENDATIONS	22
Medical Screening	22
Use of Squadrols	22
TRANSPARENCY	24
Public Reporting	24
Outreach to the Public and Law Enforcement	25
2009-2010 BY THE NUMBERS	29
APPENDIX A	
IPRA Investigative Steps.....	30
APPENDIX B	
Notice.....	34
APPENDIX C	
Abstract of Sustained Cases.....	38

MESSAGE FROM THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR

The Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) has completed its third year as an independent agency of the City of Chicago. IPRA's mission remains to conduct fair, thorough and timely investigations. IPRA is appreciative of the assistance it has received since being created by Richard M. Daley and the City Council.

IPRA has made significant strides in its first three years. The focus in 2009-2010 continued to be the integrity of investigations and the transparency of IPRA's process, because IPRA understands that each is necessary to restore and maintain trust in the disciplinary process. In addition to these improvements, IPRA increased the efficiency of our operations. Finally, faced with a rising caseload, IPRA has looked for systemic means to reduce the volume of new investigations it receives. IPRA has concentrated on how the discipline process for CPD members can be most effective at changing out-of-policy behavior, and on systemic approaches to reducing the incidents of perceived and actual misconduct.

With this third Annual Report, IPRA continues to provide transparency. IPRA remains committed to encouraging constructive dialogue to improve IPRA and its service to the people of the City of Chicago.

IPRA Investigative Personnel

Hiring. IPRA continues to work within the confines of the city-wide budget and hiring limitations. In addition, last year, IPRA worked with the Mayor's Office and the Office of Budget and Management to convert two administrative positions into investigator positions to help satisfy IPRA's need for more investigators. IPRA has also instituted efficiency measures to address its rising caseload.

While IPRA has made some progress in hiring this year, IPRA has additional vacancies due to turnover. IPRA has 4 vacancies in its 53 investigator positions. Recognizing these difficulties, IPRA remains ever vigilant for ways to increase its efficiency and performance.

Training. This past year, IPRA built upon its program for training investigative personnel, including its recurrent training for all investigators and supervising investigators. IPRA continues its In-House Training, which included an internationally recognized investigative training program, reviewing uses of force from a policy and tactical perspective, interviewing CPD officers, and preparing investigations for the State's Attorney's Office.

Improvement to Investigative Procedures

As in its prior two years, IPRA again adopted new procedures to increase the quality and integrity of investigations. It was also important for IPRA to focus on the efficiency of its investigators. A number of very significant improvements were the result of several years of negotiations with the unions representing CPD officers.

Audio Recording of CPD member interviews provides the most accurate record of a statement. It also allows for a better quality interview, and a more efficient process for investigators.

Drug and Alcohol Testing After Discharge of Firearm is now required of all sworn officers. A discharge of a firearm is a significant event that receives heightened scrutiny. This testing removes all ambiguity about an officer's condition, and will prevent false accusations.

A 72-Hour Window to provide a CPD member with a copy of the statement she gave to IPRA was instituted. Certain situations warrant IPRA holding on to a copy of a statement given by a CPD officer, rather than providing the statement immediately. IPRA now has the ability to do so.

In addition to the improvements resulting from contract negotiations, IPRA instituted several others.

Analysis of Officer and Complainant Histories provides IPRA with an opportunity to review these histories and determine whether relevant patterns exist through newly created automated reports and searches of the database for complaints of misconduct. IPRA personnel now do this for each accused CPD member or complainant. When a potential pattern is identified, it is further analyzed to determine its relevance to the investigation.

Transcription of Foreign-Language Audio-Recorded Interviews allows IPRA to better investigate matters involving individuals who speak foreign languages.

New IPRA Notices for Criminal Defendants were created to balance the importance of obtaining statements, with the rights of criminal defendants. IPRA eliminated a mis-placed Miranda warning and instead consulted with the Cook County Public Defender's Office to create a new notice for criminal defendants that describes IPRA's role and confirms that they wish to provide the statement to IPRA.

IPRA Subpoenas are an important tool when an individual refuses to cooperate with an IPRA investigation. This past year, for the first time, IPRA was required to seek enforcement of a subpoena in order to obtain witness cooperation. Ultimately, while facing significant penalties, the witness complied.

Efficiencies

IPRA's investigative resources must be carefully used to attempt to address the volume of work to be performed. Therefore, IPRA is continually looking for ways to improve how investigative time is spent.

GPS Access at IPRA provides IPRA investigators direct access to GPS records for CPD vehicles. It eliminates paper request forms, and allows for immediate retrieval of the information so that the investigation can proceed without delay. This allows IPRA investigators to work more efficiently.

Taser Discharge Notifications increased significantly this past year as a result of CPD's increased deployment of Tasers. IPRA responded by creating procedures to identify those incidents meriting dedication of IPRA's limited resources.

Recommendations

IPRA continued to make recommendations and highlight systemic concerns as part of the Force Analysis Panel process. In addition, as individual investigations highlighted other systemic concerns, IPRA brought them to the attention of CPD.

CPD Medical Screening is vital to ensuring that those in CPD's custody receive necessary care. An incident reviewed by IPRA called into question whether limitations in the process caused those screenings to be unnecessarily delayed in some situations. IPRA recommended that CPD reexamine its process to ensure timely screening could be performed and recorded.

CPD Squadrols have a number of physical characteristics that can impact the safety of both the individual being transported in the squadrol, and also the squadrol officers. Based on a number of incidents IPRA investigated involving squadrols – including individuals defeating the restraining devices, escaping through the hatch in the roof, and having serious medical complications – IPRA recommended that CPD revisit its policy and operating procedures regarding squadrol use.

Transparency

It is not only important for IPRA to provide fair, thorough and timely investigations. IPRA must also continue to ensure that the public is aware of IPRA's role.

Public Reporting continues to be an important aspect of IPRA's transparency. IPRA provides a wealth of resources on its website and continues to provide monthly, quarterly and annual reports for the benefit of the public.

Outreach to the Public has increased during the past year. IPRA now hosts quarterly meetings in various neighborhoods of the City. These meetings provide an opportunity to explain IPRA's function, while allowing IPRA to hear from the public as part of an on-going process to continuously improve how IPRA functions.

Stakeholder Panels continue to allow IPRA personnel to engage and learn from the stakeholders in the complaint and disciplinary process. IPRA has hosted three such panels including a broad spectrum of stakeholders, from community activists to police union leaders.

2010-2011 – The Year Ahead

As IPRA continues its transformation in the next year, it will remain focused on how best to provide fair, thorough, and timely investigations. IPRA must continually improve, through training of personnel, improvements to investigative processes, and increased efficiencies. In addition, IPRA must continue to focus on communicating with all stakeholders in its process to provide information to them, and receive their constructive feedback.

In the next year, IPRA also plans to continue on-going efforts to address more effectively the causes of the complaints IPRA receives. In 2009, facing a significant increase in the number of allegations of misconduct received and limited resources, IPRA recognized it needed to look to systemic means to decrease the number of complaints. This began with an analysis of the available data on the complaints IPRA receives. In 2010, IPRA continued its efforts to have a more thorough analysis of the data to identify systemic causes. IPRA also commenced additional projects aimed at bringing innovations to the investigative and discipline process.

These projects focus on the most effective ways to decrease perceived and actual misconduct (i.e. complaints to IPRA) by changing CPD member behavior, instituting systemic reforms, and through discussion with the public. Through these projects, IPRA hopes to make the disciplinary system more effective at changing officer behavior when needed, through better approaches to discipline. It also hopes to identify systemic issues of policy and training that, if changed, would decrease the likelihood an incident would result in a perception of misconduct. IPRA expects that in 2011 it will bring these projects to conclusion and institute several programs that will create a more efficient process and ultimately lead to a decrease in matters IPRA must investigate.

IPRA recognizes that many people contribute to IPRA's mission. For their continued support, I thank Mayor Richard M. Daley, the Mayor's Office, the City Council, IPRA's sister agencies and departments, community-based organizations, faith-based institutions, the Chicago Police Department, and the residents of the City of Chicago. Most importantly, I thank every staff member at IPRA for continuing to support IPRA's mission and the vigorous work required to achieve it.

Ilana B.R. Rosenzweig

INTEGRITY OF INVESTIGATIONS

IPRA strives for fair, thorough and timely investigations. This requires that IPRA be fully-staffed, with trained investigators, following good investigative practices. As in past years, improvements in these areas have been IPRA's highest priority. IPRA's staff continued to engage in consistent professional development training. IPRA also continually evaluated its procedures, modifying procedures, investigative strategies, and techniques as appropriate. Through this process, IPRA remained focused on the quality and integrity of each investigation.

Investigative Resources

Hiring and Vacancies

All City of Chicago Departments have been dealing with resource limitations. In early 2009, IPRA experienced a significant increase in the number of new investigations it was opening. In reaction to this, and taking into account the limited resources available, IPRA worked with the Mayor's Office and Office of Budget and Management to identify resources that could be used to increase IPRA's investigative capacity. As a result, in its 2010 budget, IPRA gave up two administrative positions in order to create two additional investigative positions.

IPRA began the hiring process this year. However, in addition IPRA experienced attrition of 2 investigators, and promoted one investigator to supervising investigator to replace a retiring supervising investigator. IPRA expects to fill 2 vacancies shortly. IPRA, therefore will have 4 of its 53 investigator positions vacant.

As detailed in the By the Numbers section of this report, the results of this shortage of investigators has been significant. IPRA's caseload has grown from 1981 to 2168. IPRA is committed to not jeopardizing the fairness and thoroughness of its investigations. IPRA is hopeful it will be able to fill its remaining vacancies and reverse the trend in its caseload.

Efficiencies

Since its creation, IPRA has worked to increase efficiencies so that investigators can maximize time spent on investigative tasks. As detailed in previous reports, this has included automating processes, assigning tasks to office support personnel, and reallocating intake resources. These efforts to increase investigator efficiency have paid off. IPRA continues to identify additional similar opportunities to increase efficiency.

This past year, IPRA tackled two additional projects.

GPS Access at IPRA

Last year IPRA reported that the increase in GPS information has enabled it to improve its investigations. Obtaining that information required IPRA to submit a request to the Office of Emergency Management and Communications (OEMC). While OEMC was very timely in its responses, this process involved multiple steps and inevitably the passage of time. Even minor delays have a critical impact on an investigation. Therefore, to eliminate this extra work by IPRA and OEMC, IPRA requested direct access to GPS records. OEMC agreed and installed software at IPRA that gives IPRA direct access to GPS searches. OEMC has also trained IPRA personnel on how to access these records. Now in the same time to request records, IPRA investigators can obtain these records themselves. Direct access allows IPRA to work more efficiently.

Taser Notifications

Under IPRA's ordinance, it is required to investigate each time a CPD member discharges a Taser in a manner that could potentially strike an individual, regardless of whether misconduct is alleged. In the second quarter of 2010, CPD expanded its deployment of Tasers significantly, to allow for deployment in every beat car. As a result, the number of Taser discharge notices received by IPRA increased significantly.¹

Given IPRA's limited resources, it was required to re-evaluate how it investigates these Taser discharges to focus its resources where they would be most beneficial. The resources required to investigate these discharges, multiplied by the increase in discharges, was overwhelming. Moreover, only a very small percentage of the Taser discharge notices resulted in a complaint of misconduct from the public or identification of a potential policy violation by IPRA. IPRA therefore adopted new procedures for Taser notifications designed to maximize IPRA's resources by focusing on the Taser discharges warranting the most attention.

Under the new procedures, Taser discharges for which IPRA receives an allegation of misconduct, involving serious injury or death, a minor (17 and under) or a senior citizen (65 or older) will be referred automatically to an investigator. In all other situations, the documentation will be reviewed and if an IPRA employee identifies anything warranting further investigation there will be further investigation.

Investigative Training

IPRA In-House Training

Throughout the past year, IPRA's In-House Training covered a broad series of topics including:

¹See "By the Numbers" in the Appendix B

- Evaluating the quality of investigations;
- Preparing an investigative plan in a complex investigation;
- Reviewing uses of force from a policy and tactical perspective;
- Interviewing techniques for police officers; and
- Preparing an investigation for the State's Attorney's Office

Sharpening Your Teeth – Advanced Investigative Training

IPRA's investigations of allegations of police misconduct may be extremely complex. Accordingly, IPRA sought advanced training to build upon past investigatory training. IPRA staff participated in a one-day internationally recognized investigative training program entitled "Sharpening Your Teeth." Representatives from the Office of the Ombudsman of Ontario, Canada supplied the training. The training focused on three things: 1) evaluating the quality of an investigation; 2) developing investigations plans for complex investigations; and 3) understanding the pitfalls of other oversight agencies in order to avoid them.

During the session involving the review of an investigation, participants applied 40 questions to an investigation of the death of a man after being Tasered by the police. The review centered upon the principles of good investigations: independence, adequate resources, and proper evidence gathering.

IPRA staff also developed investigation plans for a complex police pursuit that resulted in the death of an innocent bystander. Creating an investigative plan is a painstaking task that helps ensure a thorough investigation. This exercise allowed the investigator to analyze the entire investigation while developing a plan supported by chronological steps to cover every base.

IPRA staff spent the final session analyzing an oversight agency that went "off track." The purpose was to discuss the specific issues that led to the negative review of the agency. This will help avoid similar pitfalls.

Tactical and Policy Review of a Use of Force

In order to fully and properly investigate a use of force, such as an officer-involved shooting, IPRA personnel must understand not just the CPD Use of Force Model, but also the tactical decisions officers are confronted with and how they make them. To focus on those tactical decisions that are made before force is used, and that lead to a better understanding of the incident as a whole, IPRA presented training regarding Tactical Use of Force. The training was based on a program that was presented originally at the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) conference. It covered topics including searching, handcuffing, and vehicle and foot pursuits.

With a better understanding of how good and bad tactical decision-making can shape an incident, IPRA investigators are better prepared to understand the incident and

investigate it fully. Moreover, an understanding of these decisions as they relate to a specific incident allows IPRA investigators to better develop the information need for CPD's Force Analysis Panel to adequately analyze the systemic issues implicated in a shooting. As reported last year, IPRA and CPD worked together to implement the Force Analysis Panel in order to ensure that officer-involved shootings are examined for systemic issues relating to training, policy, equipment, and supervision. It is now IPRA investigators' responsibility to ensure that they gather the information necessary for that analysis. This training furthered their ability to do that.

Interviews of Accused Police Officers

One of the most critical steps in an investigation is the interview of the accused party. IPRA sought insights from the Office of the Cook County Public Defender (CCPD), another organization with extensive experience questioning CPD officers.

CCPD presented a program entitled "Fact Investigation: The Officer Interview." The program was held in small groups and utilized "learning-by-doing" methodology. Each investigator received a case scenario and took part in a simulated police officer interview, as an interviewer and interviewee. The training provided practical training for IPRA's investigative staff and an opportunity to experiment with new approaches to interviewing and to evaluate whether they would work in an IPRA investigation.

Cook County State's Attorney's Office

Certain actions by CPD members extend beyond IPRA's administrative jurisdiction and include allegations of criminal conduct by CPD members. The State's Attorney's Office (SAO) Professional Standards Unit is responsible for the criminal prosecution of matters involving police misconduct; however, IPRA investigations play a key role in the process. IPRA works closely with the SAO in investigating these allegations and ensuring that the SAO has the requisite information to make a determination regarding potential criminal charges.

The SAO and IPRA have agreed on a protocol of incidents that IPRA will automatically refer to the SAO for potential criminal prosecution. IPRA immediately notifies the SAO of those incidents so that the SAO may consider criminal charges. IPRA then shares its investigation with the SAO and continues to do so as the investigation progresses.

To ensure that the investigations IPRA performs are meeting the needs of the SAO, the SAO presented training to IPRA investigators. Because of the long-standing working relationship between IPRA and the SAO, the training was able to focus on advanced issues in these investigations to allow IPRA to provide an even better product. The training covered the facts and evidence necessary to prosecute successfully a police misconduct case. It also explained some pitfalls unique to a criminal prosecution. Further, it provided explanations to IPRA investigators why certain steps that may not be needed for an administrative investigation are important in a criminal prosecution. This training allows IPRA investigators to better meet the needs of the SAO and improve investigations in general.

CPD Training Academy

IPRA investigations enforce CPD standards as set forth in CPD policy. Therefore, IPRA investigators must stay abreast of these policies and any modifications to the policies.

For this reason IPRA investigators and supervising investigators attend annual training at the CPD Training Academy.

This year's training covered core topics applicable to the majority of IPRA investigations and topics responsive to recent developments at CPD. IPRA investigators were trained on the CPD Use of Force Model because this is implicated in the vast majority of their investigations. In addition, they were trained in appropriate handcuffing and baton techniques. Understanding how a handcuffing, control hold, or baton strike is supposed to be done enables IPRA investigators to better investigate situations where there is a claim it was performed improperly.

Because of the importance of IPRA's investigations of shootings involving CPD members, the training also included instruction from CPD Academy firearms training personnel on the operation of firearms. In addition, IPRA personnel received "Shoot - Don't Shoot" training. This simulator experience allowed the investigators to experience various scenarios and make decisions about whether and when to use deadly force. The group then discussed whether the use of deadly force during the scenario complied with CPD policy or not.

Because of the significant increase in the deployment of Tasers within CPD, and the resulting increase in Taser discharges, IPRA personnel also received training on the Taser - how it functions mechanically and its impact on the human body. In addition, the training covered appropriate use of the Taser under CPD policy.

Lastly, IPRA staff received training regarding crime scene processing procedures, including proper inventory procedures and the use of the LEICA device to map a scene. This information is critical because IPRA investigators respond to many types of scenes. At these scenes IPRA personnel must understand the proper procedures for law enforcement to secure evidence. The LEICA is a new, powerful resource for documenting the scene of an incident and preserving information that may become relevant later in the investigation.

Illinois State Police Forensic Science Center

Many IPRA investigations require forensic testing. Often there are requests for fingerprint testing, DNA analysis, biological, or gun-shot residue testing. For this reason, IPRA staff continued their annual mandatory training at the Illinois State Police Forensic Science Center. The training was a brief refresher course covering Biology/DNA, CODIS, Drug Chemistry, Firearms, Footwear/Tiretracks, GSR, Latent Prints, Microscopy, Toxicology, and Trace Chemistry. It offered an opportunity for investigators to ask specific questions about the results of these test and how to properly interpret the written reports IPRA receives from ISP.

Improvements to Investigative Procedures

New Contracts for Sworn Members

Certain improvements that IPRA had been trying to implement since its creation required modifications to the union contracts for CPD members. IPRA participated in the negotiation process in order to explain the reasons for each of its requests. This year through their unions, the Lieutenants and Captains agreed to these changes, while the Police Officers and Sergeants became subject to them as a result of an arbitrator ruling on disputed contract positions.

Audio-Recording CPD Member Statements

With the new contracts, IPRA can now audio-record all interviews. IPRA had already implemented audio-recording for its interviews of members of the public, with the consent required under Illinois law. The new contracts allow IPRA to audio-record statements taken from sworn CPD members of the ranks of Captain and below. Although exempt personnel are not subject to a contract, they are also required to have their statements audio-recorded by direction of the Superintendent of Police. Furthermore, IPRA has obtained agreements from SEIU and AFSCME that non-sworn CPD members represented by those unions can be audio-recorded with their consent.

IPRA's ability to audio-record statements is important because it allows for the most accurate record of a statement. The audio recording captures exactly what the interviewer and the interviewee say. This eliminates the possibility of human error. The audio recording also captures the demeanor and emotion of the interviewee in his response. Moreover, it contributes to the better quality of an interview because an investigator is able to focus solely on the interview. Prior to audio-recording, investigators had to split their attention between interviewing and typing the interviewee's responses to the interview questions. Finally, it is much more efficient. Previously, significant time was spent documenting the interview. An interview that previously would have take an hour and a half, can now be completed in thirty minutes.

72-Hour Window for Providing Copies of Statements

IPRA is required, by contract, to provide CPD officers with a copy of their statement to IPRA. Normally, this copy is provided immediately after the completion of the interview. However, there are times when the facts of an investigation warrant IPRA holding the copy of the recorded statement until other interviews or further investigation may be completed. Under previous contracts, the statement could be held for up to 24 hours. That proved to be insufficient. Under the new contract, IPRA may now hold a statement up to 72 hour prior to releasing it.

Drug and Alcohol Testing After Discharge of Firearm

Part of the new contract between the City of Chicago and the unions representing sworn members of CPD requires that after every discharge of a firearm, the involved officer must submit to drug and alcohol testing. This test is required even if there is no

finding of “cause” to suspect alcohol or drug use necessary. The test(s) are performed by the Internal Affairs Division of the Chicago Police Department. The results must be submitted to the Chief Administrator of IPRA.

Requiring all sworn officers to submit to these tests is important because it eliminates accusations that officers “covered up” the intoxication of another officer. The test results capture evidence that would be lost with the passage of time. Without the testing, proving or disproving an allegation of intoxication would depend on the subjective observations of witnesses from the public and CPD. The test provides objective evidence to definitively prove or disprove intoxication.

While testing for alcohol is required for every firearm discharge, the contract does not modify the standard for determining whether a shooting was within CPD’s policy. In other words, if an officer is involved in a shooting off-duty, and the test shows that the officer had consumed alcoholic beverages, that test result by itself does not make the shooting out of policy. An officer may be faced with the immediate threat of death or serious bodily injury to himself or others while off duty, and after having consumed a drink. The officer’s conduct will be evaluated considering the totality of the circumstances.

Transcribing Foreign Language Audio-Recorded Interviews

A portion of the investigations IPRA performs involve victims, complainants, or witnesses who speak foreign languages. IPRA uses internal and external resources to conduct these interviews. With audio-recording, IPRA is able to capture the exact words used by the person in their preferred language. It creates a much more accurate record of the statement than previous procedures.

Prior to audio-recording, the statement would be taken in the foreign language, written, normally in that language, and then reviewed and signed by the interviewee. An investigator would then need to create an English translation of that statement for the file. Because there is a limited pool of investigators at IPRA with foreign language skills, this would place a disproportionate burden on them.

For the audio-recorded statements, IPRA has arranged for a transcription service that can transcribe and translate the statement. This decreases the reliance on the IPRA investigators who speak other languages, and allows them to work on their assigned investigations. It also results in a very accurate record of the statement.

IPRA Notices for Criminal Defendants

Often a complainant in an allegation to IPRA is simultaneously the defendant in a criminal proceeding arising from the same incident. In the past, IPRA provided Miranda warnings to persons in custody. However, the separation of IPRA from CPD along with a recent Illinois Appellate Court decision made it clear that IPRA does not fall under Miranda requirements.

IPRA therefore began to explore changing its process. IPRA recognized that Miranda

warnings might unnecessarily “chill” participation in its process, and cause individuals not to cooperate. On the other hand, individuals facing criminal liability need to be aware of the impact speaking with IPRA could have on them. Therefore, any new process would need to effectively balance the importance of IPRA obtaining necessary statements from a complainant or witness with the need to respect that individual’s rights as a criminal defendant.

IPRA held a series of meetings with the Cook County Public Defender’s Office (CCPD). CCPD’s input was critical because they represent the overwhelming majority of criminal defendants in Chicago. Based on these discussions IPRA created a process balancing these needs. It allows for notice to individuals of the importance of their decision, as well as notice to CCPD in certain situations.

If an IPRA investigator has reason to believe an interviewee is represented by an attorney or that he has been arrested in conjunction with the incident IPRA is investigating, the investigator will ask the interviewee whether he wants to speak with his attorney prior to speaking with IPRA and present the IPRA Notice.² If the interviewee states that he does not want to speak with his attorney first, IPRA will proceed with its interview. If he wants to speak with his attorney first, IPRA will delay the interview until the interviewee indicates he is prepared to give a statement.

In addition, in recognition of the fact that CCPD represents most individuals incarcerated in the Cook County Jail and in response to a request by CCPD, IPRA notifies CCPD of any interview scheduled with an individual at Cook County Jail. CCPD can then meet with the individual, if he is a client, and determine whether a statement will be provided to IPRA. If the individual refuses to provide a statement to IPRA on the advice of his CCPD counsel, he will sign a form created by CCPD that indicates he is invoking his Fifth Amendment rights. If the individual will speak, the interview is conducted at Cook County Jail.

IPRA appreciates the thoughtful input it received from CCPD as IPRA designed a process to ensure that while IPRA pursues fair and thorough investigations, it does not infringe on the individual’s rights in criminal proceedings. This process allows IPRA to continue its administrative investigation while providing some protection for those facing criminal liability.

Subpoena Enforcement

The ordinance that created IPRA gave IPRA the power to subpoena individuals who refuse to cooperate with an IPRA investigation. While IPRA prefers to obtain voluntary cooperation, this past year IPRA exercised its jurisdiction by issuing more than 130 subpoenas.

The ordinance also authorizes fines between \$1000 and \$5000 per day for failure to comply with a subpoena from IPRA, as well as imprisonment from 30 days to six months. This year, for the first time, IPRA had to seek court enforcement of a

² See Appendix B for a copy of this notice.

subpoena issued to a witness who repeatedly refused to comply with a subpoena. The City of Chicago, Department of Law represented IPRA in the matter. After several court orders, and with significant penalties pending, the witness did comply. The court then dismissed the matter, without a judgment.

Automatic Review of Both Officer and Complainant Histories

The contracts between the City of Chicago and the unions representing CPD officer allow, in certain circumstances, for IPRA and CPD to look at patterns of allegations of misconduct. Since the former OPS and CPD first were granted this tool, different efforts have been undertaken to implement it. The difficulty has been finding an effective way to perform the analysis with the resources available. In addition, any procedure requires balance and fairness. Using CLEAR, the database that contains information on all allegations of misconduct made against CPD members, this past year IPRA instituted a procedure to implement this important tool.

For every new investigation, or whenever a new accused officer is identified, the supervising investigator is required to query a report in CLEAR that compiles the complaint history for that officer for the past 7 years. The supervising investigator and investigator then analyze the information to determine whether any relevant pattern exists.

In addition, for every new investigation, the supervising investigator and investigator will run a search in CLEAR to determine whether the complainant has a pattern of complaints and to analyze the relevance of any pattern.

Investigations of Officer Involved Shootings

During this past year there have been a number of changes to how IPRA investigates officer-involved shootings and more may come. In addition to the changes brought about by the resolution of the contracts for the officers – alcohol testing and audio-recorded statements – additional changes have resulted from actions taken by the Fraternal Order of Police.

In the past, IPRA had obtained a voluntary statement from the involved officers immediately after the shooting through the Roundtable process.³ IPRA then used that statement to commence its investigation into the incident. IPRA would provide its investigation to the Professional Standards Unit of the State’s Attorney’s Office for determination of whether the officers’ conduct complied with Illinois state law. After the SAO completed its review, then IPRA would do its complete interview of the involved officers. Sometimes it would take months or longer before these interviews of officers were possible.

³ The Roundtable process has received a great deal of attention in past years. Within hours after a shooting, CPD would convene CPD command personnel, a representative of the SAO, and IPRA. CPD Detectives would present the information gathered to that point in the investigation. This would include brief testimony from witnesses and involved officers. The most important part of the process for IPRA was the involved officers’ first-hand, voluntary statements.

This past year, IPRA adopted a procedure to allow it to interview police officers before the SAO review was completed. The investigation immediately after the shooting continued to proceed as it had before, with a scene inspection, gathering of physical evidence, interviews of witnesses, and a Roundtable at which the involved officers provided brief statements. However, within a week of each shooting, the involved officers would be required to provide IPRA with a complete, compelled interview. Because compelled statements from police officers cannot be provided to the SAO, in order to protect the rights of the involved officers and the SAO investigation, this interview was segregated from the investigation being presented to the SAO and saved for use in the later administrative investigation.⁴ This allowed for a timely interview of the officers, while not impeding the SAO's evaluation of the legality of the shooting.

The new process received positive reviews from both IPRA investigators and CPD members and their representatives. Both indicated that interviewing the officer in full more close to the time of the incident resulted in a better interview.

However, subsequent events have now overtaken this process and caused IPRA to adopt another change. IPRA, CPD, and FOP had been engaging in discussions to determine whether there was a better alternative to the Roundtable process. Each entity had individual concerns and interests that caused it to believe an alternative might be created that all could agree to and would function better. Among the concerns were the amount of time and resources devoted to creating a presentation, instead of focusing on investigating the incident. Unfortunately, no agreement could be reached on a way to replace the Roundtable.

Instead, FOP determined that it would advise its members not to provide voluntary statements to the Roundtable. FOP instructed its members to provide statements voluntarily to only the CPD Detectives and representatives of the SAO Felony Review Unit. FOP instructed its members to speak to IPRA only if compelled to do so.

IPRA's investigations cannot properly commence without the information available from the statements of involved officers. In some situations, the officer may be the only person who is available to state what occurred – because the individual shot is in surgery or deceased. In others, the officer's version may contradict, in significant ways, the version provided by the witnesses. IPRA therefore needs these statements to identify the relevant evidence and investigatory tasks. This is time-sensitive because some evidence – such as security video recordings – may be destroyed within 24 or 48 hours.

Therefore, as a result of FOP's advisement to its members, IPRA has begun to seek compelled interviews from involved officers in the hours after the shooting. According to Article 6.2 of the union contract and CPD General Order 02-09-01 officers involved in a shooting can be compelled to provide a statement on two hours notice.⁵ Under these latest procedures, the involved officers are notified by the CPD incident

4 [See, *Garrity v. New Jersey*, 385 U.S. 493 \(1967\)](#)

5 The FOP disagrees with this interpretation of Article 6.2 of the contract. The matter is scheduled for arbitration.

commander that a compelled statement has been ordered. The interview commences once the involved officers complete their statements to the CPD Detectives. Union representatives are present to represent the officers in the interview.⁶

Innovations

IPRA is constantly seeking ways to improve how it approaches allegations of misconduct, investigations, and discipline. Ultimately, the goal of a disciplinary system is to change behavior where possible, and where not possible to remove the misbehaving employee. To achieve this goal, IPRA has limited resources. This past year IPRA has begun a number of projects that seek to increase its effectiveness in achieving those goals.

Data Analysis Project

As mentioned in the IPRA Second Annual Report, in 2009 IPRA commenced an analysis of the allegations of misconduct it receives in order to understand better what leads to an allegations of misconduct being reported to IPRA and to identify any trends in those allegations. After the initial analysis, IPRA recognized that any further analysis would require partnering with individuals with expertise in this area. During the past year, CPD joined IPRA in working to identify partners who can assist in this analysis and a source of funding to support the work.

Traditionally, law enforcement and civilian oversight models have been designed to react to allegations of misconduct – focusing on investigation of specific claims and the implementation of individual discipline. Through analysis of the available data, the hope is to develop a proactive model to reduce the incidence of actual and perceived police misconduct. In the proposed initiative we will analyze complaint data to attempt to identify the factors that lead to allegations of misconduct and use those results to help enhance City policies, training for CPD staff, and, potentially, training for the public, to reduce the incidents of actual and perceived misconduct.

Alternate Resolutions

IPRA is also working on initiatives that focus on one of the goals of the disciplinary system – to be corrective and change CPD member behavior where it needs to be changed. Conventional discipline is one way to achieve that goal. This past year, IPRA began exploring the possibility of implementing other programs that would increase IPRA's effectiveness and efficiency. Specifically, IPRA has been exploring the use of training in addition to, or as an alternative to, discipline as a way to correct behavior – particular behavior that may have as its root cause not maliciousness, but a lack of knowledge or skill. In addition, IPRA been exploring mediation programs that have been implemented in a number of other jurisdictions, such as Denver, Portland, New

⁶ Where IPRA determines, based on the preliminary available information, that a Complaint Register may be initiated against an involved officer, then IPRA will proceed with the interview under Article 6.1 of the union contract, which requires longer notice.

York, Washington D.C., Minneapolis, Denver, Portland, San Francisco, and Pasadena. These programs bring complainants together with officers. In jurisdictions where mediation exists, members of the public and law enforcement personnel both report increased satisfaction with the complaint process. IPRA looks forward to continuing its work on these projects in the coming year, seeking input from the public and CPD members in order to design successful programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The ordinance that created IPRA gives IPRA the ability to present recommendations regarding CPD policy and operating procedures to improve the operations of CPD. This is an important tool for IPRA, in attempting to change behavior, or reduce incidents where allegations of misconduct may arise. When, through an investigation, IPRA identifies a CPD policy or procedure that may have contributed to the incident being investigated, IPRA brings that to the attention of CPD for appropriate action. In past Annual Reports, IPRA has reported on recommendations it made. During the past year, IPRA continued this practice.

Medical Screening Process

Medically screening of arrestees is important to ensure arrestees receive appropriate attention and care while in custody. Normally when a person is placed in lockup after the approval of arrest, he undergoes a medical screening, which is documented in a number of questions and answers on the arrest report.

In reviewing an Extraordinary Occurrence IPRA found that CPD failed to follow the normal process. In this instance, the arrestee was highly intoxicated during the booking process. Before officers could complete the arrest report he became belligerent. It was determined the arrestee should be placed in lockup while the arrest report was completed.

According to the lockup officers, they performed the required medical screening and placed the arrestee in a cell appropriate for his condition. However, they did not have access to the arrest report. Therefore, they were unable to record that they performed the required medical screening or to record the responses to the screening questions. This lack of record of a screening created questions when IPRA reviewed the incident that lead to the injury to the arrestee. It is important to have a clear process that allows for screening results to be recorded.

IPRA recommended that CPD examine this issue and institute appropriate changes to ensure the recording of a timely medical screening.

Use of Squadrols

Another series of Extraordinary Occurrences in police custody investigated by IPRA involved squadrols used to transport arrestees. During the course of these

investigations, IPRA identified several common factors that caused IPRA to recommend that CPD review its policies and procedures. In particular, physical characteristics of the squadrols, including limited visibility in certain areas, no visibility in other areas, inability of the lap bar to secure arrestees and non-existent or malfunctioning roof hatches, appeared to contribute to each of the incidents IPRA investigated.

The inability to visually monitor an arrestee negatively impacts the safety of both the arrestee and officers. An unobserved arrestee may defeat the restraints officers have placed on him and escape or harm the officers when they attempt to remove him from the squadrol. Also, because some arrestees transported in squadrols are sick or inebriated, without proper monitoring they may have a change of condition, slipping into a medical emergency, without officers being alerted. These potential areas of concern are compounded by the non-secure lap bars and roof hatches. These allow further opportunities for escape, as occurred in incidents IPRA investigated.

Because of these concerns for officer and arrestee safety, IPRA recommended that CPD revisit both its policy and its operating procedures regarding the utilization of squadrols to transport individuals and the physical characteristics of the squadrols. Reviewing the use of squadrols and their physical characteristics may lead to increased officer and arrestee safety.

TRANSPARENCY

IPRA recognizes that transparency is vital to establishing trust in IPRA and its process. IPRA exceeds its required reporting every quarter and every year. IPRA reaches out to all of Chicago's communities and all stakeholders in its process in order to communicate about IPRA's role and investigative process. IPRA will continue to work with individuals, community groups, elected officials, CPD members, and faith-based institutions to establish networks that support IPRA's mission.

Public Reporting

IPRA continues to provide a wealth of resources online. For example, IPRA continued this year to post abstracts of each month's sustained cases from IPRA's creation in September 2007 to present. The ordinance that created IPRA and outlines its jurisdiction is available on the website. IPRA also posts FOIA procedures and disclosures on its website. And, importantly, each of IPRA's quarterly and annual reports is available online.

IPRA also provides statistical and demographic data for every officer-involved shooting since January 1, 2008. IPRA continues to post the reports for its completed investigations of officer-involved shootings. These highly detailed reports offer insight into the thoroughness of each investigation. They also provide appropriate information about the incident, attempting to answer questions that were raised as the investigation commenced; but importantly, this information is being provided at the appropriate time, after a thorough investigation.

Quarterly Reports

This year, in order to clarify the information provided in its quarterly reports, IPRA added an additional chart. During the second quarter of 2010 CPD increased significantly the number of Tasers deployed. As a result, there was a noteworthy increase in Taser discharge notifications to IPRA. IPRA created a separate chart in its second quarterly report of 2010 to identify the impact of this increase in Taser discharge notifications on IPRA's overall statistics. This information was previously found in the narrative sections of the report only. By creating the chart, the public is now able to see the affect of Taser discharges on IPRA's quarterly statistics.

Outreach to the Public and Law Enforcement

In order to be effective in its mission IPRA needs cooperation from the public and law enforcement. It is imperative that all involved in the IPRA process understand that IPRA is an objective participant. Often there are misperceptions about IPRA's role. Therefore, IPRA actively reaches out to the public, CPD members, and their representative organizations so that all involved understand that IPRA exists to perform fair, thorough and timely investigations.

IPRA Hosted Meetings

While IPRA's reports and website – www.iprachicago.org – provide significant transparency, they may not be accessible to everyone. Not everyone owns a computer or is adept in using the internet to search for information relating to IPRA. Moreover, IPRA does not expect every member of the public to call or visit IPRA in order to learn more about IPRA. It is therefore important to meet with the public in their neighborhoods. IPRA hosts community meetings on a quarterly basis.

Every quarter IPRA visits a different geographic region within the City. The intent is to host at least one meeting generally on the North, South, East and West sides of the City annually. The Chicago Public Libraries have provided a comfortable public venue. IPRA explains its jurisdiction, responsibilities and its process during these meetings and answers questions and responds to the concerns of members of the public.

The first community meeting of this year was held on March 2, 2010 at the Uptown Branch Library where residents, community leaders and members of the media attended. Many of the issues from this meeting related to CPD interaction with members of the LGBTQ community. This provided a valuable opportunity for IPRA to receive feedback and constructive suggestions from community members. Some of the community organizations suggested IPRA staff receive training about unique issues within the LGBTQ community, especially as they relate to teenagers.

IPRA also hosted a meeting on the far south side of the City at Carter G. Woodson Regional Branch Library on May 11, 2010. Several issues were discussed including concern about officer-involved shootings where the person shot is African-American and the deployment of additional Tasers.

IPRA conducts follow-up emails and calls to meeting attendees. The purpose of following up is to ensure that if new or additional comments or questions arise that participants are able to present those to IPRA. A representative from IPRA met with the abovementioned attendees to discuss IPRA's process. IPRA continues to encourage members of the public to express their opinions in an effort to continue to improve IPRA's process.

IPRA held its most recent meeting at the South Shore Branch Library on September 28, 2010. IPRA's final quarterly meeting of 2010 will be the West Side meeting in November 2010 at Legler Branch Library.

Stakeholder Forum

As reported in the Second Annual Report, in May 2009 IPRA began its Stakeholder Forum to provide for candid communication between IPRA personnel and the stakeholders in the complaint and disciplinary process. The open dialogue allows IPRA personnel to explore different aspects of community and police issues. Meanwhile, community and police leaders learn the nuances of IPRA's process.

During the past year, IPRA hosted two panels. IPRA's held its first panel in October 2009, with panel members representing each of the bargaining units for sworn CPD personnel: FOP and PBPA for Sergeants, Lieutenants, and Captains. This provided an opportunity for a candid discussion about how IPRA investigations are performed and how officers and the union participate in that process. It also led to debates about what is appropriate and inappropriate police behavior.

IPRA hosted another panel May 27, 2010. The forum focused on creating a dialogue between IPRA and the minority and female police-officer community about the history that gave rise to the development of police associations to represent officers of a particular ethnicity and female officers and that lead to the creation of IPRA. The discussion focused on developing an understanding of how stereotypes and cultural stigmas may affect minority communities as well as minority and female officers. Finally, IPRA sought to understand the ways these police associations attempt to ensure proper understanding and sensitivity to issues unique to minority and women members of the public.

Five associations accepted IPRA's request to serve as panelists: the Asian-American Law Enforcement Association, the Chicago Chapter of the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, the Polish American Police Association, the Puerto Rican Police Association, and the Women's Tactical Association.

Panel members were very forthcoming in explaining sensitivity issues, language barriers, and other concerns when dealing with a diverse public. There was discussion regarding how minority and women officers are received based upon the historical culture of the CPD. Overall, the discussion was extremely informative as the panel candidly answered meaningful questions posited by IPRA.

Community Organizations

This year IPRA's Chief Administrator and staff carried on IPRA's commitment to meeting with community representatives, community organizations, faith-based institutional leaders, and other non-profit organizations. The purpose of this outreach is to exchange information and to facilitate an ongoing constructive dialogue between IPRA and these groups.

A non-exhaustive list of those with whom IPRA met this year include: the American Constitutional Society (DePaul and Chicago Chapters respectively), the Chicago Council of Lawyers, the Cabrini Green Legal Aid Clinic, Las Mujeres, Trinity United Church of Christ, Apostolic Church of God, South Shore Ministerial Association, the United Neighborhood Organization (UNO), Third Baptist Church of Chicago, Keeping it Real Law Project, The NAACP (Chicago South Side Branch), Lakeview Action Coalition, Rogers Park Community Council, and Urban Mosaic.

Outreach to Law Enforcement

IPRA continued its outreach to CPD this past year. The Chief Administrator continues to address each class of CPD Training Academy recruits and each class of promoting CPD personnel regarding IPRA's process. The Chief Administrator also attends CPD's Multi-Cultural Forum meetings. She has also met with the unions representing the sworn CPD members, the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) and the Police Benevolent and Protective Association (PBPA). IPRA personnel have attended a meeting for the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives.

Communication with Media Outlets

IPRA continued to communicate with the public by explaining IPRA's mandate and procedures to various media outlets. IPRA personnel have appeared on WVON and WBBM radio stations and local ABC, NBC, CBS and Fox news stations regarding investigations. IPRA has responded to interview and information requests from local newspapers ranging from Columbia College, Northwestern, and Loyola University journalism students to the Chicago Sun-Times, Chicago Tribune, Examiner.com, and the Chicago News Cooperative.

Chicago Police Board

IPRA attends Chicago Police Board meetings monthly. The meetings are open to the public and are held at CPD headquarters. IPRA's attendance allows members of the public raise to issues to IPRA, and allows IPRA to address those issues. Additionally, if a person wants to register a complaint of misconduct against a CPD member he or she may do so immediately. IPRA ensures personnel are present to assist with that process.

Social Networking

This past year IPRA began to use social networking as a resource to communicate more broadly about IPRA. IPRA has created a page on Facebook as "The Independent Police Review Authority." This is a great tool to keep the public engaged with IPRA, its events, and its process in general.

INDEPENDENT POLICE REVIEW AUTHORITY: 2009-2010 BY THE NUMBERS¹

Total allegations and notifications:	9,643
Total retained by IPRA:	3,067
Total referred to States' Attorney's Office	81 ²
Total investigations closed by IPRA:	2,882
Caseload as of September 30, 2010:	2,168

Table 1: Overview of IPRA Caseload by Quarter³

	Intake	Referred to IAD	Investigations Opened	Investigations Closed	Caseload
4Q 2009	2,235	1,618	617	654	1,949
1Q 2010	2,191	1,551	640	561	2,028
2Q 2010	2,626	1,758	868	832	2,048
3Q 2010	2,591	1,649	942	835	2,168
TOTALS	9,643	6,576	3,067	2,882	

Table 2: Primary Categories of Investigations Commenced by IPRA 2009 - 2010

Excessive Force	1,754	Shooting with No Hits	53
Domestic Violence	137	Extraordinary Occurrence in Custody	63
Verbal Abuse with Bias	162	Destruction of Animal	98
Coercion	2	Taser	683
Shooting with Hits	49	O/C Spray	67

Table 3: Closed Investigations

	Sustained	Not Sustained	Unfounded	Exonerated	No Affidavit	Shooting with Hits	EO
4Q 2009	12	164	47	3	304	4	4
1Q 2010	5	125	44	3	229	7	4
2Q 2010	17	140	57	4	240	2	4
3Q 2010	13	128	42	5	274	3	14

¹ October 1, 2009 – September 30, 2010

² One of these cases was also referred to the United States Attorney's Office.

³ As reported in IPRA Quarterly Reports.

APPENDIX A

IPRA Investigative Steps

Appendix A

IPRA INVESTIGATIVE STEPS

Step One – Intake

A complaint is received and it is assigned a Log Number. IPRA retains those complaints within its jurisdiction and all others are referred to the Chicago Police Department's Internal Affairs Division (IAD) for resolution.

IPRA will send the complainant a letter acknowledging the complaint within five to seven working days. That letter will indicate whether IPRA or IAD is investigating the matter.

Step Two – Complainant/Victim

IPRA needs a detailed interview from the complainant, victim or someone who witnessed the incident. State and local laws also dictate that an officer cannot be interviewed about alleged misconduct unless a person making the allegation of misconduct has signed a sworn affidavit that certifies that the allegation is true and correct.

IPRA will contact you as well as identified witnesses to obtain a detailed statement and a signed affidavit.

Step Three – Other Interviews and Physical Evidence

IPRA will work to obtain statements from all witnesses and gather all physical evidence that is relevant to the alleged misconduct. As appropriate, IPRA will request forensic testing such as fingerprint or DNA analysis. IPRA may also seek medical records or other reports.

If the investigation takes longer than six months, IPRA will send the complainant a letter stating the reasons the investigation is not yet complete.

Step Four – Conclusion of Investigations

IPRA completes a final report summarizing the available evidence and reaching a finding for the complaint. The entire investigation, including the recommended finding, is forwarded to the Chicago Police Department (CPD) for review and implementation.

IPRA will send the complainant a letter informing him or her that IPRA's investigation is complete.

- SUSTAINED: The allegation is supported by sufficient evidence to justify disciplinary action.
- NOT SUSTAINED: There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.
- UNFOUNDED: The allegation is false or not factual.
- EXONERATED: The incident occurred, but the actions of the accused were lawful and proper.
- NO AFFIDAVIT: No one who witnessed the alleged misconduct provided a sworn statement and no exception to the affidavit requirement was applicable.

Step Five – Post-Investigation Review

After IPRA completes its investigation, CPD reviews the investigation and any recommended discipline. If the Superintendent disagrees with the recommended discipline, he must do so in writing and ultimately the Police Board decides the outcome. If discipline is recommended, CPD employees then have grievance and appeal rights to challenge the outcome.

After those rights are exhausted and a final determination has been reached, IPRA will send the complainant another letter regarding the final outcome.

APPENDIX B

Independent Police Review Authority
Notice



INDEPENDENT POLICE REVIEW AUTHORITY NOTICE

Investigator's Name:	Log Number:	Date:
Statement of <input type="checkbox"/> Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms. <input type="checkbox"/> Mrs.		

My name is _____, and I am an investigator with the City of Chicago's Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA). IPRA is not a part of the Chicago Police Department and I am not a police officer. My job is to investigate police conduct, and I would like to speak with you to investigate the conduct of the police in this incident. IPRA may release your statement, for instance with a court order, subpoena, to pursue disciplinary action against a police officer proven to have committed misconduct, or for other reasons. If you have a lawyer, you are free to speak with that lawyer before giving me a statement.

I, _____, hereby state that I have read and/or have been read this notice by the IPRA investigator and, understanding this notice, I voluntarily choose to give a statement to IPRA.

Signature of Interviewee

Date and Time

Signature of Investigator

Date and Time

APPENDIX C

Abstract of Sustained Cases

Appendix C

ABSTRACTS OF SUSTAINED CASES¹

SEPTEMBER 2009

Log/C.R. No. 1017299

On 12 June 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority regarding an incident occurring in the 4th District. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer choked and struck a complainant about the head and/or face. Based on the complainant's medical records, corroborating witness statements and the recording of the 911 call requesting medical assistance at the complainant's residence, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that the accused member choked the complainant and that he struck her about the head and/or face. Further, IPRA recommended a twenty-five (25) days suspension for the accused officer.

Log/C.R. No. 1001421

On 18 November 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA, f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards) regarding incidents occurring in the 8th and 11th Districts. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department field training officer left derogatory voice messages on various dates; that he harassed a fellow department member with various text messages; made derogatory remarks about the fellow department member over the police radio zone; posted photocopied photos of the fellow department member containing derogatory writings at various public locations; on another occasion within the 8th District, was intoxicated, yelled obscenities and threats toward two fellow department members, and pounded on the vehicle of these fellow department members; on another occasion within the 11th District, approached a third fellow department member inquiring about and making derogatory statements about another fellow department member; and on various occasions ordered commercial products from the Internet in the name of and without the authorization of a fellow department member. Because there was no corroborating evidence, IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegation that the accused officer left derogatory voice messages. Based on the accused officer's admissions and the saved text messages, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that the accused officer harassed a fellow department member with various text messages. Because there were recorded transmissions of the accused officer's derogatory remarks and the accused member's admissions, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation

¹ The following reflect IPRA's recommendations to the Chicago Police Department. Results may be modified through the review and grievance process.

that the accused member made derogatory remarks over the police zone radio about a fellow department member. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer posted photocopied photos of the fellow department member containing derogatory writings at various public locations, based on the accused officer’s admissions, corroborating witness statements, and the physical evidence. Because there was no corroborating evidence to support the allegation that the accused officer was intoxicated, IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” this allegation. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused officer yelled obscenities and threats toward and pounded on the vehicle of two fellow department members based on the corroborating witness statements. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer approached a third fellow department member inquiring about and making derogatory statements about another fellow department member based on corroborating witness statements. Lastly, because there was no evidence to support the allegation that the accused officer ordered commercial products from the Internet in the name of a fellow department member without the authorization of that individual, IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” this allegation. IPRA recommended a twenty-five (25) days suspension for the accused officer.

Log/C.R. No. 1006654

On 17 June 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA, f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards) regarding incidents occurring outside of the City of Chicago limits. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer on various occasions harassed a complainant via the telephone and was intoxicated. Based on the recordings of the derogatory messages left by the accused officer and admissions made by the accused officer, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that he harassed a complainant via the telephone. Because there was no corroborating evidence to support the allegation that the accused officer was intoxicated, IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” this allegation. IPRA recommended a three (3) day suspension for the accused officer.

Log/C.R. No. 1026018

On 13 May 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority regarding an incident occurring at various times and at various locations within metropolitan Chicago. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer on one occasion occurring within the 24th District, pulled the hair of and wrestled a victim to prevent her from entering her vehicle; grabbed her personal phone after she dialed 911, which in turn disconnected the call and prevented her from speaking with an OEMC dispatcher; and was intoxicated. It was also alleged that on another occasion occurring within the 18th District, the off-duty Chicago Police Department officer, again, pulled the victim’s hair. It was further alleged that on another occasion occurring outside of the City of Chicago limits, the off-duty accused

officer pushed the victim. Because there was insufficient evidence to support the allegation that the accused member was intoxicated, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED”. However, because of an agreement reached through mediation, the accused member admitted the misconduct and IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that he pulled the hair of and wrestled the victim to prevent her from entering her vehicle; grabbed her personal phone after she dialed 911, disconnecting the call and preventing her from speaking with an OEMC dispatcher; that the accused officer pulled the victim’s hair in a separate incident; and that the accused officer pushed the victim. Because of this mediated agreement, the accused member accepted the recommended penalty of a ten (10) day suspension.

OCTOBER 2009

Log/C.R. No. 306849

On 09 July 2005, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident occurring in the 17th District. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department sergeant of police verbally abused a complainant by referring to him in a derogatory term; grabbed him by the neck and threw him against the broken glass of the complainant’s vehicle and pushed and pinned his face/head against the broken glass; slapped the complainant about the face, causing the complainant to hit his head against the wall; and further that the accused sergeant verbally abused another victim by calling her a derogatory term in Spanish. It is further alleged that an on-duty unidentified Chicago Police Department Officer kned the complainant in the thigh area. It was also alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department Officer disobeyed a direct order by handing out the property (i.e. car keys) of a prisoner and that he verbally abused his superior officer in that he directed profanity at the superior. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused sergeant verbally abused a complainant by referring to him in a derogatory term based on witness accounts. IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that the accused sergeant grabbed the complainant by the neck and threw the complainant against the broken glass of the his vehicle and pushed and pinned his face/head against the broken glass, as witness statements indicated that the accused sergeant used reasonable force to affect the arrest of the complainant who was resisting at the time. Based on corroborating witness statements, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused sergeant slapped the complainant about the face, causing the complainant to hit his head against the wall. Further, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused sergeant verbally abused another victim by calling her a derogatory term in Spanish, based on corroborating witness statements. Because there was no corroborating evidence and the complainant could not provide a description of an unidentified officer, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that on-duty unidentified Chicago Police Department Officer kned the complainant in the thigh area. IPRA recommended a finding of

“UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that the accused on-duty officer disobeyed a direct order by handing out the property (i.e. car keys) of a prisoner, in that the officer was not directed not to do so at that time the property was disbursed. Lastly, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer verbally abused his superior officer (the accused sergeant) in that he directed profanity at the superior based on the accused officer’s own admissions. IPRA recommended a penalty of fifteen (15) days suspension for the accused sergeant and a two (2) days suspension for the accused officer.

Log/C.R. No. 1022566

On 19 December 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority, regarding an incident occurring in the 1st District. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer was inattentive to duty in that he accidentally discharged his weapon without justification and that he failed to maintain control of his weapon in that he allowed a civilian to hold it. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer was inattentive to duty in that he discharged his weapon without justification based on corroborating evidence and the accused member’s own admissions. IPRA recommended a finding of “EXONERATED” for the allegation that the accused member failed to maintain control of his weapon in that he allowed a civilian to hold it, based on corroborating evidence of the accused member’s account that he gave the weapon to a civilian because the accused officer had no way of safely and properly re-holstering his weapon while he was affecting an arrest. IPRA recommended a penalty of reprimand for the accused officer.

Log/C.R. No. 1022441

On 13 December 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority, regarding an incident occurring in the 11th District. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department officer accidentally discharged his weapon without justification. Based on corroborating evidence that the accused member’s weapon was in firing condition and functioning properly and based on the member’s statements, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused member discharged his weapon without justification. IPRA recommended a penalty of reprimand for the accused officer.

Log/C.R. No. 311881

On 24 March 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident occurring in the 16th District. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer pointed his weapon, without justification at a victim; threatened to kill the victim; punched the victim about the head and body; directed profanities at the victim; failed to take proper police action; failed to report an incident to a supervisor and/or the Department; failed to complete and submit a Tactical Response Report; and provided a

false report. Further it was alleged that a second off-duty Chicago Police Department officer punched the victim about the head and body; kicked the victim about the head and body; directed profanities at the victim; failed to take proper police action; failed to report an incident to a supervisor and/or the Department; and provided a false report. It is also alleged that a third off-duty Chicago Police Department officer was in violation of the Department's medical roll policy; punched the victim about the head and body; directed profanities at the victim; failed to take proper police action; failed to report an incident to a supervisor and/or the Department; failed to submit a report to a supervisor containing all the facts observed by and/or reported to the third accused officer; failed to complete and submit a Tactical Response Report; and provided a false report. It is further alleged that a fourth on-duty Chicago Police Department officer placed three victims in custody without justification and had knowledge of misconduct on the part of a Department member and failed to report it. It was also alleged against a fifth on-duty Chicago Police Officer that he had knowledge of misconduct on the part of a Department member and failed to report it and impeded the investigation by going to the location of a potential witness and questioning that witness. It was alleged against a sixth on-duty Chicago Police Department member that he placed three victims in custody without justification and had knowledge of misconduct on the part of a Department member and failed to report it. Further it was alleged against an on-duty seventh Chicago Police Department officer that he had knowledge of misconduct on the part of a Department member and failed to report it. It was also alleged against an eighth on-duty Chicago Police Department officer that she had knowledge of misconduct on the part of a Department member and failed to report it. Lastly, it was also alleged against an on-duty Chicago Police Department sergeant that he failed to conduct a thorough preliminary investigation; failed to initiate a Complaint Register; and had knowledge of misconduct on the part of a Department member and failed to report it. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that the first off-duty accused officer pointed his weapon without justification at a victim; and punched the victim about the head and body, based on physical evidence, videotaped evidence, and corroborating witness statements. Because of conflicting evidence, IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegations that the first accused officer threatened to kill the victim and directed profanities at the victim. Based on the first accused officer's admissions, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that the accused first officer failed to take proper police action; failed to report an incident to a supervisor and/or the Department; and failed to complete and submit a Tactical Response Report. Based on material evidence that contradicted the statements provided by the first accused officer, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that this accused provided a false report. Based on witness statements, videotaped evidence, and physical evidence, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that the second and third accused officers punched the victim about the head and body and kicked the victim about the head and body. IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegation that

the second and third accused officers directed profanities at the victim, as there was no sufficient corroborating evidence. Based on admissions made by the second and third accused officers, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that they failed to take proper police action; failed to report an incident to a supervisor and/or the Department; failed to complete and submit a Tactical Response Report; and provided a false report. Based on Department records, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that the third accused officer was in violation of the Department’s medical roll policy. Because there was no corroborating evidence, IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegation against the fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth accused officers that they had knowledge of misconduct on the part of a Department member and failed to report it. Based on corroborating witness statements, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that the fifth accused officer impeded the investigation by going to location of a potential witness and questioning that witness. Because there was no corroborating evidence, IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegation against the fourth and sixth accused officers that they that placed three victims in custody without justification. Based on corroborating statements, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused sergeant failed to conduct a thorough preliminary investigation. Based on Department records, statements and videotaped evidence, IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused sergeant of police failed to initiate a Complaint Register and had knowledge of misconduct on the part of a Department member and failed to report it. IPRA recommended separation for the first, second and third accused officers, and a sixty (60) day suspension for the accused sergeant.

Log/C.R. No. 310439

On 03 January 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority, (f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident occurring in the 11th District. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department lieutenant was inattentive to duty in that she entered the wrong apartment during the execution of a search warrant and failed to ensure the proper execution of the search warrant. It was further alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department sergeant was inattentive to duty in that he entered the wrong apartment during the execution of a search warrant; failed to ensure the proper execution of a search warrant; and failed to conduct a thorough preliminary investigation of misconduct. It was also alleged against twelve other on-duty Chicago Police Department officers that they were inattentive to duty in that they entered the wrong apartment during the execution of a search warrant. Further, it was alleged against ten of the twelve accused officers that they kicked a victim; pushed the victim’s head into the floor; and verbally abused the victim. Based on department records and

witness and accused statements that verified that the wrong apartment was entered in the execution of the search warrant, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused lieutenant, sergeant and six other accused officers were inattentive to duty in that they entered the wrong apartment during the execution of a search warrant. Also, because there was no corroborating evidence, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that those accused six officers who entered the wrong apartment, kicked a victim; pushed the victim’s head into the floor; and verbally abused the victim. Based on department records and witness and accused statements, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused lieutenant and sergeant failed to ensure the proper execution of the search warrant. Also, based on corroborating department records and witness statements, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused sergeant failed to conduct a thorough preliminary investigation of misconduct. For the other six of the accused officers, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that these officers were inattentive to duty in that they entered the wrong apartment during the execution of a search warrant, as corroborating statements and reports indicated that these accused officers did not enter the residence. Additionally, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegation that four of these accused officers kicked a victim; pushed the victim’s head into the floor; and verbally abused the victim as it was already established that these officers never entered the residence in order to engage in such acts. IPRA recommended a seven (7) day suspension for the accused lieutenant and sergeant; a three (3) day suspension for the first accused officer; and a reprimand for the other five accused officers who entered the wrong residence.

NOVEMBER 2009

Log/C.R. No. 1020082

On 17 September 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority, regarding an incident occurring in the 11th District. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer forced the complainant to the ground without justification; excessively twisted the arm of the complainant without justification, causing injury; placed excessive pressure on the complainant’s left arm with his knee without justification, causing injury; threw the complainant’s cell phone across the pavement without justification; and failed to complete a Tactical Response Report regarding his contact with the complainant. Based on witness statements, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer forced the complainant to the ground without justification. IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused officer excessively twisted the arm of the complainant without justification, causing injury and placed excessive pressure on the complainant’s left arm with his knee without justification, because there was no corroborating evidence. Finally, IPRA recommended a finding of “EXONERATED” for the allegation that the accused officer failed to complete a Tactical Response Report

regarding his contact with the complainant, because the standing order requiring completion of this report only applies to physical contact with an active resistor or cooperative subject, neither of which was applicable to the complainant in this alleged incident. IPRA recommended a five (5) day suspension for the accused officer.

Log/C.R. No. 309019

On 09 October 2005, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident occurring outside the City of Chicago. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer was intoxicated; engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with a victim; conspired with a family member to give a false account to the Responding Officers of how the victim was injured; was arrested and charged with Assault Causing Serious Injury. It was further alleged that at a subsequent date, the accused officer provided inaccurate information in his testimony to the District Court located in the jurisdiction in which the incident occurred; and was found guilty of Assault Causing Serious Injury, a Class D Felony, at the conclusion of that court's criminal proceeding. Based on statements from the accused member and reports from the Police Department located in the jurisdiction in which the incident occurred, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that the accused officer was intoxicated. Because there was no corroborating evidence, IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegation that the accused officer engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with the victim. Based on statements and testimony by the accused member, his relative, and the Responding Officers, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that the accused officer conspired with a family member to provide a false account to the Responding Officers of how the victim was injured. Based on the arrest reports of the accused member, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that the accused officer was arrested and charged with Assault Causing Serious Injury. IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that the accused provided inaccurate testimony in court based on the transcript of the proceedings and the interview of the accused. Because the accused officer's conviction was overturned on appeal, IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that the accused officer was found guilty of Assault Causing Serious Injury, a Class D Felony. Lastly, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" two subsequent allegations that the accused member brought discredit and/or disrepute to the Department because of his actions in this alleged incident. IPRA recommended a penalty of ninety (90) days suspension for the accused officer.

Log/C.R. No. 313165

On 24 May 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident occurring in the 20th District. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department sergeant struck the complainant on his head with a gun; slapped the complainant;

pushed the complainant; directed profanity at the complainant; entered complainant's residence without justification; threatened to kill the complainant; and was intoxicated. It was further alleged that a second on-duty Chicago Police Department sergeant failed to conduct a complete and comprehensive investigation relative to misconduct of the first accused sergeant. In addition, it was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department captain failed to ensure that an evidence technician be requested to inventory the handgun used to strike the victim; failed to ensure that the assigned evidence technician hand-carry the inventoried item to the Forensic Services Section; and that he failed to notify and provide IPRA (f/k/a OPS) with applicable inventory numbers. Based on corroborating witness statements and physical evidence IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that the first accused sergeant struck the complainant on his head with a gun; slapped the complainant; pushed the complainant; directed profanity at the complainant; entered complainant's residence without justification; and threatened to kill the complainant. IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegation that the first accused sergeant was intoxicated as there was no corroborating evidence. In addition, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" a subsequent allegation that the first accused sergeant provided a false statement to IPRA, in that he denied all of the facts of this incident, which were proven to be accurate. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that the second accused sergeant failed to conduct a complete and comprehensive investigation relative to the misconduct of the first accused sergeant, based on witness statements, physical evidence, and the statements of the second accused sergeant. Lastly, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations against the accused captain that failed to ensure that an evidence technician be requested to inventory the handgun used to strike the victim; failed to ensure that the assigned evidence technician hand-carry the inventoried item to the Forensic Services Section; and that he failed to notify and provide IPRA (f/k/a OPS) with applicable inventory numbers, based on the fact that the accused captain failed to comply with a Department order requiring such actions to be taken. IPRA recommended separation for the first accused sergeant, a fourteen (14) day suspension for the second accused sergeant, and a ten (10) day suspension for the accused captain.

DECEMBER 2009

Log/C.R. No. 1009215

On 11 September 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority, regarding an incident occurring in the 14th District. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department sergeant slammed a subject's head against a squad car while the subject was handcuffed; grabbed the subject by his face while he was handcuffed; grabbed the subject by the throat while he was handcuffed; struck the subject on his head while he was handcuffed; pulled on the back of the subject's pants causing the subject's clothing to squeeze his testicles, while he was handcuffed; threw the subject's keys toward a sewer and attempted to kick the keys

into the sewer; called the subject a racial slur; threatened to kill the subject; instructed two subordinate officers to run a name check on the subject and to release the subject if the check returned negative results, which is a violation of Department rules; gave a false report to his commanding officer about the extent of his physical contact with the subject; and that he submitted a false Department report by excluding the physical contact/force that he used on the subject. It was further alleged that at a separate time, the accused sergeant gave a false statement to IPRA regarding the circumstances involving the arrest of the subject. It was also alleged that two on-duty Chicago Police Department officers gave a false statement to IPRA regarding the circumstances involving the arrest of the subject. Based on the statements of the subject and corroborating witnesses and/or photographic evidence of the injuries, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused sergeant slammed the subject’s head against a squad car while the subject was handcuffed; grabbed the subject by his face while he was handcuffed; grabbed the subject by the throat while he was handcuffed; struck the subject on his head while he was handcuffed; and pulled on the back of the subject’s pants causing the subject’s clothing to squeeze his testicles, while he was handcuffed. Because witness statements only corroborated part of the allegation that the accused sergeant threw the subject’s keys toward the sewer, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” only this portion of the allegation. Further, based on the statements of the subject and corroborating witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that the accused sergeant called the subject a racial slur; threatened to kill the subject and instructed two subordinate officers to run a name check on the subject and to release the subject if the check returned negative results, which is a violation of Department rules. Based on the accused sergeant’s admissions, witness statements, and Department reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused sergeant gave a false report to his commanding officer about the extent of his physical contact with the subject; that he submitted a false Department report by excluding the physical contact/force that he used on the subject; and that at a separate time, he gave a false statement to IPRA regarding the circumstances involving the arrest of the subject. IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegations that the two other accused officers gave a false statement to IPRA regarding the circumstances involving the arrest of the subject, because there was no evidence to support this allegation. Lastly, IPRA recommended separation for the accused sergeant.

Log/C.R. No. 1016171

On 30 April 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority, regarding an incident occurring outside the City of Chicago municipal limits. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer pushed a victim and pulled that same victim. It was further alleged that on a subsequent date, the accused officer was found guilty of Simple Battery. The accused officer agreed to mediation whereby he accepted IPRA’s recommendation to SUSTAIN all of the allegations made against him and a five (5) day suspension as the recommended penalty.

Log/C.R. No. 1013180

On 07 January 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority, regarding an incident occurring in the 14th District. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department officer failed to take action and assist a victim regarding an attempted theft; disrespected the victim by getting close to the victim's face when speaking to him, touching the victim's nose; twisted the victim's finger; verbally abused the victim; and refused to identify himself to the victim. Based material evidence and/or corroborating witness statements, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegations that the accused officer failed to take action and assist the victim regarding an attempted theft; disrespected the victim by getting close to the victim's face when speaking to him, touching the victim's nose; twisted the victim's finger; verbally abused the victim; and refused to identify himself to the victim. IPRA recommended a penalty of fifteen (15) days suspension.

FEBRUARY 2010

Log/C.R. No. 1008648

On August 23, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority regarding an incident occurring in the 5th District, on August 23, 2007, involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer. It was alleged that the accused officer engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with the victim, punched the victim on the head, and was inattentive to duty, in that, he failed to maintain control of his duty weapon. IPRA recommended to "UNFOUND" the allegation that the accused officer engaged in an unjustified physical altercation due to available witness accounts that uniformly contradict the victim's claim that the officer was the aggressor, as well statements by the bar owner that suggested the victim had a history of belligerent behavior. IPRA recommended that the accused officer be "EXONERATED" for the allegation that he punched the victim on the head due to available evidence that indicated that the officer struck the victim in self-defense. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that the accused officer was inattentive to duty in failing to maintain control of his duty weapon for the reason that the officer admitted his weapon fell to the floor during the altercation. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that the accused officer wagered on a game of chance, hazard, or skill in violation of the Chicago Municipal Code, Chapter 8-12-010. The victim, the accused officer, and several witnesses made statements to the sergeant responding to the scene, as well as the IPRA investigator, confirming that the victim and the accused had placed a wager on a darts game. IPRA recommended a five (5) day suspension for the accused member.

Log/C.R. No. 1015988

On April 23, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority regarding an incident occurring in the 6th District, on April 23, 2008,

involving two off-duty Chicago Police Department officers (A and B). It was alleged that Officer A engaged in an unjustified physical altercation by biting Officer B on the arm and leg, pulling her hair, and/or pinning her against a kitchen counter. It was also alleged that Officer A threatened to kill Officer B. It is further alleged that Officer B engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Officer A in that she kicked, punched, scratched, and/or choked him. Based on the basis of bite marks on Officer B, as well as Officer A's own admission that he bit her and pulled her hair, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer A engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Officer B. IPRA recommended that allegations that Officer A threatened to kill Officer B be "NOT SUSTAINED" due to insufficient evidence to prove or disprove that Officer A made the threatening statements as the only witnesses were Officers A and B. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer B engaged in an unjustified physical altercation with Officer A due to the presence of minor injuries to Officer A's face consistent with their accounts of the incident, as well as Officer B's admission that she fought back against Officer A. IPRA recommended a ten (10) day suspension for both Officer A and B.

Log/C.R. No. 1001906

On December 10, 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority regarding an incident occurring in the 2nd District, on December 9, 2006, involving a Chicago Police Department officer, civilian detention aide, and Lieutenant, all of whom were on-duty. It was alleged that the officer threw the Detention Aide's personal belongings to the floor and pushed her. It was further alleged that the Detention Aide threw the officer's personal belongings to the floor and pushed her. In addition, it was alleged that the Lieutenant became aware of allegations of a Department member's misconduct, but failed to take appropriate action. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation against the officer for throwing the Detention Aide's belongings to the floor on the basis of a witness's statement and the officer's own admission that she threw the Detention Aide's personal items to the ground. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation against the officer that she pushed the Detention Aide, based on the witness statements and the officer's own admission. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation against the Detention Aide for throwing the officer's belongings to the floor due to a witness's statement supporting the officer's account of the incident. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation against the Detention Aide that she pushed the officer, based on the witness statements and the Detention Aide's own admission. IPRA also recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for the allegation against the Lieutenant for failing to taking appropriate action after becoming aware of allegations of a Department member's misconduct due to insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation. In addition, there were inconsistencies in the manner by which the Detention Aide and the officer claimed to have notified the Lieutenant. IPRA recommended a three (3) day suspension for the officer and the detention aide. The Detention Aide and officer both retired in 2009 prior to the conclusion of the investigation.

Log/C.R. No. 1012654

On December 14, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority regarding an incident occurring in the 7th District, on December 14, 2007, involving two Chicago Police Department officers (Officer A and B), and a Sergeant, all of whom were on-duty. It was alleged that both Officer A and B verbally abused the complainant's son (victim) and searched his car without consent. Officer B was also accused of pushing the victim several times in the chest and slamming his face against the trunk of his car. In addition, the complainant alleged that the Sergeant authorized the unjustified search of the victim's car and failed to register her complaint against Officers A and B. IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegations against Officer A and B for verbally abusing the victim and improperly searching his car based on inconsistencies in the witnesses' statements and the Officers' denials of the events. IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the additional allegations against Officer B of pushing the victim and slamming his face against the trunk of his car based on conflicting statements, the victim's admission that he pulled away from the officer and a lack of injuries to the victim. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation against the sergeant for failing to initiate a complaint based on the sergeant's own admission. IPRA recommended to "UNFOUNDED" the allegation against the sergeant for authorizing the improper search of the victim's car because the sergeant was not on the scene at the time of arrest and, therefore, could not have ordered the search of the car. IPRA recommended a reprimand for the sergeant.

MARCH 2010

Log/C.R. No. 1013156

On January 6, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority regarding an incident occurring in the 5th District, on January 6, 2008, involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer. It was alleged that the accused officer failed to properly secure his weapon, failed to have the prescribed trigger locks on his weapon, and was intoxicated. IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for the allegation that the officer failed to properly secure his weapon as evidence showed there was a key lock on the closet door where he kept his weapon. IPRA recommended to "EXONERATE" the officer for the allegation that he did not have the prescribed trigger lock on his weapon. While the officer did not have a locking device on his weapon, he did store it in a location that a reasonable person would believe to be secure from minors, in accordance to the General Order and Illinois State Statute. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that the accused officer was intoxicated based on the results of a breathalyzer test and the officer's admission that he had consumed large quantities of alcoholic beverages that evening. IPRA recommended that the violation be noted to the accused member's personnel file.

APRIL 2010

Log/C.R. No. 1015524

On November 6, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority regarding an incident occurring in the 18th District, on November 6, 2008, involving a Chicago Police Department officer. It was alleged that the officer was intoxicated while off-duty. Based on the officer's admission that he was drinking beer and the results of a breathalyzer, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation. IPRA recommended a five (5) day suspension for the officer.

Log/C.R. No. 1009335

On September 16, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority regarding an incident occurring in the 16th District, on September 16, 2007, involving an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer. It was alleged that the accused officer verbally abused the victim by directing derogatory terms toward her; flashed gang signs with his hands; threatened a witness by stating he was going to have other police officers set up the witness; and made a false 911 call. On November 9, 2007, an additional complaint was registered with IPRA regarding another incident occurring on November 9, 2007 involving the same officer, again while off-duty, and victim. In the second complaint, it was alleged the officer threatened to kill the victim and referred to her in derogatory terms. It was also alleged that on March 20, 2008, the accused officer gave a false statement to an IPRA investigator. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that the officer verbally abused the victim by directing derogatory terms toward her on the basis of witness statements and the victim's 911 call, which was consistent with the overall account of the incident. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that the accused officer flashed gang signs with his hands due to witness statements. Based on several witness statements and documentation of a 911 call made by the accused officer requesting police respond to the victim and witnesses' location, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that the officer threatened a witness by stating he was going to have other police officers set up the witness. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that the officer made a false 911 call based on a lack of credibility in the officer's statements to the 911 dispatcher. Based on documentation of a phone call to the victim from the accused officer's number and the accused officer's statements, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that the officer threatened to kill the victim. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that the officer referred to her in derogatory terms based on documentation of a phone call to the victim from the accused officer's number and the accused officer's statements. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that the officer gave a false statement to IPRA investigators on the basis of documentary evidence directly contradicting his statements. IPRA recommended separation for the officer.

Log/C.R. No. 1017784

On June 30, 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority regarding an incident occurring in the 17th District, on June 30, 2008, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department officer. It was alleged that the officer mishandled his weapon, causing it to discharge. Based on the statements from the accused officer and witness, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation. IPRA recommended a one (1) day suspension for the officer.

Log/C.R. No. 1031680

On November 9, 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority regarding an incident occurring in the 14th District, on November 9, 2009, involving an on-duty Chicago Police Department Sergeant. It was alleged that the Sergeant was inattentive to duty, in that he unintentionally discharged a Taser gun. Based on the Sergeant’s own admission, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation. IPRA recommended the violation be noted to the accused member’s personnel file.

Log/C.R. No. 1020182

On 21 September 08, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding incidents occurring in the 17th District, on September 17 and 18, 2008. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer stuck his wife’s (complainant) body with his fist, struck complainant about the head and face with a plastic bottle, struck complainant’s face with his fist, “beated” complainant during his marriage with her, and threatened to kill complainant if she reported the incidents of abuse to the police. In addition, it was further alleged that the officer failed to properly secure his firearms, and was in possession of unregistered firearms. Based on statements from the accused officer and complainant, IPRA recommend a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations that the accused officer stuck complainant’s body with his fist and struck complainant about the head and face with a plastic bottle. Further, based on statements from the complainant and reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer struck complainant’s face with his fist. IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations that the accused officer “beated” complainant during his marriage with her and threatened to kill complainant if she reported the incidents of abuse to the police. Further, based on statements from the accused officer, IPRA recommended a finding of “UNFOUNDED” for the allegations that the accused officer failed to properly secure his firearms. Based on statements from the accused officer and reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer was in possession of unregistered firearms. IPRA recommended a twenty (20) day suspension for the accused officer.

MAY 2010

Log/C.R. No. 1027294

On 12 June 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 7th District, on December 14, 2007. It was alleged that a Chicago Police Department officer was inattentive to duty in that, while conducting a test, she accidentally discharged a Taser, deploying the prongs. The discharge struck no persons and resulted in no injuries. Based on statements from the accused officer and reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that she was inattentive to duty in that, while conducting a test, she accidentally discharged a Taser, deploying the prongs. IPRA recommended that the violation be noted in the accused officer’s disciplinary file.

Log/C.R. No. 1027558

On 23 June 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 7th District, on June 12, 2009. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department officer was inattentive to duty by accidentally discharging a Taser while loaded with a cartridge. The discharge struck no persons and resulted in no injuries. Based on statements from the accused officer and reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that she was inattentive to duty by accidentally discharging a Taser while loaded with a cartridge. IPRA recommended that the violation be noted in the accused officer’s disciplinary file.

Log/C.R. No. 1002797

On January 18, 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority regarding an incident occurring in the 14th District, on October 10, 2006, involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department police officers (Officer A and Officer B), two on-duty Sergeants (Sergeant C and Sergeant D), and an on-duty Captain. It was alleged that Officer A falsely arrested the victim for drugs that did not belong to him, took money from the victim and failed to inventory or return the money, conducted a strip search without prior written approval from the Watch Commander, and failed to document on the arrest report that a strip search was conducted on the victim. It was alleged that Officer B falsely arrested the victim for drugs that did not belong to him, took money from the victim and failed to inventory or return the money, conducted a strip search without prior written approval from the Watch Commander, and failed to document on the arrest report that a strip search was conducted on the victim. It was alleged that Sergeant C kicked the victim in the groin, threatened to kill the victim, and directed profanities at the victim. It was alleged that Sergeant D failed to document the authorization for a strip search. It was alleged that the Captain failed to document the authorization for a strip search. IPRA recommended to “NOT SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer A falsely arrested the

victim for drugs that did not belong to him, because there was insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegations due to the officers' statements they found drugs, physical evidence of drugs found on him, and the victim's admission that he used drugs. IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer A took money from the victim and failed to inventory or return the money due to the lack of evidence to support or refute the victim's allegations. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that the Officer A conducted a strip search without prior written approval from the Watch Commander based on the officer's own admission. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer A failed to document on the arrest report that a strip search was conducted on the victim based on the officer's own admission. IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer B falsely arrested the victim for drugs that did not belong to him, because there was insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegations due to the officers' statements they found drugs, physical evidence of drugs found on him, and the victim's admission that he used drugs. IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer B took money from the victim and failed to inventory or return the money due to the lack of evidence to support or refute the victim's allegations. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer B conducted a strip search without prior written approval from the Watch Commander based on the officer's own admission. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer B failed to document on the arrest report that a strip search was conducted on the victim based on the officer's own admission. IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" for allegations that Sergeant C kicked the victim in the groin, threatened to kill the victim, and directed profanities at the victim due to the lack of evidence that Sergeant C had contact with the victim. In addition, the victim failed to report being kicked in the groin while being treated by medical authorities soon after the alleged incident. IPRA recommended a finding of "EXONERATED" for the allegation that Sergeant D failed to document the authorization for a strip search due to statements made by Officers A and B corroborating his story that the officers failed to seek out permission to conduct the strip search. IPRA recommended a finding of "EXONERATED" for the allegation that the Captain failed to document the authorization for a strip search due to statements made by Officers A and B corroborating his story that the officers failed to seek out permission to conduct the strip search. IPRA recommended a one (1) day suspension for both Officer A and Officer B.

Log/C.R. No. 1009147

On 09 September 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority regarding an incident occurring in the 22nd District, on September 9, 2007, involving off-duty Chicago Police Department Officer A and on-duty Chicago Police Department Officer B. It was alleged that while off-duty, Officer A unlawfully entered complainant's residence, which resulted in the officer's arrest for Criminal Trespass, displayed his handgun, which resulted in the officer's arrest for Aggravated

Assault, and was intoxicated. In addition, it was alleged that an on-duty Officer B attempted to prevent complainant from pursuing criminal charges against Officer A. Based on statements from the accused officer and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer A unlawfully entered complainant’s residence, which resulted in his arrest for Criminal Trespass. Further, based on statements from the accused officer and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer A displayed his handgun, which resulted in his arrest for Aggravated Assault. Based on statements from the accused officer, witnesses, and tests, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer A was intoxicated. Further, based on statements from the accused officer and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that Officer B attempted to prevent complainant from pursuing criminal charges against Officer A. IPRA recommended that Officer A be suspended for fifteen (15) days and that Officer B be suspended for five (5) days.

JUNE 2010

Log/C.R. No. 315303

On 04 September 2006, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA f/k/a The Office of Professional Standards), regarding an incident occurring in the 9th District, on September 4, 2006. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department officer accidentally discharged his weapon and fired his weapon at the victim. Based on statements from the accused officer and reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer accidentally discharged his weapon. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the accused fired his weapon at the victim. IPRA recommended a reprimand for the accused member.

Log/C.R. No. 1009463

On 20 September 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority, regarding an incidents occurring in the 12th and 22nd Districts, on September 20, 2007. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer brought discredit upon the Department in that he engaged in unprofessional behavior in front of Illinois State Police Personnel. In addition, it was alleged that the officer pointed a handgun at complainant during a traffic altercation. Based on statements from the witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer brought discredit upon the Department in that he engaged in unprofessional behavior in front of Illinois State Police Personnel. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NO AFFIDAVIT” for the allegation that the accused officer pointed a handgun at complainant during a traffic altercation. IPRA recommended a reprimand for the accused member.

Log/C.R. No. 1024254

On 24 February 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring on February 24, 2009. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer pushed a door against complainant (an on-duty Florida law enforcement officer), striking him on the shoulder; grabbed complainant by the arm and pulled him; was arrested for Battery to Law Enforcement Officer, Resisting with Violence and Resisting without Violence, and pled “No Contest” to Disorderly Conduct; and kicked the door of his holding cell. Based on statements from the accused officer and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer pushed a door against complainant, striking him on the shoulder. Further, IPRA recommended a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegation that the accused officer grabbed complainant by the arm and pulled him. Based on the statement from the accused officer and records, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer was arrested for Battery to Law Enforcement Officer, Resisting with Violence and Resisting without Violence, and pled “No Contest” to Disorderly Conduct. Further, based on statement of the accused officer, witnesses and records, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer kicked the door of his holding cell. IPRA recommended a twenty (20) day suspension for the accused officer.

Log/C.R. No. 1010898

On 14 November 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 15th District, on November 14, 2007. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department officer was inattentive to duty in that while holstering his weapon, the weapon discharged, and that he was wearing a holster that was not prescribed by the Department. Based on statements from the accused officer and witnesses, video, and reports, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer was inattentive to duty in that while holstering his weapon, the weapon discharged. Further, based on the statements from the accused officer and witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer was wearing a holster that was not prescribed by the Department. IPRA recommended a reprimand for the accused member.

Log/C.R. No. 1021152

On 26 October 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 16th District, on October 26, 2008. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department officer verbally abused with national origin biased language and disrespectful comments to two victims who did not speak English, who needed her assistance, and brought discredit on the Chicago Police Department based on her overall conduct in the public view of O’Hare Airport while she was in full Chicago Police Department uniform. Based on statements from witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that

the accused verbally abused with national origin biased language and disrespectful comments to two victims who did not speak English and who needed her assistance. Further, based on statements from witnesses, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused brought discredit on the Chicago Police Department based on her overall conduct in the public view of O’Hare Airport and while she was in full Chicago Police Department uniform. IPRA recommended a ten (10) day suspension for the accused officer.

Log/C.R. No. 1029336

On 19 August 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 7th District, on August 18, 2009. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department officer was inattentive to duty in that he failed to maintain control of his weapon by discharging his weapon. Based on statements from the accused officer, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer was inattentive to duty in that he failed to maintain control of his weapon by discharging his weapon. IPRA recommended a reprimand for the accused member.

Log/C.R. No. 1033959

On 18 February 2010, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 16th District, on February 18, 2010. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department sergeant shoved a spiral notebook into victim’s stomach. Based on statements from witness, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused shoved a spiral notebook into victim’s stomach. IPRA recommended a reprimand for the accused member.

Log/C.R. No. 1030437

On 24 September 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 16th District, on September 24, 2009, involving two on-duty Chicago Police Department sergeants (A & B) and an off-duty officer (C). It was alleged that the two on-duty Sergeants A & B both failed to file a complaint regarding misconduct and failed to initiate an Aggravated Assault Case Report. In addition, it was alleged that an off-duty Officer C pointed a weapon at complainant’s head and verbally threatened him. Based on statements from the complainant and reports, IPRA recommend to “SUSTAIN” the allegations that Sergeants A & B both failed to file a complaint regarding misconduct. Further, IPRA recommend a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations Sergeants A & B failed to initiate an Aggravated Assault Case Report. Based on statements from the complainant and reports, IPRA recommend a finding of “NOT SUSTAINED” for the allegations that the accused Officer C pointed a weapon at complainant’s head and verbally threatened him. IPRA recommended a reprimand for the accused Sergeants A & B.

JULY 2010

Log/C.R. No. 1016443

On 10 May 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred in the 11th District, on May 10, 2008, in which an off-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officer allegedly stuck her adult daughter with a belt. It was also alleged that the officer failed to cooperate with the police investigation regarding this incident and made a false report to IPRA. Because the complainant did not give a sworn affidavit regarding the incident with the belt, IPRA recommended that this allegation be classified as “NO AFFIDAVIT”. However, based on witness statements from other CPD officers and personnel, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused officer failed to cooperate with a police investigation and to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that she gave a false statement to IPRA regarding the incident. IPRA recommended a penalty of thirty (30) days suspension.

Log/C.R. No. 1023965

On 17 February 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred in the 8th District, on February 17, 2009, during which an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) sergeant allegedly used improper force against an underage subject by punching him in the face with a clenched fist without justification; verbally abused the subject and his brother by subjecting them to racial slurs; and directed profanities at the subject’s brother. It was also alleged that the accused made false statements to IPRA when he denied the previous allegations. Based on documented facial contusions suffered by the subject, statements given by each of the brothers in separate interviews, which corroborate one another, as well as further corroborating statements given to their mother, another CPD sergeant, and various medical personnel, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused used improper force against the subject when the officer punched him in the face. Furthermore, based on the brothers’ corroborating statements given separately regarding the incident, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused verbally abused the subjects by subjecting them to racial slurs and to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused directed profanities at the brother. Lastly, based on a preponderance of the evidence, IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation that the accused gave false statements to IPRA by denying the aforementioned allegations. IPRA recommended a penalty of forty-five (45) days suspension.

AUGUST 2010

Log/C.R. No. 1024645

On 12 March 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review

Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred in the 20th District, on March 12, 2009, during which it was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) sergeant was inattentive to duty when he accidentally discharged his firearm, resulting in minor injuries to himself, as well as three (3) other officers. Based on the sergeant's own statement, in addition to corroborating witness statements given by various CPD personnel, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAINED" the allegation. IPRA recommended a reprimand for the accused member.

Log/C.R. No. 1027827

On 01 July 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred in the 11th District, on November 4, 2008, involving two (2) on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers – Officer A and Officer B. It is alleged that Officer A struck the victim in the head/face; observed misconduct and failed to report it; and failed to complete Department Reports regarding his contact with the unidentified victim. It was also alleged that Officer B punched the unidentified victim in the face; failed to complete Department Reports regarding his contact with the unidentified victim; held a cigarette and/or cigar in his mouth while in uniform and in public; and violated a law and/or ordinance by smoking in a public vehicle and/or workplace. It was subsequently alleged that Officer B also provided a false statement to IPRA. Based on video evidence and Officer A's statement, IPRA recommended a finding of "EXONERATED" for the allegation that Officer A struck the suspect about the head/face because the type of strike used was permitted in that situation under the Use of Force Model. However, because of the same video evidence and the same statement given by Officer A, which both describe misconduct by Officer B, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer A observed misconduct by Officer B and failed to report it. In addition, based on Officer A's own admission, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer A failed to complete the required report regarding his contact with the suspect. Based on the video evidence and Officer B's statement, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer B punched the suspect on his face when the suspect was not assaulting any of the officers. Based on Officer B's own admission, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer B failed to complete the required report regarding his contact with the suspect. Furthermore, based on his own admission, as well as video footage, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer B held a cigarette and/or cigar in his mouth while in uniform and in public; and that he violated a law and/or ordinance by smoking a cigar in a public vehicle and/or workplace. Lastly, having initially denied the allegations found to be 'sustained' against him, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that Officer B provided a false statement during an interview with IPRA. IPRA recommended a twenty (20) day suspension for Officer A and a sixty (60) day suspension for Officer B.

Log/C.R. No. 1014583

On 01 March 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred in the 21st District, on February 29, 2008, in which two on-duty Chicago Police Department (CPD) officers (Officer A and Officer B) were involved. It was alleged that Officer A searched the suspect's car without permission; directed profanity at him; and that Officer A failed to provide his name and badge number upon request. It was also alleged that Officer B directed profanities at the suspect; grabbed the suspect's arms, placed him in a wristlock, and slammed him into the hood of his vehicle; and also failed to provide his name and badge number upon request. No witnesses could be found to either prove or refute any of these allegations. Based on lack of witness statements and the Officers' denial of the allegations, IPRA recommended a finding of "NOT SUSTAINED" for these allegations. Subsequently, allegations were made that both Officers A and B determined the suspect to have been driving with a suspended license and failed to issue him a citation; that they allowed the suspect to continue to operate the vehicle knowing his license was suspended; and that they failed to generate any documentation regarding the incident, by either issuing a citation or by preparing a contact card. Based on the statements given by Officers A and B, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that both officers failed to issue a citation to the suspect who was driving without a valid driver's license and also to "SUSTAIN" the allegation that both officers allowed the suspect to continue driving his vehicle knowing that the suspect's driver's license was suspended. Based on both officers' statement, IPRA recommended a finding of "UNFOUNDED" regarding the allegation that the officers failed to document the incident. IPRA recommended a reprimand for the accused Officers A & B.

Log/C.R. No. 1010829

On 10 November 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred in the 25th District, on November 10, 2007. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer directed profanities at complainant; displayed her handgun at complainant and her friends; threatened to shoot complainant; and brought discredit on the Chicago Police Department based on her overall conduct in the public view of a Walmart store while she was working secondary employment as an Asset Protection Guard. IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" all the aforementioned allegations against the accused member based on corroborating witness statements and reports. IPRA recommended a ten (10) day suspension for the accused member. The officer left the Department on a Family Leave of Absence in 2008, never returned to work, and as a result, was resigned from her position as a police officer with the Chicago Police Department.

SEPTEMBER 2010

Log/C.R. No. 1028927

On 06 August 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred in the 16th District, on August 4, 2009. It was alleged that a Chicago Police Department officer improperly handcuffed the complainant; handcuffed the complainant without justification; searched the residence of the complainant without consent and; threatened to arrest complainant in the event that the complainant should register a complaint against him. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the following allegations of violations committed by the accused: improperly handcuffed the complainant; handcuffed the complainant without justification and; searched the residence of the complainant without consent against the accused member based on corroborating witness statements, the officer’s statement, and reports. IPRA recommended a five (5) day suspension for the accused member.

Log/C.R. No. 1022361

On 10 December 2008, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred in the 6th District, on December 10, 2008. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer used deadly force in violation of policy, in that he fired a warning shot; and provided false information in his statement to IPRA, in that he denied firing a warning shot. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” both allegations against the accused member based on corroborating witness statements and reports. IPRA recommended a thirty (30) day suspension for the accused member.

Log/C.R. No. 1024256

On 27 February 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred in the 12th District, on July 15, 2007. It was alleged that a Chicago Police Department officer’s magazine was loaded with two different types of ammunition, in violation of General Order 07-01-09. IPRA recommended to “SUSTAIN” the allegation. IPRA recommended a penalty of VIOLATION NOTED for the accused member.

Log/C.R. No. 1032042

On 22 November 2009, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred in the 16th District, on November 22, 2009. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer referred to the reporting party as “nigger”; pointed his firearm at the reporting party without justification; failed to properly identify himself as a police officer; engaged in conduct which brought discredit upon the Department by depositing a

plastic bag containing dog feces onto the property owned by the reporting party; made false reports; made a false statement and; committed an additional violation of Rule 2, in that the accused brought discredit to the Department based on his overall conduct during the reported incident. Based on witness statements, video evidence, the statement of the victim and the accused's statement, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" all allegations of violations committed by the accused. IPRA recommended SEPARATION for the accused member.

Log/C.R. No. 1010375

On 23 October 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred in Lisle, Illinois, on October 21, 2007. It was alleged that an off-duty Chicago Police Department officer engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with the complainant; threatened the complainant with physical harm; and impeded the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals and brought discredit upon the Department in violation of Rule 2. Based on witness and complainant statements, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" all of the allegations of violations committed by the accused. IPRA recommended a seven (7) day suspension for the accused member.

Log/C.R. No. 1009540

On 25 September 2007, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA), regarding an incident occurring in the 8th District, on September 24, 2007, involving two on-duty, Chicago Police officers (A and B). It was alleged that Officer A failed to complete a contact card for an American Taxi cab driver; mishandled his weapon; and failed to immediately notify the zone regarding the discharge of his weapon. It is further alleged that Officer B failed to complete a contact card for an American Taxi cab driver. Additionally, it was alleged that an unknown officer damaged the interior of complainant's vehicle while it was in the possession of the police. Based on the statements of Officer A and B and CPD records, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" all allegations of misconduct made against Officers A and B. IPRA recommended to "NOT SUSTAIN" the allegation against the unknown officer, because there was insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation, as alleged by the complainant. IPRA recommended a two (2) day suspension for Officer A, and recommended a two (2) day suspension for Officer B.

Log/C.R. No. 1035386

On 13 April 2010, a complaint was registered with the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) regarding an incident that occurred in the 11th District, on April 13, 2010. It was alleged that an on-duty Chicago Police Department officer discharged his weapon without justification, in violation of Rule 10. Based on CPD reports and physical evidence, IPRA recommended to "SUSTAIN" the allegation of a violation committed by the accused. IPRA recommended a penalty of VIOLATION NOTED for the accused member.



Independent Police Review Authority
10 West 35th Street
Suite 1200
Chicago, Illinois 60616

(312) 745-3594 Complaint Line
(312) 745-3609 General
(312) 745-3591 FAX
(312) 745-3593 TTY

www.iprachicago.org