

SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Date of Incident:	April 20, 2018
Time of Incident:	12:58 P.M.
Location of Incident:	6237 N. Clark Street, Chicago, IL
Date of COPA Notification:	April 20, 2018
Time of COPA Notification:	2:27 P.M.

On April 20, 2018, at approximately 12:56 pm, Officer Tim Tatum was off-duty, working security at K&J Global Pharmacy, 6237 N. Clark. Officer Tatum stood in an aisle speaking with the owner of the pharmacy, [REDACTED] when a Black male, dressed in all black, wearing a mask and gloves, entered the store brandishing a gun in his right hand. The unknown male pointed the weapon in the direction of Officer Tatum and [REDACTED] Officer Tatum immediately took cover, while [REDACTED] ran to the back of the store and retrieved his weapon from behind the counter. At this time, Officer Tatum and [REDACTED] fired their weapons at the unknown male who eventually fled from the store. Officer Tatum briefly pursued the unknown male, on foot, but was unsuccessful in locating the unknown male. Further investigation revealed that Officer Tatum was not qualified with the weapon that he had discharged during the incident. To date, this unknown male has not been identified or apprehended.

II. INVOLVED PARTIES

Accused Officer #1:	Tim Tatum, Star #18647, Employee ID# [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: November 24, 2003, Police Officer, Unit of Assignment: 006 th District, DOB: [REDACTED], 1965, Male, Black
Involved Individual #1:	Unknown

III. ALLEGATIONS

COPA initiated this investigation pursuant to its authority under Municipal Code of Chicago Sec. 2-78-120(c) to conduct investigation “into all incidents, including those in which no allegation of misconduct is made, in which, a Police Department member discharges a firearm in a manner that potentially could strike another individual.” In the course of that investigation, COPA determined that it was necessary to serve the following allegation:

Officer	Allegation	Finding / Recommendation
Officer Tim Tatum	1.Carried his auxiliary weapon without annually qualifying with it, in violation of directive U04 – 02(II)(F).	Sustained/Violations Noted

IV. APPLICABLE RULES AND LAWS

Rules

1. Rule 6 – Disobedience of an order or directive whether written or oral.

General Orders

1. General Order G03-02-01: The Use of Force Model

Special Orders

1. U04-02, Department Approved Weapons and Ammunition (effective date: June 2, 2017)

Federal Laws

1. U.S. Constitution, 4th Amendment

State Laws

1. 720 ILCS 5/7-5, Peace Officer’s Use of Force in Making Arrest

V. INVESTIGATION

a. Interviews

COPA interviewed Officer Tim Tatum² on May 31, 2018. He stated that on April 20, 2018, he was off-duty, working as a part-time security officer, at a pharmacy, at 6237 N. Clark.³ Officer Tatum worked, for the owner of the store, [REDACTED] because there was a prior attempt robbery on the store. Officer Tatum wore civilian clothing, and he carried his auxiliary weapon, a Smith and Wesson .38 Caliber, revolver. He was not carrying any “less than lethal” weapons (i.e. baton, taser, or pepper spray).

Officer Tatum and [REDACTED] were having a conversation, near the back area of the store, in the first aisle. There was no one else in the store at the time. He then heard the door chime. Officer Tatum looked toward the door and observed a black male subject, wearing a ski mask, with a black hat covering his face, wearing a dark grey coat and black pants. The subject pointed what he believed to be a blue steel, black, semi-automatic gun, at Officer Tatum and stated “all I want is money.” Officer Tatum immediately took cover behind a four-foot shelving unit, and [REDACTED] went toward the back area of the store. The subject advanced toward Officer Tatum, with the gun in his hand. Officer Tatum attempted to move back and forth through the aisle to avoid the subject, who was pointing the gun at Officer Tatum.

Officer Tatum drew his weapon, to scare the subject, and believed the subject would leave. Instead, the subject approached closer and pointed his weapon over the shelving at Officer Tatum. The subject continued to point his weapon at Officer Tatum, and Officer Tatum, in fear for his life, fired his weapon four times, at the subject. He did not know, at the time, that [REDACTED] had fired his weapon. He believed he fired three times, but he now knows it was four. The subject immediately fled the store, and Officer Tatum chased the subject on foot. The subject ran through an alley, and Officer Tatum immediately stopped the foot pursuit, because he did not think it was a safe situation. Officer Tatum returned to the store to check on [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] called 911 to report the shots fired. He does not believe he said anything to the subject, and he did not announce his office. He was too busy taking cover and scared, which was why he did not announce his office.

Officer Tatum learned [REDACTED] fired his weapon two or three times at the subject. Officer Tatum had [REDACTED] immediately secure his weapon until detectives arrived on the scene. Officer Tatum was unaware if the subject fired at them.

COPA interviewed, Officer Tim Tatum⁴ again on August 7, 2019, Officer Tatum indicated that he did not know that he was not qualified with his weapon at the time of the incident. Officer Tatum said that he is only allowed to qualify on the days made available by the

² Att. 18, 30.

³ Officer Tatum had worked at the store for about two months, twice a week. Mostly on Fridays and Saturdays for about five hours.

⁴ Att. 46. Officer Tatum was initially interviewed as an Involved Member on May 31, 2018. When the investigation revealed that he had not qualified with his auxiliary weapon that he had discharged he was served with an allegation of misconduct.

gun range. During 2018, he was only able to qualify in May or September. He said that officers need to call the range to schedule a time, but he did not indicate that he had attempted to do so. Officer Tatum admitted that after reviewing the Auxiliary Weapon Qualification form, he was not authorized to carry his auxiliary weapon on April 20, 2018.

On April 20, 2018 an interview was conducted with ██████████ which was recorded on body worn camera. ██████████ described in detail the shooting and provided a video recording of the entire incident that was captured on his commercial DVR located at his business. Based on that information, COPA did not conduct an interview with ██████████ but used the electronica recorded interview.

b. Digital Evidence

The **evidence technician photographs**⁵ depict the scene and a photograph of Officer Tatum.

The **video footage from K&J Global Pharmacy** includes multiple different camera channels which capture the incident.⁷ Channel 2, shows the entrance of the store. It depicts an offender entered the pharmacy with some type of material on his head. The unknown subject is also holding what appears to be a gun. The video shows the unknown subject moving from one side of a divider to the other side of a divider and appears to be pointing his weapon at someone. The video depicts the window just right of the main entrance breaking/shattering and the subject ducks down. The unknown subject then exits the store. The video then shows Officer Tatum briefly walk out of the store with a gun in his right hand. ██████████ appeared to carry a gun in his right hand. The video footage does not depict whether the unknown subject was shot.

The video footage from the pharmacy, Channel 8, shows the area from the perspective of the back to the front of the store. The video shows Officer Tatum and ██████████ having a conversation in what appears to be the first aisle, near the back of the store. During this time, an unknown subject enters the store wearing dark colored jeans and a dark colored hooded zip-up jacket. The video footage does not show the head of the unknown subject, because of the angle of the camera. Officer Tatum approaches the unknown subject, and Officer Tatum appears to reach for his own weapon. As Officer Tatum moves closer to the unknown subject, the unknown subject pulls what appears to be a gun from his jacket pocket and points it at Officer Tatum. Officer Tatum quickly ducks down and appears to take cover behind shelving units that divide the aisles. The video footage depicts ██████████ slightly duck down briefly and hurry toward the back of the store. The unknown subject goes back and forth from the middle aisle to the first aisle with his gun pointed at Officer Tatum, apparently attempting to get an angle to point the weapon at Officer Tatum. Officer Tatum continues to avoid the unknown subject, by ducking behind the shelving units. After about 15 seconds of ducking back and forth for cover on each side of the shelves, Officer Tatum removes his gun from his waistband and points it at the unknown subject. The video depicts the unknown subject duck, as the glass window behind him shatters, then rush out of the store. Just after the glass shatters, Officer Tatum ducks into a crouched position and appears to fire shots at the unknown subject. Officer Tatum then briefly

⁵ Att. 16

⁷ Att. 17

goes outside and looks in the direction the unknown subject fled. Officer Tatum returns to the store. █████ comes from the back area of the store, with what appears to be a gun in his right hand.

Video footage on Channel 3 depicts the interior rear of the store with a service counter along the back of the store that has a dividing screen pulled most of the way down. Channel 4 depicts a back room and office with the opposite side of the counter and dividing screen in the middle of the frame. █████ is seen on Channel 3, ducking for cover and moving through a door into the back room. Channel 4 then picks him up coming through the door, opening a drawer of his desk, pulling out a gun and sticking it through open part of the screen, and appearing to fire a few shots. The view from Channel 3 depicts █████ sticking a handgun through the open screen. One muzzle flash is captured on camera but he appears to fire more than once (at least two shell casings are seen being dispelled from the gun).

The **video footage obtained from Cantic Auto Repair (6249 N. Clark)**⁹ depicts an unknown person, who appears to be male, riding a bike from the north area of the alley to the south area of the alley, at 11:55:49. The unknown person appears to be wearing dark colored jeans and a dark-colored hoodie, with white lettering on the back. The subject rides, what appears to be, a mountain bike. At approximately 11:57:01, the unknown subject rides from south to north and turns east down the T-Alley. The camera never captures where the unknown subject goes or comes from. The video footage also depicts what appears to be two female whites and a male white, who appears to be a mechanic, having a conversation amongst themselves.

The **Electronically Recorded Interview conducted by Det. Gregory Andras (via BWC - AXON_Body_2_Video_2018-04-20_1343.mp4)**¹⁰ depicts █████ pointing in different areas of the store. █████ says, when the unknown subject first entered the store, he did not see him; he saw Officer Tatum dodging. █████ relates he observed the unknown subject point a black handgun at Officer Tatum. █████ ducked down and ran toward the back of the store to retrieve his weapon, from behind the counter. Once he retrieved the weapon he fired twice at the unknown subject. The unknown subject exited the store and fled the area. █████ states he did not know if the unknown subject fired his weapon.

c. Documentary Evidence

The **case report and detective supplementary report**¹¹ indicate a police-involved shooting occurred at 6237 N. Clark. The scene of the shooting was inside of K&J Pharmacy. Off-Duty Chicago Police Officer, Officer Tim Tatum, was inside the store working security when the incident occurred. The owner of the store, █████ was also present and neither was hit by gunfire. The offender fled the scene and was not located. The offender wore a face mask and a hat on his head to conceal his identity.

⁹ Att. 34

¹⁰ Mr. █████ indicated that he was not available to be interviewed, due to him leaving the country the following day. However, the video camera from the pharmacy captures the incident and his observation are noted in the Detetives' supplementary report.

¹¹ Atts. 5, 6, 26, 27

Det. Loftus¹² related to reporting detectives that he had interviewed Officer Tatum and that Officer Tatum reported that he observed an unknown male black enter and state “all I want is the money,” and point a blue steel semi-automatic pistol over the aisle at himself and ██████. Tatum says he then took cover behind shelves to protect himself as the offender came into the aisle and pointed the gun at him. Tatum then heard a shot and was able to draw his weapon and fire what he believes to be three shots, from a crouched position, before the offender fled.

Det. Andras interviewed the owner of the pharmacy, ██████ on the scene. ██████ had security officers work at his store because he had been robbed in the past. At the time of the incident, Officer Tatum worked as security. At approximately 1:30 pm, ██████ worked in the pharmacy and talked to Officer Tatum, in the first aisle, on the south end, of the store. Officer Tatum faced him and looked in the easterly direction. ██████ saw a black male offender, about 5’10” with a medium build, enter the front door. The offender wore a black ski mask on and a black jacket. ██████ saw the offender had a gun in his hand when he entered the store.

The offender “menaced” Officer Tatum with a gun and stated words to the effect, “I just want the money. Give me the money.”¹³ As the offender pointed the gun at Officer Tatum, Officer Tatum tried to get out the offender’s sights. The offender ran back and forth in front of the first aisle. ██████ believed the offender tried to get a good shot at Officer Tatum, above the shelving unit or around it. During this time, ██████ ran into the rear office of the pharmacy and went behind the counter. ██████ grabbed his handgun, he keeps behind the counter, in a desk drawer. ██████ fired two rounds at the offender. ██████ believed Officer Tatum fired at least once, possibly twice, at the offender. The offender ran out of the store, then east on Thome. ██████ and Officer Tatum went to the front door, looked east, and did not see the offender.

The report indicates that there were four spent cartridges in Officer Tatum’s revolver.¹⁴ Two 9mm fired cartridge cases, matching¹⁵ the 9mm used by ██████, were recovered from the store floor.¹⁶

The **Tactical Response Report (TRR)**²⁰ authored by Officer Tim Tatum indicates the unknown subject posed an imminent threat of battery with a weapon, used force likely to cause death or great bodily harm, and displayed a semi-automatic weapon. Officer Tatum responded with movement to avoid the attack and discharged his revolver at the unknown subject. He indictes in the TRR that he fired four shots.

The **OEMC Event Query and Transmissions**²¹ indicate an off-duty Chicago Police Officer, P.O. Tim Tatum, #18647, working security, stated he fired his firearm at an armed robbery/offender, but no one was struck. The OEMC event query, per Beat 2433, indicated the

¹² Att. 27 at pp. 11-12.

¹³ Att. 27, p. 12 of 13

¹⁴ Att. 27 at p. 17.

¹⁵ Pursuant to request of detectives, ISP did not do ballistic tests on this firearm so it was not determined if the cartridges were specifically from this weapon. Att. 48.

¹⁶ *Id.* at p. 26.

²⁰ Att. 7

²¹ Att. 12, 22

offender was a male wearing all black with a black mask. It was further indicated in the report, the offender possibly wore a black jacket with white lettering on the back. An unknown caller heard three to four shots fired, but the caller did not see anything.

Illinois State Police Forensic Report²² indicated that Officer Tatum's weapon was not tested. The report said "Per policy, we do not examine fired cartridge cases found in a revolver."²³

The **Crime Scene Processing Report**²⁴ indicated that Evidence Technician Carriere, #12472, recovered four shell casings and one unfired bullet from Officer Tatum's weapon (Smith and Wesson, Revolver). The report contains a diagram showing that the firearm has a capacity of five rounds. The report depicted that a fired bullet was recovered from the floor, a metal fragment was recovered from the floor, a fired bullet was recovered from the window sill, and a fired bullet was recovered from the sidewalk.

d. Additional Evidence

The **Gun Registration**²⁶ and **Auxiliary Weapon Qualification**²⁷ for Officer Tatum, indicate that Officer Tatum's Smith and Wesson Revolver, model 642, is registered with the City of Chicago. The records show Officer Tatum qualified with the revolver, April 3, 2017. He did not qualify with the revolver, until May 17, 2018.

I. RECOMMENDED DISCIPLINE FOR SUSTAINED ALLEGATIONS²⁸

a. Officer Tim Tatum #18647

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History

Officer Tatum has (1) Prolem Solving Award, (1) Presidential Election Deployment Award, (2) Attendance Recognition Awards, (1) 2007 Crime Reduction Ribbon Award, (15) Honorable Mention Awards, (9) Complimentary Letter Awards, (1) Nato Summit Service Award, (1) Life Saving Award, (1) 2009 Crime Reduction Award, (1) Arnold Mireles Special Partner Award, and (1) Joint Operartions Award.

Officer Tatum does not have any cases sustained against him within the last five years.

ii. Recommended Penalty, by Allegation

²² Att. 48

²³ Att. 48, paragraph 3, Lines 1, 2

²⁴ Att. 37, p. 2

²⁶ Att. 40

²⁷ Att. 41

²⁸ Only include this section for investigations with at least one sustained allegation.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

a. Use of Deadly Force²⁹

The main issue in evaluating every use of force is whether the amount of force the officer used was objectively reasonable in light of the totality of the circumstances faced by the officer.³⁰ Factors to be considered in assessing the reasonableness of force include, but are not limited to, (1) whether the subject was posing an imminent threat to the officer or others; (2) the risk of harm, level of threat or resistance presented by the subject; and (3) the subject's proximity or access to weapons; (4) the severity of the crime at issue; (5) whether the subject is actively resisting arrest or attempting to evade arrest by flight.³¹

The Department's "highest priority is the sanctity of human life."³² Discharging a firearm is deadly force under Department policy.³³ Department policy dictates that "[t]he use of deadly force is a last resort that is permissible only when necessary to protect against an imminent threat to life or to prevent great bodily harm to the member or another person."³⁴ Thus, a Department member may use deadly force in only two situations. First, deadly force may be used to prevent death or great bodily harm from an imminent threat posed to the sworn member or another person. Second, deadly force may be used to prevent an arrest from being defeated by resistance or escape, where the person to be arrested poses an imminent threat of death or great bodily harm to a sworn member or another person unless arrested without delay."³⁵ A threat is imminent when it is objectively reasonable to believe that:

- a. the subject's actions are likely to cause death or great bodily harm to the member or others unless action is taken; and
- b. the subject has the means or instruments to cause death or great bodily harm; and
- c. the subject has the opportunity and ability to cause death or great bodily harm."³⁶

Department policy recognizes that Department members must "make split-second decisions—in circumstances that are tense, uncertain, and rapidly evolving—about the amount of force that is necessary in a particular situation. These decisions must therefore be judged based on the totality of the circumstances known by the member at the time and from the perspective of a reasonable Department member on the scene, in the same or similar circumstances, and not with the benefit of 20/20 hindsight."³⁷

²⁹ On October 16, 2017, the Department materially modified its Use of Force policy. The Department's current Use of Force Policy prohibits the use of deadly force under circumstances that would be permissible under the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution and Illinois state law. COPA's analysis focuses solely on whether Officer Tatum complied with General Order G03-02. COPA cites case-law solely for guidance on how to interpret common concepts or terms.

³⁰ General Order G03-02(III)(B)(1).

³¹ *Id.*

³² General Order G03-02(II)(A)

³³ General Order 03-02(III)(C)(1)

³⁴ General Order G03-02(III)(C)(3).

³⁵ *Id.*

³⁶ General Order G03-02(III)(C)(2).

³⁷ General Order G03-02(II)(D).

b. Certification on Auxiliary Weapons

Chicago Police Department Directives related to Uniform and Property U-04-02 titled Department Approved Weapons and Ammunition Section II.F reads in pertinent part: “Department members must qualify annually with all prescribed, alternate prescribed, or auxiliary firearms, Taser devices, and short-barreled revolvers prior to carrying the firearm on or off duty.”

c. Standard of Proof

For each Allegation COPA must make one of the following findings:

1. Sustained - where it is determined the allegation is supported by a preponderance of the evidence;
2. Not Sustained - where it is determined there is insufficient evidence to prove the allegations by a preponderance of the evidence;
3. Unfounded - where it is determined by clear and convincing evidence that an allegation is false or not factual; or
4. Exonerated - where it is determined by clear and convincing evidence that the conduct described in the allegation occurred, but it is lawful and proper.

A **preponderance of evidence** is evidence indicating that it is **more likely than not** that the conduct occurred and violated Department policy. *See Avery v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co.*, 216 Ill. 2d 100, 191 (2005), (a proposition is proved by a preponderance of the evidence when it has been found to be more probably true than not). If the evidence gathered in an investigation establishes that it is more likely that the misconduct occurred, even if by a narrow margin, then the preponderance of the evidence standard is met.

Clear and convincing evidence is a higher standard than a preponderance of the evidence but lower than the "beyond-a-reasonable doubt" standard required to convict a person of a criminal offense. *See e.g., People v. Coan*, 2016 IL App (2d) 151036 (2016). Clear and Convincing is defined as a “degree of proof, which, considering all the evidence in the case, produces the firm and abiding belief that it is highly probable that the proposition . . . is true.” *Id.* at ¶ 28

III. ANALYSIS

The facts show there was an attempted armed robbery of K&J Pharmacy on April 20, 2018 and that Officer Tatum, serving as a security guard, intervened to stop the robbery. Officer Tatum’s statement to COPA that the offender had a firearm, and pointed it at both Officer Tatum and store owner [REDACTED] prior to Officer Tatum firing, is corroborated by video, as well as [REDACTED] statement on BWC immediately after the incident and Officer Tatum’s own contemporaneous statement to Detective Loftus.

Both the governing Chicago Police Department Order and Illinois laws recognize an individual's right to use force likely to cause death or great bodily harm in defense of oneself or another in these circumstances. Therefore, Officer Tatum's firearm discharge is found to be within policy.

However, Officer Tatum used his auxiliary weapon, a Smith and Wesson .38 Caliber revolver. At the time of the incident, April 20, 2018, Officer Tatum had not qualified with that weapon since April 3, 2017. Therefore, he was in violation of Department Order U04-02, which required him to qualify on his auxiliary weapon annually.

a. Use of Deadly Force

1. Officer Tatum Reasonably Believed that the Unknown Subject Posed an Imminent Threat of Death or Great Bodily Harm to both Himself and [REDACTED]

COPA finds that it was objectively reasonable to believe that the unknown subject posed an imminent threat of death or great bodily harm to both Officer Tatum and [REDACTED]. The video of the incident shows the suspect carrying what is almost certainly a firearm. Officer Tatum, who had a close view of the firearm, was even able to describe it with great specificity. He was not merely holding the firearm, he brandished it at Officer Tatum, attempting repeatedly to get a clear angle to shoot the officer. This supports Officer Tatum's objectively reasonable belief that the object was a firearm since it is illogical for him to believe that the object being brandished as a weapon is not a real gun.

Moreover, it appears that he did not fire the first shot, the video appears to depict the front window shattering, apparently from a shot by [REDACTED] prior to Officer Tatum firing any shots.³⁸ While it turns out that the shot was fired by [REDACTED] and not the suspect, it would be reasonable, albeit mistaken, for Officer Tatum to believe that the subject had fired at him, prior to him firing at all. Therefore, it is clear that the subject had the means, opportunity, and ability to cause death or great bodily harm.

2. The Unknown Subject was Committing an Attempted Aggravated Robbery at the Time Officer Tatum Shot at Him.

Under Illinois law, a person commits armed robbery when he knowingly takes property from a person by the use of force or by threatening the imminent use of force, and he carries on or about his person or is otherwise armed with a weapon.³⁹ It is a Class X felony, carrying six to thirty years imprisonment. If that weapon is a firearm, he is subject to a mandatory additional fifteen years' imprisonment. Even if the apparent firearm was not in fact real, the subject still

³⁸ Officer Tatum did not reference this other shot in his statement to COPA, but he did say in his on the scene statement to OCIC that he heard another shot before he fired.

³⁹ 720 ILCS 5/18-2. Additionally, A person commits the offense of attempt when, with intent to commit a specific offense, he does any act that constitutes a substantial step toward the commission of that offense. A person convicted of attempt may be fined or imprisoned or both not to exceed the maximum provided for the offense attempted. 720 ILCS 5/8-4.

was committing attempted aggravated robbery because he indicated with his actions that he was presently armed with a firearm.⁴⁰ Aggravated robbery is a Class 1 felony. In either case, the crime he was committing was a serious felony, which further justified Officer Tatum’s use of deadly force.

3. It was Objectively Reasonable for Officer Tatum to Use Deadly Force Under the Totality of the Circumstances.

Officer Tatum’s actions were objectively reasonable in response to that threat. He attempted to avoid using deadly force until it was absolutely necessary. Even though Illinois law explicitly states that he is not required to retreat, Officer Tatum first sought to find cover, repeatedly, prior to shooting. He also purports that he initially pulled his firearm not to shoot, but to serve as a deterrent. He also was not carrying any other less-lethal weapons which he could have employed instead of his firearm. He thus also reasonably complied with the policy on sanctity of life.

Based on a preponderance of the evidence, it was objectively reasonable for Officer Tatum to believe that the subject presented a danger to himself and [REDACTED]. Officer Tatum was entitled to use deadly force against the armed offender. Therefore, COPA finds that an officer with similar training and experience as Officer Tatum would reasonably believe that the armed subject posed an immediate threat to his or her safety. The use of deadly force by Officer Tatum was objectively reasonable and **within policy**, as outlined by the Use of Force Model; the Illinois State statute; and the Chicago Police Department’s General Order 03-02.

b. Weapon Qualification

COPA recommends a finding of **Sustained** for the allegation that he carried his auxiliary weapon without annually qualifying with it. Officer Tatum’s Auxiliary Form indicates that as of the incident date, he had most recently qualified on April 3, 2017. Thus, on April 20, 2018 he was beyond the one year period to annually qualify on this weapon. Based on the information provided, COPA recommends a finding of **Sustained**.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis set forth above, COPA finds that Officer Tim Tatum’s use of Deadly Force was within policy. However, as to his failure to annually qualify with his auxiliary weapon, COPA makes the following finding:

Officer	Allegation	Finding / Recommendation
Officer Tim Tatum	1. Carried his auxiliary weapon without annually qualifying with it, in violation of directive U04 – 02(II)(F).	Sustained/Violation Noted

⁴⁰ 720 ILCS 5/18-1.

Approved:



Angela Hearts-Glass
Deputy Chief Administrator

11-13-19

Date



Sydney R. Roberts
Chief Administrator

11-13-19

Date

Appendix A

Assigned Investigative Staff

Squad#:	8
Major Case Specialist:	MCS Wilbert Neal
Supervising Investigator:	Robert Coleman
Deputy Chief Administrator:	Angela Hearts - Glass