

**SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION****I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Date of Incident:	August 28, 2016
Time of Incident:	6:43 PM
Location of Incident:	XXX S. Normal Ave.
Date of COPA Notification:	November 20, 2017
Time of COPA Notification:	2:24 PM

On August 28, 2016 at approximately 6:20 PM, Subject 1, was arrested for aggravated discharge of a firearm and unlawful use of a weapon. Subject 1 reportedly fired a weapon in self-defense and alleged that he was refused a lawyer by Detectives A and B. Subject 1 also alleged that Officers C and D fabricated the police report, refused to turn on their body worn cameras, did not have a working dash camera, pulled Subject 1 out of his vehicle illegally, and searched Subject 1's vehicle without his consent. After conducting an interview with Subject 1, he clarified his statements and no misconduct was identified regarding Detectives A and B. Subject 1 also alleged that Sergeant E made a false report, which was Exonerated without serving Sergeant E with the allegation. Interviews were held with Officers C and D, and the allegations against Officer C and Officer D were Unfounded, Exonerated, and Not Sustained.

**II. INVOLVED PARTIES**

Involved Officer #1:	Officer C, Star #XXX, Employee ID # XXX, Date of Appointment: XXX, 2006, Police Officer, XXX (Gang Investigations), Date of Birth: XXX, 1982, Male, White
Involved Officer #2:	Officer D, Star # XXX, Employee ID # XXX, Date of Appointment: XXX, 1998, XXX (Midway Airport), Date of Birth: XXX, 1970, Male, White
Involved Officer #3:	Officer A, Star # XXX, Employee ID # XXX, Date of Appointment: XXX, 1999, Detective, XXX (Bureau of Detectives – Area South), Date of Birth: XXX, 1976, Male, Asian
Involved Officer #4:	Officer B, Star # XXX, Employee ID # XXX, Date of Appointment: XXX, 1996, XXX (Bureau of Detectives – Area South), Date of Birth: XXX, 1971, Male, White

Involved Officer #5:	Officer E, Star # XXX, Employee ID # XXX, Date of Appointment: XXX, 1988, Sergeant, District XX, Date of Birth: XXX, 1963, Male, White
Subject #1:	Subject 1, Date of Birth: XXX, 1993, Male, Black

**III. ALLEGATIONS**

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Officer C <sup>1</sup>	1. Struck Subject 1 in the face with his palm, in violation of Rule 6, Rule 8, and Rule 9.	Unfounded
	2. Provided a false report in Subject 1’s arrest report that Subject 1 exited his car voluntarily, in violation of Rule 14.	Unfounded
	3. Failed to turn on his Body Worn Camera (BWC), in violation of Rule 6.	Exonerated
	4. Searched Subject 1’s vehicle without consent, in violation of Rule 6.	Exonerated
	5. Provided a false report that officers saw a gun in Subject 1’s car, in violation of Rule 14.	Unfounded
	6. Provided a false report that officers saw Subject 1 speeding, in violation of Rule 14.	Unfounded
	7. Pulled Subject 1 out of his car illegally, in violation of Rule 6.	Unfounded
Officer D <sup>2</sup>	1. Failed to turn on his Body Worn Camera (BWC), in violation of Rule 6.	Exonerated
	2. Searched Subject 1’s vehicle without consent, in violation of Rule 6.	Exonerated
	3. Provided a false report that officers saw a gun in Subject 1’s car, in violation of Rule 14.	Unfounded

<sup>1</sup> Officer C was not served with Allegations 3 – 7, as COPA was able to determine they were Unfounded and Exonerated through available evidence. These allegations are further discussed in the Analysis portion of this report.

<sup>2</sup> Officer D was not served with any allegations, as COPA was able to determine they were Unfounded and Exonerated through available evidence. These allegations are further discussed in the Analysis portion of this report.

	4. Provided a false report that officers saw Subject 1 speeding, in violation of Rule 14.	Unfounded
Detective <sup>3</sup> A	1. Denied Subject 1 a lawyer, in violation of Rule 6. 2. Conducted his investigation with bias, in violation of Rule 6.	Unfounded Unfounded
Detective B <sup>4</sup>	1. Denied Subject 1 a lawyer, in violation of Rule 6. 2. Conducted his investigation with bias, in violation of Rule 6.	Unfounded Unfounded
Sergeant E <sup>5</sup>	1. Provided a false report that Subject 1 told the sergeant “Theres [sic] always a gun in that van.Its [sic] the family car,” in violation of Rule 14.	Exonerated

#### IV. APPLICABLE RULES AND LAWS

---

##### Rules

---

1. **Rule 6:** Prohibits disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.
2. **Rule 8:** Prohibits disrespect to or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty.
3. **Rule 9:** Prohibits engaging in any unjustified verbal or physical altercation with any person, while on or off duty.
4. **Rule 14:** Prohibits making a false report, written or oral.

---

##### General Orders

---

1. **General Order G03-02:** Use of Force Guidelines<sup>6</sup>
2. **General Order G03-02-01:** The Use of Force Model<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Detective A was not served with allegations as COPA was able to Unfounded both claims with available evidence. These findings are further discussed in the Analysis portion of this report.

<sup>4</sup> Detective B was not served with allegations as COPA was able to Unfounded both claims with available evidence. These findings are further discussed in the Analysis portion of this report.

<sup>5</sup> Sergeant E was not served with allegations as COPA was able to determine he did not engaged in misconduct. This finding is further discussed in the Analysis portion of this report.

<sup>6</sup> The Use of Force Guidelines referenced in this report were effective from October 2002 until October 2017 (See Att. 40).

<sup>7</sup> The Use of Force Model policy referenced in this report was effective from May 2012 until October 2017 (See Att. 41).

3. **General Order G04-03:** Custodial Interrogations

4. **General Order G02-04:** Prohibition Regarding Racial Profiling and Other Biased Based Policing

---

Special Orders

---

1. **Special Order S03-14:** Body Worn Cameras

---

United States Constitution

---

1. **Fourth Amendment:** guarantees protection from unlawful arrest and unreasonable search and seizure to all persons in this country.

## V. INVESTIGATION<sup>8</sup>

### a. Interviews

Subject 1 (via his wife, Civilian 2) submitted an **online complaint** to COPA on November 18, 2017.<sup>9</sup> On August 28, 2016, Subject 1 was arrested for aggravated discharge of a firearm and unlawful use of a weapon. Subject 1 believed he was acting in self-defense and alleged Detectives B and A investigated with bias and refused him a lawyer. Subject 1 further alleged that Officers C and D fabricated their police report, turned off their body worn cameras, and had a broken in-car camera. Lastly, Subject 1 stated that Officers C and D pulled Subject 1 out of his car illegally and illegally searched his vehicle.

On February 16, 2018, COPA interviewed the complainant, **Subject 1**.<sup>10</sup> Subject 1 stated that on August 28, 2016, he was picking up his mother from her boyfriend's house near 112<sup>th</sup> and Eggleston. When he arrived, Subject 1's mother was arguing with her boyfriend in front of the home. Subject 1 exited the car and when the boyfriend saw Subject 1's two friends in the back seat, the boyfriend went back into his house and came back out with a gun. Subject 1 had gone back into his vehicle but exited again when the boyfriend returned outside. The boyfriend shot at Subject 1's car. Subject 1 responded by returning fire approximately nine times before returning to his vehicle. Subject 1 "sat" the gun on the driver's side floor and drove off. When Subject 1 drove away, a CPD vehicle pulled behind Subject 1, followed him for about half a block, and then turned the vehicles emergency lights on. Subject 1 stopped his car as soon as the CPD vehicle turned on its lights. An officer (identified as Officer C) approached Subject 1 with his weapon drawn and asked Subject 1 for license and insurance. Subject 1 reached over to retrieve his documents, at which point Officer C stuck his hand through the window, opened the car door, pulled Subject 1 out of the car, and hit Subject 1 in the face with the back of his hand. Subject 1 elaborated that Officer C hit Subject 1 with his hand where the palm meets the thumb. Subject 1 was placed in handcuffs as soon as he was removed from his car. The officers searched the vehicle

---

<sup>8</sup> COPA conducted a thorough and complete investigation. The following is a summary of the material evidence gathered and relied upon in our analysis.

<sup>9</sup> Att. 4

<sup>10</sup> Att. 20

and a weapon was found. Subject 1 denied giving officers permission to search his vehicle. Once Officer C saw additional people in Subject 1's vehicle, he called for backup. Subject 1 related that two of his friends and his mother were in the vehicle, all three of whom were also pulled out. Per Subject 1, all four civilians were arrested and officers drove Subject 1's car to the police station. Subject 1 stated that a magazine was found in the pocket of his friend, Civilian 3.

Once Subject 1 was taken to the police station, he was interviewed. Subject 1 told detectives he acted in self-defense because he was shot at by his mother's boyfriend and Subject 1 fired back. Subject 1 stated that the detectives were biased because they did not listen to Subject 1's version of events that he acted in self-defense and they did not arrest Subject 1's mother's boyfriend. Subject 1 stated that he was read his Miranda Rights at the police station and was asked if he wanted a lawyer. Subject 1 stated he was in an interview room and a sergeant or detective was with an officer (believed to be Sergeant E and Officer F). Officer F read Subject 1 his Miranda Rights. Subject 1 initially asked for an attorney but once detectives told Subject 1 what his mother and friends were going to be charged with, Subject 1 agreed to talk. Subject 1 did not know why he was charged with armed robbery.

Subject 1 disagreed with the facts from his arrest report specifically stated Subject 1 denied speeding. Subject 1 related that there was a gun in his car but it was not visible because his windows are tinted and the gun was under a car seat. Subject 1 stated that the police report was fabricated to state the officers could see the gun. Subject 1 also denied that he got out the car when the police turned on the lights, as stated in his arrest report. Subject 1 reiterated that the officers pulled him out of the vehicle. Subject 1 also denied stating to police, "Theres [sic] always a gun in that van. Its [sic] the family car." Subject 1 denied this statement and related he actually said there were bullets in his car because his father is a tow-truck driver, so his father may have found the bullets while working and put them in the car. Finally, Subject 1 stated that the officers turned off their BWC when they approached him and there was no in-car camera (ICC). Subject 1 reported seeing BWC on the officers but the light was turned off.

COPA interviewed **Officer C** on April 9, 2018.<sup>11</sup> According to Officer C, on August 28, 2016, he and Officer D stopped a van near XXX S. Normal that was driven by Subject 1. Officer C heard gunshots while they were near 113<sup>th</sup> and Stewart, observed the van driving at a "high rate of speed," and an "unknown citizen" pointed towards the van. The officers engaged their emergency equipment and pulled the van over.<sup>12</sup> Subject 1 reportedly jumped out of the vehicle and pointed towards a block over. The officers ordered Subject 1 to the back of the van and its occupants were ordered to exit. The officers saw a firearm with a slide lock, located in between seats in the van in plain view. Officer C related that Subject 1 immediately jumped out of the car and he did not speak to Subject 1 through the car window. Officer C denied pulling Subject 1 out of the van, using force to get Subject 1 out of the vehicle, or striking Subject 1. Officer C related he did not get permission to search Subject 1's vehicle but permission was not required, since Officer C had reason to believe there was a gun in Subject 1's car. Subject 1's victim (Civilian 4) arrived on scene and told the arresting officers that Subject 1 shot at his house.

---

<sup>11</sup> Att. 26

<sup>12</sup> The location of the shooting, XXX S. Eggleston, is approximately 417 feet from 113<sup>th</sup> and Stewart. The location where Subject 1 was pulled over, XXX S. Normal, is approximately one block west of the location of the shooting. (See Att. 33)

**Officer D** was interviewed by COPA on April 11, 2018.<sup>13</sup> Officer D related that on August 28, 2016, he was on patrol in a marked car with Officer C. The officers stopped a van near XXX S. Normal after they “heard multiple shots fired” nearby and could smell the gunfire. The officers then saw “a van speeding away.” Officer D believed there was also someone on the street “frantically pointing” at the van. The officers pulled the van over after they activated their lights and sirens. Officer D recalled that the driver (known to be Subject 1) “jumped out.” Officer D approached the passenger side of the van with his gun drawn and ordered the occupants to put their hands up. Officer D looked into the vehicle and heard Officer C placing Subject 1 into custody. Officer D denied that Officer C pulled Subject 1 out of the van or struck Subject 1. Officer D related that Subject 1 exited the vehicle voluntarily and tried to act like he heard shots, “playing off it wasn’t him.” Then, multiple officers arrived and searched the van. Officer D saw a gun in the van in plain sight, “laying in the middle, locked in a slide lock” and about an arm’s length behind the driver’s seat. Officer D ordered the occupants out of the van and detained them. Then the victim (known to be Civilian 4) arrived and identified Subject 1 as the offender who shot at him. Officer D stated that Subject 1’s van was searched and permission was not obtained. Per Officer D, permission was not required because the officers viewed the handgun and had probable cause to stop the vehicle.

#### b. Digital Evidence

A request for **in-car camera** footage was met with negative results.<sup>14</sup> The 22<sup>nd</sup> District did not have **body worn camera** at the time of Subject 1’s arrest.<sup>15</sup>

#### c. Physical Evidence

A **Crime Scene Report** was identified for **RD #XXX**.<sup>1617</sup> Nine expended shells were recovered, believed to have been fired from Subject 1’s weapon. One fired bullet was located with an unknown caliber. Evidence Technicians also noted multiple holes in the dwelling located at XXX S. Eggleston, several of which were believed to be bullet holes. Nine fired cartridges cases were recovered from the street and one fired bullet was recovered in the home’s front room.

#### d. Documentary Evidence

An **Arrest Report** was located from Subject 1’s August 28, 2016 arrest with **RD #XXX**.<sup>18</sup> Subject 1 was charged with felony aggravated discharge of a firearm – occupied building and felony aggravated unlawful use of a weapon/person/loaded/no FCCA. According to this report, Subject 1 was arrested on signed complaints from Civilian 4. Civilian 4 reported that Subject 1 “produced a handgun and fired several rounds at [Civilian 4] striking his residence at XXX S.

---

<sup>13</sup> Att. 31

<sup>14</sup> Att. 38

<sup>15</sup> Att. 39

<sup>16</sup> Att. 19

<sup>17</sup> While seemingly unrelated to the present investigation, a CPD Firearm Technician determined there was a “High Confidence Correlation [...] between the ballistics evidence” recovered from Subject 1 and the “fire-arm related evidence” from a June 27, 2016 homicide case.

<sup>18</sup> Att. 6

Eggleston.” The arresting officers, Officers C and D, saw the suspect vehicle occupied by Subject 1 “travelling at a high rate of speed” and conducted a traffic stop. Subject 1 exited the vehicle and was detained. A firearm was recovered from the vehicle. Once at the 22nd District, Subject 1 told officers “My mom called me cuz [sic] she got into [sic] with a guy and I think a shot came from the house so I shot up the house. Theres [sic] always a gun in that van. Its [sic] the family car.” A search revealed that Subject 1 had active Illinois Owners Firearm Identification (FOID) but not a Concealed Carry License (CCL).

**Detective Supplementary Reports** were identified for **RD #XXX**<sup>19</sup> In addition to Subject 1, the offenders related to this case were Civilian 3, Civilian 5, and Civilian 6.<sup>20</sup> A firearms examination revealed the shell casings located on scene were fired from Subject 1’s weapon.

**Inventory Reports** were located for **RD #XXX**<sup>21</sup> Multiple items were inventoried including fired bullets and casings, magazines, a firearm, and personal affects.

The following **Office of Emergency Management and Communications (OEMC) Event Query Reports** were located related to Subject 1’s August 28, 2016 arrest:

- Per **Event Number XXX**, a report of shots fired was received at approximately 6:20 PM.<sup>22</sup> At about 6:21 PM Beat XXX (Officers C and D) reported they had curbed a vehicle at XXX S. Normal.
- According to **Event Number XXX**, at roughly 6:21 PM, a male caller reported two men outside of a van near 112<sup>th</sup> and Eggleston with shots fired.<sup>23</sup>
- The report for **Event Number XXX** related a caller at XXX S. Eggleston reported that a black male was at her door with a gun. She believed her upstairs neighbor was involved in a confrontation.
- Lastly, **Event Number XXX** related a caller at XXX S. Eggleston heard seven shots fired in the alley.<sup>24</sup>

#### e. Additional Evidence

The following relevant criminal dockets were obtained through the **Cook County Clerk of Courts**:

- **Case Number 16CRXXX** was filed on September 29, 2016.<sup>25</sup> Subject 1 was charged with one felony count of attempted armed robbery, four felony counts of aggravated discharge

---

<sup>19</sup> Atts. 5, 8

<sup>20</sup> The Arrest Reports for Civilian 3, Civilian 5, and Civilian 6 for RD #XXX can be found in Atts. 14, 15, and 16.

<sup>21</sup> Att. 18

<sup>22</sup> Att. 34

<sup>23</sup> Att. 35

<sup>24</sup> Att.37

<sup>25</sup> Atts. 7, 10

of a firearm – occupied building, one felony count of aggravated unlawful restraint, and two felony counts of aggravated unlawful use of a weapon/vehicle/loaded/no FCCA. On November 29, 2017, Subject 1 pleaded guilty to felony attempted armed robbery. Subject 1 was sentenced to five years with the Illinois Department of Corrections, including two years of mandatory supervised release. Subject 1 was also fined \$652 and given 458 days of credit for time served.

- **Case Number XXX** was filed on August 30, 2016.<sup>26</sup> Subject 1 was charged with felony aggravated discharge of a firearm and felony aggravated unlawful use of a weapon/vehicle/loaded/no FCCA. On September 23, 2016, the case was transferred to the criminal division with Case Number 16CRXXX.

Subject 1 is currently incarcerated in the **Illinois Department of Corrections** at the Centralia Correctional Center, per Cook County Case Number 16CRXXX.<sup>27</sup> Subject 1 was admitted on December 1, 2017 with a projected parole date of February 21, 2019. Subject 1's projected discharge date is February 21, 2021.

## VI. ANALYSIS

Allegation 3 against Officer C and Allegation 1 against Officer D, that they failed to turn on their BWC, is Exonerated. While it is true neither officer turned on their BWC, it was because they had not been issued BWCs at the time of Subject 1's August 28, 2016 arrest.

Allegation 4 against Officer C and Allegation 2 against Officer D, that they searched Subject 1's car without consent, is Exonerated. The officers both acknowledged they did not get consent before searching Subject 1's van. However, consent was not required as the officers had probable cause to perform the search as they believed a gun was in the vehicle. "After an officer is in possession of facts sufficient to support probable cause to believe that a vehicle contains contraband, the vehicle may be searched without a warrant and the search area includes any interior compartment of the vehicle that might reasonably contain the contraband." *People v. Contreras*, 2014 IL App (1st) 131889, ¶ 28. Under the automobile exception, law enforcement officers make undertake a warrantless search of a vehicle if there is probable cause to believe that the automobile contains evidence of criminal activity that the officers are entitled to seize." *People v. James*, 163 Ill. 2d 302, 312 (1994). Officers heard gunshots, followed by Subject 1 driving away and a civilian pointing at Subject 1's van. Moreover, the officers report that they observed the gun in plain view. Subject 1's arrest report detailed sufficient information to support probable to search the vehicle for the gun therefore this claim is Exonerated.

Allegation 5 against Officer C and Allegation 3 against Officer D, that they provided a false report that the officers saw a gun in Subject 1's car, is Unfounded. Both officers related that the gun was in plain sight. Subject 1 did not believe the officers could have seen the gun. However, Subject 1 was fleeing a scene and the gun could have slide on the floor, moving from where Subject 1 set it to where officers observed it. Further, there is no question the gun was in the car, per

---

<sup>26</sup> Att. 11

<sup>27</sup> Att. 13

Subject 1's own admissions. Subject 1 had no basis to determine what the officers could or could not have seen, and this allegation is Unfounded.

Similarly, Allegation 6 against Officer C and Allegation 4 against Officer D, that they provided a false report that they saw Subject 1 speeding, is also Unfounded. As stated above, Subject 1, by his own account, was fleeing the scene of a shooting. In a high stress situation, he may have been speeding without realizing it. Further, the officers' perception that Subject 1 was speeding is just that, their perception. Whether Subject 1 agrees does not mean the officers lied. Therefore, this allegation is Unfounded.

Allegation 1 against Officer C, that he struck Subject 1 in the face with his palm, is Unfounded. Both arresting officers denied that this occurred while Subject 1 alleged it happened. COPA finds that Subject 1 is not credible. While Subject 1 was honest about firing his weapon in questioning Subject 1 about certain allegations he changed his version of events. For example, originally, Subject 1 alleged he was denied a lawyer but later clarified that after requesting a lawyer he waived his Miranda rights when confronted with the fact that his mother and friends were being charged criminally. Additionally, Subject 1 stated that he dropped the gun between the drivers and passengers seat but later argued the gun could not be seen by police because it was under the seat. Based on the evidence collected by COPA, we determine that Subject 1's statements regarding the specific facts in this case are not reliable. Moreover, the officer's statements are credible. First, both officers offered consistent statements. The officers are not currently partners yet had clear and consistent memories of the arrest.

Allegation 2, that Officer C he provided a false report that Subject 1 exited his car voluntarily, is Unfounded. While the relevant question is whether Subject 1 exited his car voluntarily or if Officer C pulled him out, the officer would have been justified in removing Subject 1 either way. Subject 1 was identified as a suspect in a shooting and the officer had probable cause to detain and arrest Subject 1. As a shooter leaving a scene, Subject 1 could be classified as a fleeing felon. Therefore, Officer C would have been within policy to pull Subject 1 out of the car (if that is in fact what Officer C did). Shootings are a severe crime, making the use of force a reasonable response. As far as the officers knew, Subject 1 posed an immediate threat and therefore needed to be apprehended immediately. However, as argued above Subject 1 is not credible therefore COPA finds that Subject 1 did exit his car as stated by the officers, therefore the allegation is Unfounded.

For the reasons articulated in Allegation 2, Allegation 7 against Officer C, that he pulled Subject 1 out of his car illegally, is Unfounded.

Allegation 1 against Detectives A and B, that they denied Subject 1 a lawyer, are Unfounded. While Subject 1's online complaint to COPA stated he was not allowed to speak with an attorney, his COPA interview revealed that he agreed to speak to detectives without an attorney and this allegation was not served against either detective. Similarly, Allegation 2 against Detectives A and B, that they conducted their investigation with bias, is Unfounded. Subject 1 clarified that the detectives were biased because they only listened to Civilian 4's version of events and not Subject 1's. COPA does not agree with this assessment, as Department reports indicate detectives completed a full investigation. Regardless, this does not meet the threshold for bias

according to General Order G02-04. This General Order states, “In making [...] law enforcement decisions [...] Chicago Police Department officers may not use race, ethnicity, color, national origin, ancestry, religion, disability, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, marital status, parental status, military discharge status, financial status, or lawful source of income to any degree [...]” As Subject 1’s allegation of bias did not fall into one of these protected categories, no misconduct occurred.

Lastly, Allegation 1 against Sergeant E, that he provided a false report that Subject 1 told the sergeant “Theres [sic] always a gun in that van. Its [sic] the family car,” is Exonerated. Subject 1 stated that he actually told Sergeant E that his father may have put bullets in the car. The Arrest Report was written by Officer C and is therefore the officer’s interpretation of the sergeant’s statements. Subject 1’s version of what he said and the version in his arrest report are similar enough that willfulness cannot be proven on the part of either Sergeant E.

**VII. CONCLUSION<sup>28</sup>**

Based on the analysis set forth above, COPA makes the following findings:

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Officer C	1. Struck Subject 1 in the face with his palm, in violation of Rule 6, Rule 8, and Rule 9	Unfounded
	2. Provided a false report in Subject 1’s arrest report that Subject 1 exited his car voluntarily, in violation of Rule 14.	Unfounded
	3. Failed to turn on his Body Worn Camera (BWC), in violation of Rule 6.	Exonerated
	4. Searched Subject 1’s vehicle without consent, in violation of Rule 6.	Exonerated
	5. Provided a false report that officers saw a gun in Subject 1’s car, in violation of Rule 14.	Unfounded
	6. Provided a false report that officers saw Subject 1 speeding, in violation of Rule 14.	Unfounded
	7. Pulled Subject 1 out of his car illegally, in violation of Rule 6.	Unfounded
Officer D	1. Failed to turn on his Body Worn Camera (BWC), in violation of Rule 6.	Exonerated

<sup>28</sup> Add additional rows for additional allegations and/or involved officers.

	<p>2. Searched Subject 1’s vehicle without consent, in violation of Rule 6.</p> <p>3. Provided a false report that officers saw a gun in Subject 1’s car, in violation of Rule 14.</p> <p>4. Provided a false report that officers saw Subject 1 speeding, in violation of Rule 14.</p>	<p>Exonerated</p> <p>Unfounded</p> <p>Unfounded</p>
Detective A	<p>1. Denied Subject 1 a lawyer, in violation of Rule 6.</p> <p>2. Conducted his investigation with bias, in violation of Rule 6.</p>	<p>Unfounded</p> <p>Unfounded</p>
Detective B	<p>1. Denied Subject 1 a lawyer, in violation of Rule 6.</p> <p>2. Conducted his investigation with bias, in violation of Rule 6.</p>	<p>Unfounded</p> <p>Unfounded</p>
Sergeant E	<p>1. Provided a false report that Subject 1 told the sergeant “Theres [sic] always a gun in that van.Its [sic] the family car,” in violation of Rule 14.</p>	<p>Exonerated</p>

Approved:

\_\_\_\_\_  
 XXX  
 Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

**Appendix A**

Assigned Investigative Staff

---

<b>Squad#:</b>	XXX
<b>Investigator:</b>	XXX
<b>Supervising Investigator:</b>	XXX
<b>Deputy Chief Administrator:</b>	XXX