

INTRODUCTION

On March 17, 2015, at approximately 22:38 hours, Subject 1 and Subject 2 were driving in Subject 2's vehicle. An unmarked squad car, containing Chicago Police Officers ("PO") Officer A, Officer B, and Officer C, pulled up behind Subject 2's vehicle, engaged their emergency lights and sirens, and attempted to curb the vehicle. Subject 2, who was driving, pulled over. POs Officer A, Officer B, and Officer C exited their squad car and approached the vehicle, but the vehicle sped off. The officers ran back to their squad car and pursued the vehicle, which eventually came to a stop at XXXX XX XXXXXXXX XXXX XXXXXXXX, XXXXXXXX, XX XXXXXX. The passenger, Subject 1, exited the vehicle and attempted to flee on foot. Subject 1 was arrested and sustained an injury to his left leg, for which he needed medical attention. Four other officers responded to the scene and assisted: POs Officer D, Officer E, Officer F, and Officer G.

ALLEGATIONS

It is alleged that on March 17, 2015, at approximately 22:38 hours, at XXXX XX XXXXXXXX XXXX XXXXXXXX, XXXXXXXX, XX XXXXXX, on the street, **accused PO Officer A, #XXXXXX, employee #XXXXXX, Unit XXX**, while on duty:

1. Pointed a gun at Subject 2 without justification, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, and 38;
2. Directed profanity at Subject 2, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9;
3. Handcuffed Subject 2 too tightly, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
4. "Clotheslined" Subject 1 by placing his arm against Subject 1's chest and kicking him on his left thigh, causing him to fall to the ground and break his left leg, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
5. Repeatedly punched Subject 1 about the head and body, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
6. Repeatedly kicked Subject 1 about the head and body, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
7. Dragged Subject 1 across the pavement, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.

It is further alleged that on March 17, 2015, at approximately 22:38 hours, at XXXX XX XXXXXXXX XXXX XXXXXXXX, XXXXXXXX, XX XXXXXX, on the street, **accused PO Officer B, #XXXXXX, Employee #XXXXXX, Unit XXX**, while on duty:

1. Pointed a gun at Subject 2 without justification, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, and 38;
2. Directed profanity at Subject 2, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9;
3. Handcuffed Subject 2 too tightly, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;

CIVILIAN OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
LOG #1074294

4. "Clotheslined" Subject 1 by placing his arm against Subject 1's chest and kicking him on his left thigh, causing him to fall to the ground and break his left leg, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
5. Repeatedly punched Subject 1 about the head and body, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
6. Repeatedly kicked Subject 1 about the head and body, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
7. Dragged Subject 1 across the pavement, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.

It is further alleged that on March 17, 2015, at approximately 22:38 hours, at XXXX XX XXXXXXXX XXXX XXXXXXXX, XXXXXXXX, XX XXXXX, on the street, **accused PO Officer C, #XXXX, Employee #XXXX, Unit XXX**, while on duty:

1. Pointed a gun at Subject 2 without justification, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, and 38;
2. Directed profanity at Subject 2, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9;
3. Handcuffed Subject 2 too tightly, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
4. "Clotheslined" Subject 1 by placing his arm against Subject 1's chest and kicking him on his left thigh, causing him to fall to the ground and break his left leg, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
5. Repeatedly punched Subject 1 about the head and body, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
6. Repeatedly kicked Subject 1 about the head and body, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
7. Dragged Subject 1 across the pavement, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.

It is further alleged that on March 17, 2015, at approximately 22:38 hours, at XXXX XX XXXXXXXX XXXX XXXXXXXX, XXXXXXXX, XX XXXXX, on the street, **accused PO Officer D, #XXXXX, employee #XXXXX, Unit XXX**, while on duty:

1. Pointed a gun at Subject 2 without justification, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, and 38;
2. Directed profanity at Subject 2, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9;
3. Handcuffed Subject 2 too tightly, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
4. "Clotheslined" Subject 1 by placing his arm against Subject 1's chest and kicking him on his left thigh, causing him to fall to the ground and break his left leg, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;

CIVILIAN OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
LOG #1074294

5. Repeatedly punched Subject 1 about the head and body, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
6. Repeatedly kicked Subject 1 about the head and body, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
7. Dragged Subject 1 across the pavement, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.

It is further alleged that on March 17, 2015, at approximately 22:38 hours, at XXXX XX XXXXXXXX XXXX XXXXXXXX, XXXXXXXX, XX XXXXXX, on the street, **accused PO Officer E, #XXXXXX, employee #XXXXXX, Unit XXX**, while on duty:

1. Pointed a gun at Subject 2 without justification, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, and 38;
2. Directed profanity at Subject 2, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9;
3. Handcuffed Subject 2 too tightly, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
4. “Clotheslined” Subject 1 by placing his arm against Subject 1’s chest and kicking him on his left thigh, causing him to fall to the ground and break his left leg, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
5. Repeatedly punched Subject 1 about the head and body, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
6. Repeatedly kicked Subject 1 about the head and body, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
7. Dragged Subject 1 across the pavement, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.

It is further alleged that on March 17, 2015, at approximately 22:38 hours, at XXXX XX XXXXXXXX XXXX XXXXXXXX, XXXXXXXX, XX XXXXXX, on the street, **accused PO Officer F, #XXXXXX, employee #XXXX, Unit XXX**, while on duty:

1. Pointed a gun at Subject 2 without justification, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, and 38;
2. Directed profanity at Subject 2, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9;
3. Handcuffed Subject 2 too tightly, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
4. “Clotheslined” Subject 1 by placing his arm against Subject 1’s chest and kicking him on his left thigh, causing him to fall to the ground and break his left leg, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
5. Repeatedly punched Subject 1 about the head and body, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;

6. Repeatedly kicked Subject 1 about the head and body, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
7. Dragged Subject 1 across the pavement, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.

It is further alleged that on March 17, 2015, at approximately 22:38 hours, at XXXX XX XXXXXXXX XXXX XXXXXXXX, XXXXXXXX, XX XXXXX, on the street, **accused PO Officer G, #XXXXX, employee #XXXX, Unit XXX**, while on duty:

1. Pointed a gun at Subject 2 without justification, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, and 38;
2. Directed profanity at Subject 2, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9;
3. Handcuffed Subject 2 too tightly, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
4. “Clotheslined” Subject 1 by placing his arm against Subject 1’s chest and kicking him on his left thigh, causing him to fall to the ground and break his left leg, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
5. Repeatedly punched Subject 1 about the head and body, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
6. Repeatedly kicked Subject 1 about the head and body, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9;
7. Dragged Subject 1 across the pavement, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.

APPLICABLE RULES AND LAW

Rule 2: Any action or conduct which impedes the Department’s efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department.¹

Rule 3: Any failure to promote the Department’s efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals.²

¹ This Rule applies to both the professional and private conduct of all members. It prohibits any and all conduct which is contrary to the letter and spirit of Departmental policy or goals or which would reflect adversely upon the Department or its members. It includes not only all unlawful acts by members but also all acts, which although not unlawful in themselves, would degrade or bring disrespect upon the member or the Department, including public and open association with persons of known bad or criminal reputation in the community unless such association is in the performance of police duties. It also includes any action contrary to the stated policy, goals, rules, regulations, orders or directives of the Department.

² This Rule prohibits any omission or failure to act by any member of the Department, whether on or off duty, which act would be required by the stated policy, goals, rules, regulations, orders and directives of the Department. It applies to supervisory and other members who, through carelessness, inefficiency or design fail to implement all policy goals, rules, regulations, orders and directives of the Department or fail to report to the Department any and all known violations of same, or who through carelessness, inefficiency or design fail to become aware of any such violation, when their assigned duty or supervisory responsibility would require them to become so aware.

Rule 6: Disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.³

Rule 8: Disrespect to or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty.

Rule 9: Engaging in any unjustified verbal or physical altercation with any person, while on or off duty.⁴

Rule 10: Inattention to duty.

Rule 38: Unlawful or unnecessary use or display of a weapon.

Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution: The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated...

Article 1, Section 6 of the Illinois State Constitution: The people shall have the right to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and other possessions against unreasonable searches, seizures, invasions of privacy or interceptions of communications by eavesdropping devices or other means...

Chicago Police Department General Order G03-02: Use of Force Guidelines⁵

Chicago Police Department General Order G03-02-01: Use of Force Model⁶

720 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 5/7-5: [A peace officer] is justified in the use of any force which he reasonably believes to be necessary to effect the arrest and of any force which he reasonably believes to be necessary to defend himself or another from bodily harm while making the arrest...

INVESTIGATION

IPRA gathered relevant physical and documentary evidence associated with this incident. In addition, IPRA obtained statements from over a dozen individuals including the complainants and accused officers. A summary of this evidence follows.

Case Incident Report

³ This Rule prohibits disobedience by a member of any lawful written or oral order or directive of a superior officer or another member of any rank who is relaying the order of a superior.

⁴ Rules 8 and 9 prohibit the use of any excessive force by any member. These rules prohibit all brutality, and physical or verbal maltreatment of any citizen while on or off duty, including any unjustified altercation of any kind.

⁵ Relevant sections of this General Order will be discussed if necessary in the analysis and conclusion section of this Summary Report.

⁶ The analysis and conclusion section of this Summary Report will apply this General Order as necessary to the facts of this case.

The Original Case Incident Report, XX #XXXXXXXX, documented that the responding officers curbed Subject 2's vehicle for a minor traffic infraction at XXXX XX XXXXXX XXXXXX. According to the Report, as the officers approached the vehicle, Subject 1 was observed leaning over from the passenger seat and pressing the gas pedal with his left hand in an attempt to accelerate the vehicle. The Report indicated that Subject 1 ignored multiple commands from officers telling him to stop. The driver, Subject 2, was attempting to stop Subject 1 from pressing the gas pedal, but Subject 1 was screaming, "Drive bitch, don't make me hit you." The vehicle then drove forward and fled westbound on XXXX XXXXXX before coming to a stop at XXXX XX XXXXXX XXXX XXXXXX. Subject 1 then exited the vehicle, ignored commands from officers to stop, ran about ten feet, fell to the ground and stated that he broke his leg. He was then placed into custody.⁷ Subject 1 told officers that he made Subject 2 flee because he has a domestic warrant and because he had been drinking. Subject 2 told officers on scene that she tried to stop multiple times but she feared for her safety because of Subject 1. Subject 1 was transported to XXXX XXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX. He told the Physician Assistant A, in the presence of Sergeant A, that he injured his leg when he was running and fell. (Attachment 10)

Photographs

Photographs were taken of Subject 1 while hospitalized. These photographs showed him in a hospital bed, handcuffed, with a large bandage wrapped around his left thigh and another bandage wrapped around his left hip area. An abrasion could be seen on the left side of his face and ear. (Attachment 39)

Chicago Fire Department Ambulance Report

The Chicago Fire Department Ambulance Report stated that the patient, Subject 1, showed no obvious signs of trauma. He was complaining of pain in his left leg after tripping and falling while running from the police. The patient attempted to refuse medical care, but he eventually consented. Once transported to the hospital, the paramedics cut away the left pant leg of his jeans to get a better look at his leg. The report documented that there appeared to be a closed femur fracture. (Attachment 28)

Medical Records

Medical Records obtained from the hospital show that Subject 1 tested negative for alcohol. The records also stated that Subject 1's femur was broken in half. Subject 1 went into surgery at approximately 07:40 hours on March 19, 2015. Subject 1 was released and transferred to Cook County Jail on March 21, 2015. Subject 1's medical records do not reflect that he ever communicated to medical personnel that officers caused his injuries. (Attachment 40)

Interview of Complainant Subject 2

On March 19, 2015, Complainant Subject 2 was interviewed at IPRA about the incident. Subject 2 stated that she was driving with her boyfriend, Subject 1, heading westbound on XXXX Street. She stated that an unmarked police vehicle pulled them over. Subject 2 stated that two

⁷ The Arrest Report for Physician Assistant A stated essentially the same account of the incident as the Original Case Incident Report. (Attachment 9) Attempts were made to retrieve the in-car camera footage as well as any other available video footage. No videos were found. (Attachments 12, 16, &106)

white male officers exited the vehicle with their guns drawn and pointing at the car. Subject 2 said that one officer approached her side of the vehicle and the other officer approached the passenger side. Subject 2 stated that the officers said something to the effect of, "Put the fucking windows down." Subject 2 said that she then drove away, fleeing for about two and half blocks. The police officers followed her vehicle until she pulled over again. She stated that the reason she drove away was because she was afraid and wanted to get into an area with more light. According to her, once she stopped, Subject 1 began exiting the vehicle and quickly moving away from the car. The officers approached them again with their guns drawn, telling them to "get the fuck out the car" and to "get the fuck down." She saw an officer tackle Subject 1. She said that it was difficult to remember what exactly was being said because everyone was yelling.

One officer grabbed Subject 2 to put her in custody. She said that the officers were yelling profanities to her along the lines of, "Shut the fuck up bitch," and, "Hoe go fuck yourself." She was then handcuffed. According to Subject 2, more officers arrived and began to punch and kick Subject 1. She said that, at that point, Subject 1 was handcuffed on the ground. The officers then moved Subject 2 to be placed into a vehicle where she asked if they could loosen her handcuffs because they were too tight. The officers did not respond to her request. More officers showed up and began searching the car. An officer asked her what was in her car, to which she responded, "Nothing is in my car." The officer replied, "Bitch you're lying." After the search revealed that nothing was in her car, the officers told her that they were going to give her a break, and her handcuffs were removed. She observed Subject 1 leaning against a garage with handcuffs on. An ambulance arrived for Subject 1, and when he attempted to walk on his own he fell. Subject 2 learned later that Subject 1 sustained a broken leg and was treated at Holy Cross Hospital. (Attachments 4 & 8)

Interview of Complainant Subject 1

On April 23, 2015, Complainant Subject 1 gave a statement to IPRA regarding the events. Subject 1 stated that on the date and time of the alleged incident, he and his girlfriend, Subject 2, were riding in a vehicle together. Subject 2 was the driver while Subject 1 was in the passenger seat. An unmarked police vehicle drove up behind them and began flashing its lights. Subject 2 pulled their vehicle over to the side of the road. Two civilian dressed officers exited the unmarked police vehicle and approached the vehicle Subject 2 and Subject 1 were in with their guns drawn. Before the officers said anything, Subject 1 said that Subject 2 sped off down the road because she knew that Subject 1 had marijuana on his person. Subject 1 stated that he never forced Subject 2 to drive away nor did he touch the gas pedal. Subject 1 did however give Subject 2 directions on which way to drive once she fled the scene.

As they drove away, Subject 1 observed five to six squad cars and unmarked cars in front of them. The police vehicles had their lights and sirens on. Subject 2 stopped the vehicle because an unmarked police vehicle was blocking them. Subject 1 immediately exited and ran away. One of the officers from the unmarked vehicle chased Subject 1, caught up to him, and "clotheslined" him. Subject 1 stated that he was kicked in the left thigh before he fell to the ground. Once on the ground, Subject 1 was handcuffed. After being handcuffed, he was repeatedly punched and kicked by officers. Two of the officers pulled Subject 1 towards a gate. At this point Subject 1 calmly told the officers that his left leg was broken. The officers tried to stand Subject 1 up, but he could not stand. An ambulance was called to the scene to transport Subject 1 to Holy Cross

Hospital. At the hospital, he told the medical personnel that his leg was broken, but did not say how it broke.

Subject 1 stated that he did not know why he and Subject 2 were pulled over. He stated that he was not under the influence of drugs or alcohol at the time of the incident. He also stated that there was another civilian witness to the incident, but she was an undocumented immigrant and did not want to get involved. (Attachments 32 to 36)

Interview of Physician Assistant A

In a statement to IPRA on December 9, 2015, Physician Assistant A stated that on the date and time of the alleged incident, she was working in the emergency room at Holy Cross Hospital. She recalled Subject 1 being brought in by the police and paramedics. He was placed into one of her assigned rooms, making Subject 1 her patient. When Physician Assistant A first saw Subject 1, she stated that his left leg had lost its range of motion and the paramedics suspected a femur fracture. Physician Assistant A said that Subject 1's left leg was swollen but she did not recall Subject 1 having any other injuries. Based on notes that she took the night of the incident, Physician Assistant A stated that Subject 1 told her he had been running and heard a pop in his left leg, causing him to fall to the ground. He did not state to her that the police had punched, kicked, or tackled him. The medical personnel then did an x-ray of Subject 1's leg, which revealed a fracture through the middle of the femur. (Attachments 43 to 46)

Interview of Paramedic A

In a statement to IPRA on June 26, 2016, Paramedic A stated that she was called to the scene of the alleged incident to provide medical care for an injured victim in police custody. Paramedic A recalled that the patient, Subject 1, was sitting on a curb, handcuffed, when she and her partner, Paramedic B⁸, pulled up. Paramedic A spoke to the patient who stated that he did not want medical attention. She recalled Subject 1 continually trying to stand and walk on his own, but he could not. Paramedic A said that he eventually allowed her and her partner to examine him and transport him to the hospital. She stated that at no time did the patient tell her that he had been battered. In the ambulance, she cut his pant leg open at the knee to search for any abrasions, but she did not find any. While in route to Holy Cross Hospital, Subject 1 began complaining of more leg pain, so Paramedic A told her partner, who was driving the ambulance, to pull over. At this point, the paramedics cut the rest of his pant leg open up to his thigh, allowing them to see that Subject 1 had a severe femur deformity. Paramedic A stated that she then put a traction splint on Subject 1, a splint that helps to keep the fractured bones separated and ease the pain in the thigh. Paramedic A stated that she observed no hostility between the police and Subject 1. (Attachments 91 to 93 & 108)

Interview of Witness⁹ Sergeant A

In a statement to IPRA on May 18, 2016, Witness Sergeant A stated that on March 17, 2015, at approximately 22:38 hours, he was working as the supervisor for XXXX

⁸ Paramedic B gave a statement to IPRA on June 28, 2016. Paramedic B did not recall any details about the incident, and relied on the CFD Run Report for her statement. (Attachments 94 to 96 & 120)

⁹ Witness POs Officer H and Officer I were interviewed by IPRA on August 19, 2016, but they provided no relevant information. (Attachments 121 to 124)

XXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXX, a unit comprised of POs Officer A, Officer B, and Officer C. He recalled being in civilian dress and driving an unmarked squad car. Sergeant A responded to the scene after Subject 1 was already in custody. Sergeant A could not recall if the XXXX XXXX called him to assist or if he heard them on the radio and responded. When he arrived, an ambulance was already there. Sergeant A did not speak to Subject 1 or the ambulance personnel at the scene. Sergeant A learned from the officers on scene that Subject 1 had injured his leg when he attempted to flee from the police. Furthermore, the officers told Sergeant A that the female driver of the vehicle that fled, Subject 2, was threatened by Subject 1 when she originally pulled over. Subject 1 yelled at Subject 2 and attempted to force her to drive the vehicle. Sergeant A had a conversation with Subject 2 at the scene that essentially confirmed what the officers had told him. He stated, "It was apparent to me that she was a victim, that she didn't feel like she could pull over, that she was threatened to keep driving by the complainant." Sergeant A stated that at no time did Subject 2 state to him that she drove away because she was afraid of what the police might do to her.

Sergeant A recalled that his first contact with Subject 1 was in the emergency room of Holy Cross Hospital. He recalled a Physician Assistant asking Subject 1 what happened to his leg, to which he responded that he sustained the injury when he ran from the police and fell. Sergeant A also asked Subject 1 what happened, and Subject 1 told him the same. At no time did Sergeant A hear Subject 1 state that he sustained his injuries from police misconduct. (Attachments 51 & 98)

Interview of Accused PO Officer A

In a statement to IPRA on May 19, 2016, accused PO Officer A stated that on March 17, 2015, at approximately 22:38 hours, he was on patrol with his partners, POs Officer B and Officer C. He and his partners were assigned to the XXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX XXXX in an unmarked squad car in civilian dress. PO Officer A stated that he came into contact with Subject 1 through a traffic stop, though he could not recall what the traffic violation was. A female, now known as Subject 2, was driving the vehicle and Subject 1 was the passenger. Once PO Officer A and his partners curbed the vehicle, he exited and approached the passenger side of the car. He stated that he did not believe his firearm was drawn upon the approach, nor did he notice if his partners were. He observed Subject 1 leaning over into the driver's seat and attempting to hit the gas. PO Officer A heard Subject 1 yelling at Subject 2 and telling her to drive. PO Officer A recalled that Subject 2 was crying and had her hands up. He heard Subject 1 threatening to hit her and calling her "bitch," and then the car sped away.

PO Officer A and his partners ran back to their vehicle. PO Officer A stated that he radioed for assistance while PO Officer B drove and PO Officer C was in the back seat. They pursued the fleeing vehicle, which eventually came to a stop at XXXX XX XXXXXXXX XXXX XXXXXXX. PO Officer A stated that there was another police vehicle assisting them which may have cut off Subject 1 and Subject 2, but he was unsure. He stated that the officers in the assisting vehicle were POs Officer D and Officer E. Once the vehicle the Subject 2 was driving came to a stop, PO Officer A's police vehicle pulled up behind them. PO Officer A stated that Subject 1 then exited the vehicle and ran north down XXXXXXXX XXXX XXXXXXX. PO Officer A, along with POs Officer E and Officer D, gave chase. Subject 1 then dropped to the ground, collapsing on his stomach. Once he was on the ground, the officers placed Subject 1 into custody. PO Officer A recalled Subject 1 saying that his leg was hurt. Officers helped Subject 1 up and called an ambulance so that his leg could be evaluated. PO Officer A did not recall Subject 1 falling again.

PO Officer A does not know what occurred once Subject 1 was placed in the ambulance. He also did not recall what time Sergeant A arrived at the scene.

PO Officer A also had contact with Subject 2. He recalled that she was very upset and that she told him she drove away because she was afraid. She also told PO Officer A that she had tried multiple times to stop the car after they fled from the original stop. PO Officer A did not recall handcuffing her. Furthermore, he explained that the officers decided that they would not give Subject 2 a ticket because she was a victim of assault by Subject 1. PO Officer A denied all of the allegations against him. (Attachments 57 and 87)

Interview of Accused PO Officer B

In a statement to IPRA on May 19, 2016, Accused PO Officer B stated that on March 17, 2015, at approximately 22:38 hours, he was on patrol with his partners, POs Officer A and Officer C. He and his partners were assigned to the XXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX XXXX under the XXXXXX XX XXXXXXXXXXX XXXXX and he stated that they were in civilian dress in an unmarked police vehicle, which he was driving. They curbed the vehicle Subject 1 was in because of a traffic violation. PO Officer B could not recall what the traffic violation was. The officers exited their vehicle and approached Subject 2's vehicle. PO Officer B could not remember if he and his partners had their weapons out. He recalled hearing the engine rev and seeing Subject 1, who was the passenger, leaning over in the driver's seat, reaching to the floor. The driver, Subject 2, had her hands up. He then stated that "the car took off." PO Officer B ran back to his vehicle to chase the fleeing car. He stated that POs Officer E and Officer D assisted them in the chase, eventually curbing the vehicle a second time at XXXX XX XXXXXXXXXXX XXXX XXXXXX. PO Officer B did not know why the fleeing vehicle came to a stop. At this point, Subject 1 exited the vehicle and began to run away. PO Officer B said that he lost sight of Subject 1 because he was on the driver's side of the police vehicle. When PO Officer B rounded the vehicle and ran in the direction of Subject 1, he observed Subject 1 already on the ground being placed into custody. At no point did PO Officer B hear Subject 1 say that the police officers made him fall.

PO Officer B did not recall Subject 1 stating any complaints against the officers. PO Officer B said that he, PO Officer A, and PO Officer D helped move Subject 1 and help him up. According to PO Officer B, Subject 1 did not want to get medical help from the paramedics and was standing the majority of the encounter. He did not recall Subject 1 falling down again. PO Officer B did not believe he had a verbal exchange with Subject 2. PO Officer B denied all of the allegations against him. (Attachments 54 & 99)

Interview of Accused PO Officer C

In a statement to IPRA on June 6, 2016, Accused PO Officer C stated that on March 17, 2015, at approximately 22:38 hours, he was on patrol with his partners, POs Officer A and Officer B. POs Officer C stated essentially the same account of the incident as his partners. He added that he was the rear passenger in their unmarked police vehicle and he also did not remember why they pulled over the vehicle that contained Subject 2 and Subject 1. He also stated that at the initial traffic stop, all three of the officers exited their car to approach the curbed vehicle. PO Officer C stated that his view was obscured at first when he exited the police vehicle because PO Officer A was in front of him. Once he had a clear line of vision, he saw Subject 1 pushing and hitting

Subject 2's leg, trying to accelerate the vehicle. Once the vehicle was put in drive and sped away, the officers ran back to their vehicle and pursued the fleeing subjects.

PO Officer C did not observe Subject 1 fall, nor did he see which officer made first contact. The next time PO Officer C saw Subject 1, he was handcuffed and walking to a garage, while being assisted by officers. PO Officer C noted that Subject 1 was visibly limping. An ambulance was called because they realized Subject 1 was injured. PO Officer C also said that, while speaking with other officers, they stated to him that they heard a pop or a bang while chasing Subject 1, followed by him collapsing to the ground.

PO Officer C did have a verbal interaction with Subject 1, during which he asked Subject 1 how his leg felt. PO Officer C stated that Subject 1 responded, "I'm good enough to go in the lockup." PO Officer C said that Subject 1 was essentially unable to walk. He also stated that he was the one that initially called an ambulance. Subject 1 told PO Officer C that he injured his leg while he was running away. PO Officer C stated that he helped Subject 1 into the ambulance and that he was the officer that rode with Subject 1 to the hospital. Once at the hospital, PO Officer C said that the medical personnel figured out that Subject 1 had a broken femur pretty quickly. PO Officer C also stated that Subject 1 told all of the medical personnel that he had fallen and hurt himself while running from the police. Most of the nurses and doctors asked Subject 1 if the police had anything to do with it, to which Subject 1 would respond, "The police never touched me."

With regard to Subject 2, PO Officer C stated that he believed he spoke to her briefly, trying to understand what was going on. He said that she was crying and told him that she was scared of what Subject 1 would have done to her if she did not drive away. PO Officer C stated that he believed he was the officer who handcuffed Subject 2. When asked why he handcuffed her, he stated, "So, for the safety of it, until we figure out what happened, I believe I handcuffed her. She talked me through her story. I took the handcuffs off, and she calmed down, and we figured out the whole situation." PO Officer C denied all of the allegations against him, except he stated that he may have had his gun displayed momentarily, but he could not recall. (Attachments 79 and 107)

Interview of Accused PO Officer D

In a statement to IPRA on June 1, 2016, Accused PO Officer D stated that on March 17, 2015, at approximately 22:38 hours, he was on patrol with PO Officer E. He and his partner were assigned to the XXXXXXXX XXX XXXX in Beat XXXX, driving an unmarked police vehicle, and in civilian dress. PO Officer D stated that he first came into contact with Subject 1 and Subject 2 when he and PO Officer E assisted other officers, now known as POs Officer A, Officer B, and Officer C, with an arrest. PO Officer D stated that he first saw the vehicle Subject 1 and Subject 2 were in while he and his partner were in a Burger King parking lot at XXXXXXXX XXX XXXXXX. He observed the unmarked police vehicle, containing the other three officers, curb Subject 2's vehicle with its lights activated. He observed POs Officer A, Officer B, and Officer C exit their police vehicle and approach the curbed vehicle. He then observed the fleeing vehicle speed away down the street and the three officers give chase in their vehicle. PO Officer D and his partner followed the fleeing vehicle and the unmarked car that was attempting to pull it over. Eventually, the fleeing vehicle pulled into an alley which PO Officer D knew could be cut off on Central Park Avenue, so he and PO Officer E turned down Central Park Avenue to cut off the

vehicle. Once they successfully blocked in the vehicle, Subject 1 exited the car and began to flee on foot.

The officers gave chase, PO Officer D included. Subject 1 ran about ten to fifteen feet and then, according to PO Officer D, “It looked like he pulled his hamstring... and he went down to the ground.” PO Officer D stated that none of the officers had any physical contact with Subject 1 prior to his fall. At that point, PO Officer D stated that there were three officers, himself included, surrounding Subject 1. One of the officers, he could not recall who, handcuffed Subject 1, at which point a fourth officer, now known as PO Officer C, arrived. One of the officers, he could not recall who, called for an ambulance. The ambulance arrived and paramedics walked Subject 1 to the ambulance. A short time after that, Sergeant A arrived. PO Officer D told Sergeant A what had happened, and then he and his partner left the scene. PO Officer D stated that he had no physical contact with Subject 1 or Subject 2. He did not recall hearing Subject 1 state how he fell or why. PO Officer D denied all of the allegations against him. (Attachments 76 & 100)

Interview of Accused PO Officer E

In a statement to IPRA on May 26, 2016, Accused PO Officer E stated that on March 17, 2015, at approximately 22:38 hours, he was on patrol with his partner, PO Officer D. PO Officer E stated essentially the same account of the incident as his partner, however, PO Officer E stated that the XXXX XXXX, now known to be POs Officer A, Officer B, and Officer C, activated their lights and sirens to pull over the vehicle, but the vehicle sped away. When the vehicle driven by Subject 2 halted after the chase, Subject 1 opened his door and attempted to flee on foot. At this point, PO Officer E’s partner, PO Officer D, exited their vehicle and pursued the subject along with two of the officers from the XXXX XXXX. PO Officer E stated that he did not know what caused Subject 1 to fall and that he did not exit his police vehicle until Subject 1 had been handcuffed. The only physical contact that PO Officer E witnessed between Subject 1 and the officers was when Subject 1 was handcuffed and transported to the ambulance. PO Officer E did not interact with either Subject 1 or Subject 2. PO Officer E denied the allegations against him. (Attachments 63 & 89)

Interview of Accused PO Officer F

In a statement to IPRA on June 13, 2016, Accused PO Officer F stated that on March 17, 2015, at approximately 22:38 hours, he was on duty with his partner, PO Officer G, in uniform and working Beat XXX in a marked police vehicle. PO Officer G stated that he came into contact with Subject 1 when he and his partner responded to a call for assistance to the XXXX block of XXXXXXXX XXXX XXXXXXXX. PO Officer F stated that the reason for assistance was that a vehicle being pursued had finally come to a stop. PO Officer F did not know why the vehicle was being pursued. He stated that they had no part in curbing the fleeing vehicle. He further said that he did not recall ever actually seeing Subject 1 or Subject 2. PO Officer F stated, “I remember responding to the scene and by the time we got to the scene, everything was over.” He did not recall himself or his partner ever having any physical or verbal interaction with either Subject 1 or Subject 2. PO Officer F denied all allegations made against him. (Attachments 85 & 97)

Interview of Accused PO Officer G

In a statement to IPRA on June 6, 2016, Accused PO Officer G stated that on March 17, 2015, at approximately 22:38 hours, he was on duty with his partner, PO Officer F, in uniform and working Beat XXX in a marked police vehicle. He said that he and his partner came into contact with Subject 1 when they responded to a unit attempting to pull over a vehicle. PO Officer G did not know the circumstances surrounding the traffic stop. PO Officer G essentially stated the same account as PO Officer F. PO Officer G added that, when they arrived, Subject 1 was standing up next to a wooden fence. He could not recall if someone was assisting Subject 1. PO Officer G stated that he did not see Subject 1 fall while he was at the scene. PO Officer G and his partner did not have any physical or verbal interaction with Subject 1, and he was unaware of any physical contact that Subject 1 may have had with the other officers besides when they assisted him to the ambulance. PO Officer G recalled being told that Subject 1 had fallen and injured his leg while running from the police. He did not observe any injuries to Subject 1. PO Officer G recalled seeing Subject 2 sitting in the back of a squad car. PO Officer G denied all allegations made against him. (Attachments 82 & 90)

Civil Lawsuit

On December 10, 2015, Subject 1 filed a civil lawsuit against the City of Chicago and unknown Chicago police officers in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. On April 7, 2016, Subject 1 filed an amended complaint naming the accused in COPA's administrative case as defendants. All accused officers were deposed in the civil lawsuit. IPRA began and COPA completed a review of these depositions. None of the depositions contained information, insofar as it related to the allegations in this case, substantially different from the statements given to IPRA.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

Officer A

COPA recommends that allegation #1, that PO Officer A pointed a gun at Subject 2 without justification be **Not Sustained**. None of the officers recalled drawing or pointing their firearms at Subject 2. Subject 2's credibility is damaged by the inconsistencies between the information she communicated on the day of the incident and the day of her statement with IPRA. Subject 1's credibility is damaged for similar reasons. Additionally, Subject 2 and Subject 1 had substantially different accounts of what occurred on the day of the incident. These inconsistencies call into question all their statements. There is insufficient evidence to prove that PO Officer A pointed his gun at Subject 2.

COPA recommends that allegation #2, that PO Officer A directed profanity at Subject 2 **Not Sustained**. There is insufficient evidence to prove that PO Officer A directed profanity at Subject 2.

COPA recommends that allegation #3, that PO Officer A handcuffed Subject 2 too tightly be **Unfounded**. PO Officer C admitted that he was the one who handcuffed Subject 2.

COPA recommends that allegation #4, that PO Officer A "clotheslined" Subject 1 by placing his arm against Subject 1's chest and kicking him on his left thigh, causing him to fall to

the ground and break his left leg be **Unfounded**. The evidence indicates that it is more likely than not that Subject 1 broke his leg while running from the officers. The Original Case Incident Report indicates that Subject 1 told Physician Assistant A, in the presence of Sergeant A, that the leg injury occurred when Subject 1 was running and fell. In her statement to IPRA, Physician Assistant A affirmed this narrative, stating that Subject 1 told her he had been running and heard a pop in his left leg which caused him to fall. Physician Assistant A also stated in her interview that Subject 1 never mentioned police officers as the cause of his injury.

The Chicago Fire Department Ambulance Report indicates that Subject 1 complained to them of pain in his left leg after tripping and falling while running from the police. Paramedic A told IPRA that she did not recall Subject 1 ever mentioning in the ambulance ride from the scene to the hospital that officers physically assaulted him. In his statement to IPRA, Sergeant A recalled hearing a physician's assistant asking Subject 1 what happened to his leg, to which he responded that he sustained the injury when he ran from the police and fell. Sergeant A also personally asked Subject 1 what happened, and Sergeant A recalled Subject 1 telling him the same story. Additionally, PO Officer C recalled, in his interview with IPRA, that Subject 1 told him on the day of the incident that he injured his leg while running from the police. PO Officer C also recalled Subject 1 telling all medical personnel present that day that he fell and hurt himself running from the police. Admittedly, police officers were present at all times that Subject 1 spoke with medical personnel. Subject 1, however, never raised this as a reason why he told medical personnel a story substantially different from the one he told IPRA and consistent with the narrative given by all officer witnesses.

The evidence from both interested and disinterested witnesses tells a consistent story. It is more likely than not that Subject 1 sustained his leg injury while running from the accused.

COPA recommends that allegation #5, that PO Officer A repeatedly punched Subject 1 about the head and body be **Unfounded**. The totality of the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that no officer made violent physical contact with Subject 1. Most importantly, Subject 1 never mentions to any officer or medical personnel on the day of the incident that anything happened to him other than a fall. The only evidence that would tend to support Subject 1's allegations came from Subject 1 himself and Subject 2. On the other hand, evidence that tended to disprove Subject 1's allegations came from medical records, Physician Assistant A, Paramedic A, and Sergeant A. All accused officers also denied these allegations.

COPA recommends that allegation #6, that PO Officer A repeatedly kicked Subject 1 about the head and body be **Unfounded**. The totality of the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that no officer made violent physical contact with Subject 1. Most importantly, Subject 1 never mentions to any officer or medical personnel on the day of the incident that anything happened to him other than a fall. The only evidence that would tend to support Subject 1's allegations came from Subject 1 himself and Subject 2. On the other hand, evidence that tended to disprove Subject 1's allegations came from medical records, Physician Assistant A, Paramedic A, and Sergeant A. All accused officers also denied these allegations.

COPA recommends that allegation #7, that PO Officer A dragged Subject 1 across the pavement be **Unfounded**. The totality of the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that no officer made violent physical contact with Subject 1. Most importantly, Subject 1 never mentions

to any officer or medical personnel on the day of the incident that anything happened to him other than a fall. The only evidence that would tend to support Subject 1's allegations came from Subject 1 himself and Subject 2. On the other hand, evidence that tended to disprove Subject 1's allegations came from medical records, Physician Assistant A, Paramedic A, and Sergeant A. All accused officers also denied these allegations.

Officer B

COPA recommends that allegation #1, that PO Officer B pointed a gun at Subject 2 without justification be **Not Sustained**. None of the officers recalled drawing or pointing their firearms at Subject 2. Subject 2's credibility is damaged by the inconsistencies between the information she communicated on the day of the incident and the day of her statement with IPRA. Subject 1's credibility is damaged for similar reasons. Additionally, Subject 2 and Subject 1 had substantially different accounts of what occurred on the day of the incident. These inconsistencies call into question all of their statements. There is insufficient evidence to prove that PO Officer B pointed his gun at Subject 2.

COPA recommends that allegation #2, that PO Officer B directed profanity at Subject 2 be **Not Sustained**. There is insufficient evidence to prove that PO Officer B directed profanity at Subject 2.

COPA recommends that allegation #3, that PO Officer B handcuffed Subject 2 too tightly be **Unfounded**. PO Officer C admitted that he was the one who handcuffed Subject 2.

COPA recommends that allegation #4, that PO Officer B "clotheslined" Subject 1 by placing his arm against Subject 1's chest and kicking him on his left thigh, causing him to fall to the ground and break his left leg be **Unfounded**. The evidence indicates that it is more likely than not that Subject 1 broke his leg while running from the officers. The Original Case Incident Report indicates that Subject 1 told Physician Assistant A, in the presence of Sergeant A, that the leg injury occurred when Subject 1 was running and fell. In her statement to IPRA, Physician Assistant A affirmed this narrative, stating that Subject 1 told her he had been running and heard a pop in his left leg which caused him to fall. Physician Assistant A also stated in her interview that Subject 1 never mentioned police officers as the cause of his injury.

The Chicago Fire Department Ambulance Report indicates that Subject 1 complained to them of pain in his left leg after tripping and falling while running from the police. Paramedic A told IPRA that she did not recall Subject 1 ever mentioning in the ambulance ride from the scene to the hospital that officers physically assaulted him. In his statement to IPRA, Sergeant A recalled hearing a physician's assistant asking Subject 1 what happened to his leg, to which he responded that he sustained the injury when he ran from the police and fell. Sergeant A also personally asked Subject 1 what happened, and Sergeant A recalled Subject 1 telling him the same story. Additionally, PO Officer C recalled, in his interview with IPRA, that Subject 1 told him on the day of the incident that he injured his leg while running from the police. PO Officer C also recalled Subject 1 telling all medical personnel present that day that he fell and hurt himself running from the police. Admittedly, police officers were present at all times that Subject 1 spoke with medical personnel. Subject 1, however, never raised this as a reason why he told medical personnel a story substantially different from the one he told IPRA and consistent with the narrative given by all officer witnesses.

The evidence from both interested and disinterested witnesses tells a consistent story. It is more likely than not that Subject 1 sustained his leg injury while running from the accused.

COPA recommends that allegation #5, that PO Officer B repeatedly punched Subject 1 about the head and body be **Unfounded**. The totality of the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that no officer made violent physical contact with Subject 1. Most importantly, Subject 1 never mentions to any officer or medical personnel on the day of the incident that anything happened to him other than a fall. The only evidence that would tend to support Subject 1's allegations came from Subject 1 himself and Subject 2. On the other hand, evidence that tended to disprove Subject 1's allegations came from medical records, Physician Assistant A, Paramedic A, and Sergeant A. All accused officers also denied these allegations.

COPA recommends that allegation #6, that PO Officer B repeatedly kicked Subject 1 about the head and body be **Unfounded**. The totality of the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that no officer made violent physical contact with Subject 1. Most importantly, Subject 1 never mentions to any officer or medical personnel on the day of the incident that anything happened to him other than a fall. The only evidence that would tend to support Subject 1's allegations came from Subject 1 himself and Subject 2. On the other hand, evidence that tended to disprove Subject 1's allegations came from medical records, Physician Assistant A, Paramedic A, and Sergeant A. All accused officers also denied these allegations.

COPA recommends that allegation #7, that PO Officer B dragged Subject 1 across the pavement be **Unfounded**. The totality of the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that no officer made violent physical contact with Subject 1. Most importantly, Subject 1 never mentions to any officer or medical personnel on the day of the incident that anything happened to him other than a fall. The only evidence that would tend to support Subject 1's allegations came from Subject 1 himself and Subject 2. On the other hand, evidence that tended to disprove Subject 1's allegations came from medical records, Physician Assistant A, Paramedic A, and Sergeant A. All accused officers also denied these allegations.

Officer C

COPA recommends that allegation #1, that PO Officer C pointed a gun at Subject 2 without justification be **Not Sustained**. None of the officers recalled drawing or pointing their firearms at Subject 2. Subject 2's credibility is damaged by the inconsistencies between the information she communicated on the day of the incident and the day of her statement with IPRA. Subject 1's credibility is damaged for similar reasons. Additionally, Subject 2 and Subject 1 had substantially different accounts of what occurred on the day of the incident. These inconsistencies call into question all of their statements. There is insufficient evidence to prove that PO Officer C pointed his gun at Subject 2.

COPA recommends that allegation #2, that PO Officer C directed profanity at Subject 2 be **Not Sustained**. There is insufficient evidence to prove that PO Officer C directed profanity at Subject 2.

COPA recommends that allegation #3, that PO Officer C handcuffed Subject 2 too tightly be **Not Sustained**. PO Officer C admitted that he was the one who handcuffed Subject 2, but there is insufficient evidence to prove that PO Officer C handcuffed Subject 2 too tightly. Subject 2's

credibility is damaged by the inconsistencies between the information she communicated on the day of the incident and the day of her statement with IPRA. Additionally, Subject 2 and Subject 1 had substantially different accounts of what occurred on the day of the incident. These inconsistencies call into question all of their statements.

COPA recommends that allegation #4, that PO Officer C “clotheslined” Subject 1 by placing his arm against Subject 1’s chest and kicking him on his left thigh, causing him to fall to the ground and break his left leg be **Unfounded**. The evidence indicates that it is more likely than not that Subject 1 broke his leg while running from the officers. The Original Case Incident Report indicates that Subject 1 told Physician Assistant A, in the presence of Sergeant A, that the leg injury occurred when Subject 1 was running and fell. In her statement to IPRA, Physician Assistant A affirmed this narrative, stating that Subject 1 told her he had been running and heard a pop in his left leg which caused him to fall. Physician Assistant A also stated in her interview that Subject 1 never mentioned police officers as the cause of his injury.

The Chicago Fire Department Ambulance Report indicates that Subject 1 complained to them of pain in his left leg after tripping and falling while running from the police. Paramedic A told IPRA that she did not recall Subject 1 ever mentioning in the ambulance ride from the scene to the hospital that officers physically assaulted him. In his statement to IPRA, Sergeant A recalled hearing a physician’s assistant asking Subject 1 what happened to his leg, to which he responded that he sustained the injury when he ran from the police and fell. Sergeant A also personally asked Subject 1 what happened, and Sergeant A recalled Subject 1 telling him the same story. Additionally, PO Officer C recalled, in his interview with IPRA, that Subject 1 told him on the day of the incident that he injured his leg while running from the police. PO Officer C also recalled Subject 1 telling all medical personnel present that day that he fell and hurt himself running from the police. Admittedly, police officers were present at all times that Subject 1 spoke with medical personnel. Subject 1, however, never raised this as a reason why he told medical personnel a story substantially different from the one he told IPRA and consistent with the narrative given by all officer witnesses.

The evidence from both interested and disinterested witnesses tells a consistent story. It is more likely than not that Subject 1 sustained his leg injury while running from the accused.

COPA recommends that allegation #5, that PO Officer C repeatedly punched Subject 1 about the head and body be **Unfounded**. The totality of the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that no officer made violent physical contact with Subject 1. Most importantly, Subject 1 never mentions to any officer or medical personnel on the day of the incident that anything happened to him other than a fall. The only evidence that would tend to support Subject 1’s allegations came from Subject 1 himself and Subject 2. On the other hand, evidence that tended to disprove Subject 1’s allegations came from medical records, Physician Assistant A, Paramedic A, and Sergeant A. All accused officers also denied these allegations.

COPA recommends that allegation #6, that PO Officer C repeatedly kicked Subject 1 about the head and body be **Unfounded**. The totality of the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that no officer made violent physical contact with Subject 1. Most importantly, Subject 1 never mentions to any officer or medical personnel on the day of the incident that anything happened to him other than a fall. The only evidence that would tend to support Subject 1’s allegations came

from Subject 1 himself and Subject 2. On the other hand, evidence that tended to disprove Subject 1's allegations came from medical records, Physician Assistant A, Paramedic A, and Sergeant A. All accused officers also denied these allegations.

COPA recommends that allegation #7, that PO Officer C dragged Subject 1 across the pavement be **Unfounded**. The totality of the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that no officer made violent physical contact with Subject 1. Most importantly, Subject 1 never mentions to any officer or medical personnel on the day of the incident that anything happened to him other than a fall. The only evidence that would tend to support Subject 1's allegations came from Subject 1 himself and Subject 2. On the other hand, evidence that tended to disprove Subject 1's allegations came from medical records, Physician Assistant A, Paramedic A, and Sergeant A. All accused officers also denied these allegations.

Officer D

COPA recommends that allegation #1, that PO Officer D pointed a gun at Subject 2 without justification be **Not Sustained**. None of the officers recalled drawing or pointing their firearms at Subject 2. Subject 2's credibility is damaged by the inconsistencies between the information she communicated on the day of the incident and the day of her statement with IPRA. Subject 1's credibility is damaged for similar reasons. Additionally, Subject 2 and Subject 1 had substantially different accounts of what occurred on the day of the incident. These inconsistencies call into question all of their statements. There is insufficient evidence to prove that PO Officer D pointed his gun at Subject 2.

COPA recommends that allegation #2, that PO Officer D directed profanity at Subject 2 be **Not Sustained**. There is insufficient evidence to prove that PO Officer D directed profanity at Subject 2.

COPA recommends that allegation #3, that PO Officer D handcuffed Subject 2 too tightly be **Unfounded**. PO Officer C admitted that he was the one who handcuffed Subject 2.

COPA recommends that allegation #4, that PO Officer D "clotheslined" Subject 1 by placing his arm against Subject 1's chest and kicking him on his left thigh, causing him to fall to the ground and break his left leg be **Unfounded**. The evidence indicates that it is more likely than not that Subject 1 broke his leg while running from the officers. The Original Case Incident Report indicates that Subject 1 told Physician Assistant A, in the presence of Sergeant A, that the leg injury occurred when Subject 1 was running and fell. In her statement to IPRA, Physician Assistant A affirmed this narrative, stating that Subject 1 told her he had been running and heard a pop in his left leg which caused him to fall. Physician Assistant A also stated in her interview that Subject 1 never mentioned police officers as the cause of his injury.

The Chicago Fire Department Ambulance Report indicates that Subject 1 complained to them of pain in his left leg after tripping and falling while running from the police. Paramedic A told IPRA that she did not recall Subject 1 ever mentioning in the ambulance ride from the scene to the hospital that officers physically assaulted him. In his statement to IPRA, Sergeant A recalled hearing a physician's assistant asking Subject 1 what happened to his leg, to which he responded that he sustained the injury when he ran from the police and fell. Sergeant A also personally asked Subject 1 what happened, and Sergeant A recalled Subject 1 telling him the same story.

CIVILIAN OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
LOG #1074294

Additionally, PO Officer C recalled, in his interview with IPRA, that Subject 1 told him on the day of the incident that he injured his leg while running from the police. PO Officer C also recalled Subject 1 telling all medical personnel present that day that he fell and hurt himself running from the police. Admittedly, police officers were present at all times that Subject 1 spoke with medical personnel. Subject 1, however, never raised this as a reason why he told medical personnel a story substantially different from the one he told IPRA and consistent with the narrative given by all officer witnesses.

The evidence from both interested and disinterested witnesses tells a consistent story. It is more likely than not that Subject 1 sustained his leg injury while running from the accused.

COPA recommends that allegation #5, that PO Officer D repeatedly punched Subject 1 about the head and body be **Unfounded**. The totality of the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that no officer made violent physical contact with Subject 1. Most importantly, Subject 1 never mentions to any officer or medical personnel on the day of the incident that anything happened to him other than a fall. The only evidence that would tend to support Subject 1's allegations came from Subject 1 himself and Subject 2. On the other hand, evidence that tended to disprove Subject 1's allegations came from medical records, Physician Assistant A, Paramedic A, and Sergeant A. All accused officers also denied these allegations.

COPA recommends that allegation #6, that PO Officer D repeatedly kicked Subject 1 about the head and body be **Unfounded**. The totality of the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that no officer made violent physical contact with Subject 1. Most importantly, Subject 1 never mentions to any officer or medical personnel on the day of the incident that anything happened to him other than a fall. The only evidence that would tend to support Subject 1's allegations came from Subject 1 himself and Subject 2. On the other hand, evidence that tended to disprove Subject 1's allegations came from medical records, Physician Assistant A, Paramedic A, and Sergeant A. All accused officers also denied these allegations.

COPA recommends that allegation #7, that PO Officer D dragged Subject 1 across the pavement be **Unfounded**. The totality of the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that no officer made violent physical contact with Subject 1. Most importantly, Subject 1 never mentions to any officer or medical personnel on the day of the incident that anything happened to him other than a fall. The only evidence that would tend to support Subject 1's allegations came from Subject 1 himself and Subject 2. On the other hand, evidence that tended to disprove Subject 1's allegations came from medical records, Physician Assistant A, Paramedic A, and Sergeant A. All accused officers also denied these allegations.

Officer Officer E

COPA recommends that allegation #1, that PO Officer E pointed a gun at Subject 2 without justification be **Not Sustained**. None of the officers recalled drawing or pointing their firearms at Subject 2. Subject 2's credibility is damaged by the inconsistencies between the information she communicated on the day of the incident and the day of her statement with IPRA. Subject 1's credibility is damaged for similar reasons. Additionally, Subject 2 and Subject 1 had substantially different accounts of what occurred on the day of the incident. These inconsistencies call into question all of their statements. There is insufficient evidence to prove that PO Officer E pointed his gun at Subject 2.

COPA recommends that allegation #2, that PO Officer E directed profanity at Subject 2 **Not Sustained**. There is insufficient evidence to prove that PO Officer E directed profanity at Subject 2.

COPA recommends that allegation #3, that PO Officer E handcuffed Subject 2 too tightly be **Unfounded**. PO Officer C admitted that he was the one who handcuffed Subject 2.

COPA recommends that allegation #4, that PO Officer E “clotheslined” Subject 1 by placing his arm against Subject 1’s chest and kicking him on his left thigh, causing him to fall to the ground and break his left leg be **Unfounded**. The evidence indicates that it is more likely than not that Subject 1 broke his leg while running from the officers. The Original Case Incident Report indicates that Subject 1 told Physician Assistant A, in the presence of Sergeant A, that the leg injury occurred when Subject 1 was running and fell. In her statement to IPRA, Physician Assistant A affirmed this narrative, stating that Subject 1 told her he had been running and heard a pop in his left leg which caused him to fall. Physician Assistant A also stated in her interview that Subject 1 never mentioned police officers as the cause of his injury.

The Chicago Fire Department Ambulance Report indicates that Subject 1 complained to them of pain in his left leg after tripping and falling while running from the police. Paramedic A told IPRA that she did not recall Subject 1 ever mentioning in the ambulance ride from the scene to the hospital that officers physically assaulted him. In his statement to IPRA, Sergeant A recalled hearing a physician’s assistant asking Subject 1 what happened to his leg, to which he responded that he sustained the injury when he ran from the police and fell. Sergeant A also personally asked Subject 1 what happened, and Sergeant A recalled Subject 1 telling him the same story. Additionally, PO Officer C recalled, in his interview with IPRA, that Subject 1 told him on the day of the incident that he injured his leg while running from the police. PO Officer C also recalled Subject 1 telling all medical personnel present that day that he fell and hurt himself running from the police. Admittedly, police officers were present at all times that Subject 1 spoke with medical personnel. Subject 1, however, never raised this as a reason why he told medical personnel a story substantially different from the one he told IPRA and consistent with the narrative given by all officer witnesses.

The evidence from both interested and disinterested witnesses tells a consistent story. It is more likely than not that Subject 1 sustained his leg injury while running from the accused.

COPA recommends that allegation #5, that PO Officer E repeatedly punched Subject 1 about the head and body be **Unfounded**. The totality of the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that no officer made violent physical contact with Subject 1. Most importantly, Subject 1 never mentions to any officer or medical personnel on the day of the incident that anything happened to him other than a fall. The only evidence that would tend to support Subject 1’s allegations came from Subject 1 himself and Subject 2. On the other hand, evidence that tended to disprove Subject 1’s allegations came from medical records, physician assistant Physician Assistant A, Paramedic A, and Sergeant A. All accused officers also denied these allegations.

COPA recommends that allegation #6, that PO Officer E repeatedly kicked Subject 1 about the head and body be **Unfounded**. The totality of the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that no officer made violent physical contact with Subject 1. Most importantly, Subject 1 never mentions to any officer or medical personnel on the day of the incident that anything happened to

him other than a fall. The only evidence that would tend to support Subject 1's allegations came from Subject 1 himself and Subject 2. On the other hand, evidence that tended to disprove Subject 1's allegations came from medical records, Physician Assistant A, Paramedic A, and Sergeant A. All accused officers also denied these allegations.

COPA recommends that allegation #7, that PO Officer E dragged Subject 1 across the pavement be **Unfounded**. The totality of the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that no officer made violent physical contact with Subject 1. Most importantly, Subject 1 never mentions to any officer or medical personnel on the day of the incident that anything happened to him other than a fall. The only evidence that would tend to support Subject 1's allegations came from Subject 1 himself and Subject 2. On the other hand, evidence that tended to disprove Subject 1's allegations came from medical records, Physician Assistant A, Paramedic A, and Sergeant A. All accused officers also denied these allegations.

Officer Officer F

COPA recommends that allegation #1, that PO Officer F pointed a gun at Subject 2 without justification be **Not Sustained**. None of the officers recalled drawing or pointing their firearms at Subject 2. Subject 2's credibility is damaged by the inconsistencies between the information she communicated on the day of the incident and the day of her statement with IPRA. Subject 1's credibility is damaged for similar reasons. Additionally, Subject 2 and Subject 1 had substantially different accounts of what occurred on the day of the incident. These inconsistencies call into question all of their statements. There is insufficient evidence to prove that PO Officer F pointed his gun at Subject 2.

COPA recommends that allegation #2, that PO Officer F directed profanity at Subject 2 be **Not Sustained**. There is insufficient evidence to prove that PO Officer F directed profanity at Subject 2.

COPA recommends that allegation #3, that PO Officer F handcuffed Subject 2 too tightly be **Unfounded**. PO Officer C admitted that he was the one who handcuffed Subject 2.

COPA recommends that allegation #4, that PO Officer F "clotheslined" Subject 1 by placing his arm against Subject 1's chest and kicking him on his left thigh, causing him to fall to the ground and break his left leg be **Unfounded**. The evidence indicates that it is more likely than not that Subject 1 broke his leg while running from the officers. The Original Case Incident Report indicates that Subject 1 told Physician Assistant A, in the presence of Sergeant A, that the leg injury occurred when Subject 1 was running and fell. In her statement to IPRA, Physician Assistant A affirmed this narrative, stating that Subject 1 told her he had been running and heard a pop in his left leg which caused him to fall. Physician Assistant A also stated in her interview that Subject 1 never mentioned police officers as the cause of his injury.

The Chicago Fire Department Ambulance Report indicates that Subject 1 complained to them of pain in his left leg after tripping and falling while running from the police. Paramedic A told IPRA that she did not recall Subject 1 ever mentioning in the ambulance ride from the scene to the hospital that officers physically assaulted him. In his statement to IPRA, Sergeant A recalled hearing a physician's assistant asking Subject 1 what happened to his leg, to which he responded that he sustained the injury when he ran from the police and fell. Sergeant A also personally asked

Subject 1 what happened, and Sergeant A recalled Subject 1 telling him the same story. Additionally, PO Officer C recalled, in his interview with IPRA, that Subject 1 told him on the day of the incident that he injured his leg while running from the police. PO Officer C also recalled Subject 1 telling all medical personnel present that day that he fell and hurt himself running from the police. Admittedly, police officers were present at all times that Subject 1 spoke with medical personnel. Subject 1, however, never raised this as a reason why he told medical personnel a story substantially different from the one he told IPRA and consistent with the narrative given by all officer witnesses.

The evidence from both interested and disinterested witnesses tells a consistent story. It is more likely than not that Subject 1 sustained his leg injury while running from the accused.

COPA recommends that allegation #5, that PO Officer F repeatedly punched Subject 1 about the head and body be **Unfounded**. The totality of the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that no officer made violent physical contact with Subject 1. Most importantly, Subject 1 never mentions to any officer or medical personnel on the day of the incident that anything happened to him other than a fall. The only evidence that would tend to support Subject 1's allegations came from Subject 1 himself and Subject 2. On the other hand, evidence that tended to disprove Subject 1's allegations came from medical records, Physician Assistant A, Paramedic A, and Sergeant A. All accused officers also denied these allegations.

COPA recommends that allegation #6, that PO Officer F repeatedly kicked Subject 1 about the head and body be **Unfounded**. The totality of the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that no officer made violent physical contact with Subject 1. Most importantly, Subject 1 never mentions to any officer or medical personnel on the day of the incident that anything happened to him other than a fall. The only evidence that would tend to support Subject 1's allegations came from Subject 1 himself and Subject 2. On the other hand, evidence that tended to disprove Subject 1's allegations came from medical records, Physician Assistant A, Paramedic A, and Sergeant A. All accused officers also denied these allegations.

COPA recommends that allegation #7, that PO Officer F dragged Subject 1 across the pavement be **Unfounded**. The totality of the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that no officer made violent physical contact with Subject 1. Most importantly, Subject 1 never mentions to any officer or medical personnel on the day of the incident that anything happened to him other than a fall. The only evidence that would tend to support Subject 1's allegations came from Subject 1 himself and Subject 2. On the other hand, evidence that tended to disprove Subject 1's allegations came from medical records, Physician Assistant A, Paramedic A, and Sergeant A. All accused officers also denied these allegations.

Officer Officer G

COPA recommends that allegation #1, that PO Officer G pointed a gun at Subject 2 without justification be **Not Sustained**. None of the officers recalled drawing or pointing their firearms at Subject 2. Subject 2's credibility is damaged by the inconsistencies between the information she communicated on the day of the incident and the day of her statement with IPRA. Subject 1's credibility is damaged for similar reasons. Additionally, Subject 2 and Subject 1 had substantially different accounts of what occurred on the day of the incident. These inconsistencies call into

question all of their statements. There is insufficient evidence to prove that PO Officer G pointed his gun at Subject 2.

COPA recommends that allegation #2, that PO Officer G directed profanity at Subject 2 **Not Sustained**. There is insufficient evidence to prove that PO Officer G directed profanity at Subject 2.

COPA recommends that allegation #3, that PO Officer G handcuffed Subject 2 too tightly be **Unfounded**. PO Officer C admitted that he was the one who handcuffed Subject 2.

COPA recommends that allegation #4, that PO Officer G “clotheslined” Subject 1 by placing his arm against Subject 1’s chest and kicking him on his left thigh, causing him to fall to the ground and break his left leg be **Unfounded**. The evidence indicates that it is more likely than not that Subject 1 broke his leg while running from the officers. The Original Case Incident Report indicates that Subject 1 told Physician Assistant A, in the presence of Sergeant A, that the leg injury occurred when Subject 1 was running and fell. In her statement to IPRA, Physician Assistant A affirmed this narrative, stating that Subject 1 told her he had been running and heard a pop in his left leg which caused him to fall. Physician Assistant A also stated in her interview that Subject 1 never mentioned police officers as the cause of his injury.

The Chicago Police Department Ambulance Report indicates that Subject 1 complained to them of pain in his left leg after tripping and falling while running from the police. Paramedic A told IPRA that she did not recall Subject 1 ever mentioning in the ambulance ride from the scene to the hospital that officers physically assaulted him. In his statement to IPRA, Sergeant A recalled hearing a physician’s assistant asking Subject 1 what happened to his leg, to which he responded that he sustained the injury when he ran from the police and fell. Sergeant A also personally asked Subject 1 what happened, and Sergeant A recalled Subject 1 telling him the same story. Additionally, PO Officer C recalled, in his interview with IPRA, that Subject 1 told him on the day of the incident that he injured his leg while running from the police. PO Officer C also recalled Subject 1 telling all medical personnel present that day that he fell and hurt himself running from the police. Admittedly, police officers were present at all times that Subject 1 spoke with medical personnel. Subject 1, however, never raised this as a reason why he told medical personnel a story substantially different from the one he told IPRA and consistent with the narrative given by all officer witnesses.

The evidence from both interested and disinterested witnesses tells a consistent story. It is more likely than not that Subject 1 sustained his leg injury while running from the accused.

COPA recommends that allegation #5, that PO Officer G repeatedly punched Subject 1 about the head and body be **Unfounded**. The totality of the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that no officer made violent physical contact with Subject 1. Most importantly, Subject 1 never mentions to any officer or medical personnel on the day of the incident that anything happened to him other than a fall. The only evidence that would tend to support Subject 1’s allegations came from Subject 1 himself and Subject 2. On the other hand, evidence that tended to disprove Subject 1’s allegations came from medical records, Physician Assistant A, Paramedic A, and Sergeant A. All accused officers also denied these allegations.

COPA recommends that allegation #6, that PO Officer G repeatedly kicked Subject 1 about the head and body be **Unfounded**. The totality of the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that no officer made violent physical contact with Subject 1. Most importantly, Subject 1 never mentions to any officer or medical personnel on the day of the incident that anything happened to him other than a fall. The only evidence that would tend to support Subject 1's allegations came from Subject 1 himself and Subject 2. On the other hand, evidence that tended to disprove Subject 1's allegations came from medical records, physician assistant Physician Assistant A, Paramedic A, and Sergeant A. All accused officers also denied these allegations.

COPA recommends that allegation #7, that PO Officer G dragged Subject 1 across the pavement be **Unfounded**. The totality of the evidence shows that it is more likely than not that no officer made violent physical contact with Subject 1. Most importantly, Subject 1 never mentions to any officer or medical personnel on the day of the incident that anything happened to him other than a fall. The only evidence that would tend to support Subject 1's allegations came from Subject 1 himself and Subject 2. On the other hand, evidence that tended to disprove Subject 1's allegations came from medical records, Physician Assistant A, Paramedic A, and Sergeant A. All accused officers also denied these allegations.

FINDINGS

<u>ACCUSED</u>	Officer A, Star #XXXXXX, Employee #XXXXXX, Unit XXX
Allegations 1-2	Not Sustained
Allegations 3-7	Unfounded
<u>ACCUSED</u>	Officer B, Star #XXXXXX, Employee #XXXXXX, Unit XXX
Allegations 1-2	Not Sustained
Allegations 3-7	Unfounded
<u>ACCUSED</u>	Officer C, Star #XXXX, Employee #XXXX, Unit XXX
Allegations 1-3	Not Sustained
Allegations 4-7	Unfounded
<u>ACCUSED</u>	Officer D, Star #XXXXXX, Employee #XXXXXX, Unit XXX
Allegations 1-2	Not Sustained
Allegations 3-7	Unfounded
<u>ACCUSED</u>	Officer E, Star #XXXXXX, Employee #XXXXXX, Unit XXX
Allegations 1-2	Not Sustained

CIVILIAN OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
LOG #1074294

Allegations 3-7 Unfounded

ACCUSED Officer F, Star #XXXXXX, Employee #XXXX, Unit XXX

Allegations 1-2 Not Sustained

Allegations 3-7 Unfounded

ACCUSED Officer G, Star #XXXXXX, Employee #XXXX, Unit XXX

Allegations 1-2 Not Sustained

Allegations 3-7 Unfounded