

SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Date of Incident:	December 10, 2017
Time of Incident:	10:30 am
Location of Incident:	██████████ ██████████
Date of COPA Notification:	December 19, 2017
Time of COPA Notification:	4:07 pm

On December 10, 2017 Chicago Police Officers were on patrol near ██████████ ██████████. Officers observed a vehicle enter the opposite lane of traffic to pass another vehicle. Officers initiated a traffic stop. The driver of the vehicle, ██████████ (██████████) was ordered out of his vehicle and he exited. ██████████ stood outside his vehicle with his hands on the officers' vehicle while the officers conducted the traffic stop. An officer searched ██████████ car during the traffic stop. ██████████ was not given any paper documentation regarding the stop.

II. INVOLVED PARTIES

Involved Officer #1:	██████████ Star # ██████████ Employee ID # ██████████ Date of Appointment: ██████████ 2015, Police Officer, Unit of Assignment: ██████████ DOB: ██████████ 1991, Male, Hispanic
Involved Officer #2:	██████████ Star # ██████████ Employee ID # ██████████ Date of Appointment: ██████████ 2014, Police Officer, Unit of Assignment: ██████████ DOB: ██████████ 1981, Male, Hispanic
Involved Officer #3:	██████████ Star # ██████████ Employee ID # ██████████ Date of Appointment: ██████████ /2014, Police Officer, Unit of Assignment: ██████████ DOB: ██████████ /1989, Female, White
Involved Individual	██████████ DOB: ██████████ 1968, Male, Black

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer	Allegation	Finding/Recommendation
██████████	1. It is alleged that on December 10, 2017, at approximately 10:30 am, at ██████████ Officer ██████████ conducted an improper search of ██████████ vehicle in violation of Rule 2, Rule 3, and Rule 6.	Sustained/ (1) day with Training
██████████	2. It is alleged that on December 10, 2017, at approximately 10:30 am, at ██████████ Officer ██████████ did not properly document the traffic stop involving ██████████ and the search of his vehicle in violation of Rule 2, Rule 3, Rule 5 and Rule 6.	Sustained/ Reprimand and Training
██████████	1. It is alleged that on December 10, 2017, at approximately 10:30 am, at ██████████ Officer ██████████ did not properly document the traffic stop involving ██████████ and the search of his vehicle in violation of Rule 2, Rule 3, Rule 5 and Rule 6.	Sustained/ Reprimand and Training
██████████	1. It is alleged that on December 10, 2017, at approximately 10:30 am, at ██████████ Officer ██████████ did not properly document the traffic stop involving ██████████ and the search of his vehicle in violation of Rule 2, Rule 3, and Rule 5 and Rule 6.	Sustained/ Reprimand and Training

IV. APPLICABLE RULES AND LAWS

Rules

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

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

3. **Rule 5:** Failure to perform any duty.

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

---

#### General Orders

---

1. GO 01-01 Mission Statement and Core Values
2. SO S04-13-09 Investigatory Stop System
3. SO S04-14-09 Illinois Traffic and Pedestrian Stop Statistical Study

---

#### Federal Laws

---

1. U. S. Constitution, Amendment IV.

## V. INVESTIGATION<sup>1</sup>

### a. Interviews

██████████ gave a digitally recorded interview to COPA on December 19, 2017. In his statement, ██████████ stated that on December 10, 2017, between approximately 10:30 and 11:00 a.m., he was driving his white 2013 Infiniti JX35 west on ██████ St., near ██████ Ave. and ██████ Ave. ██████████ stated he was driving alone. ██████████ then stated while he was driving his car, he passed a vehicle that seemed “somewhat disabled”<sup>2</sup> on the left side of ██████ St. and upon doing so, ██████████ noticed the emergency lights of a police car. ██████████ stated that to pass this vehicle he was momentarily in the opposite lane of traffic. ██████████ stated he figured he was being pulled over and pulled over to the side of the road. ██████████ stated that when he pulled over, the officers pulled behind him in an electric colored blue unmarked Ford with a Municipal Police license plate. After stopping, ██████████ stated he lowered his driver side window halfway.

██████████ then stated he put his hands where the officers could see them. ██████████ stated that there were three uniformed officers: one was possibly a white male, the other was possibly a Hispanic male, and one was possibly a white female. ██████████ stated that the officers exited their vehicle and approached his vehicle quickly, with the two male officers coming towards the driver side and the female officer coming towards the passenger side. ██████████ then stated the male white officer asked ██████████ to lower his window. ██████████ stated he asked the officer why he needed to lower his window further, as the officers could hear him, see him, see his hands, and ██████████ had the proper documentation the officers would need. ██████████ stated the white male officer asked him to lower his window again, more forcefully. ██████████ stated the Hispanic officer then started getting aggressive and told ██████████ that his behavior made him think there may be something in his mug. ██████████ stated that he believed the officers were insinuating that there could be alcohol in his mug. ██████████ stated at that point the traffic stop became confrontational. ██████████ stated that the officers ordered him out of the car and told him that if he refused to come out of the car, he

---

<sup>1</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>2</sup> Attachment 17 03:19-03:20

would be subject to arrest. ██████ stated he was then ordered to the back of his vehicle, told to face the police vehicle and place his hands on the police vehicle.

██████ stated that the Hispanic officer went to the front passenger side of his vehicle, and it appeared as if the white male officer went to the driver side of the vehicle. ██████ stated the female officer stood next to him. ██████ stated that he was not searched, he was not patted down, and he was not asked for his Driver's License or proof of insurance. ██████ stated that his Driver's License and proof of insurance were in his wallet and he told the officers that they were in his wallet. ██████ stated that he saw the two male officers going towards the car but did not see them enter the car. ██████ stated that he knew, however, that the officers searched through his car because when he returned to his vehicle one of his bags in his backseat was unzipped and his mail – also in the backseat - was shuffled. ██████ also stated that the white officer asked him if another individual ever used ██████ vehicle, because he saw marijuana crumbs underneath the driver's seat. ██████ stated that he called the officer a liar because he does not smoke marijuana and no one else drives his car.

██████ stated that one of the male officers asked about cigars in the middle console of his vehicle's glove compartment. ██████ stated that the Hispanic officer was very sarcastic. ██████ stated the officers never issued him a citation nor ever asked for his Driver's License. ██████ stated that none of the officers went back to their vehicle to run his information. ██████ stated the officers never gave him any forms or receipt after the stop. ██████ stated the officers were verbally aggressive, and the Hispanic officer was especially aggressive. ██████ stated the officers told him that they pulled him over because he could have caused an accident by entering the opposite lane of traffic. ██████ stated he tried not to argue with the officers, acted cordially, and when the traffic stop was finished he got back into his vehicle and left.<sup>3</sup>

**Police Officer ██████ # ██████** (“Officer ██████” gave a digitally recorded interview to COPA on July 23, 2018 as a witness. Officer ██████ the female officer present during this traffic stop, stated she worked with Officer ██████ and Officer ██████ a couple times. Officer ██████ stated she barely recalled the traffic stop involving ██████ and did not recall the reason for the traffic stop. Officer ██████ stated she was acting as the guard officer and stood near ██████ and talked to him. Officer ██████ was on the other end of the car and did not know if any of the officers had his Driver's License or if any of the other officers ran ██████ information. Officer ██████ stated she did not believe she nor any other officers gave ██████ any paper documentation for the stop or completed any documentation for the traffic stop. Because Officer ██████ could not recall the traffic stop, she was shown the body worn camera footage to refresh her recollection. This interview was a summary of her refreshed recollection.<sup>4</sup>

**Officer ██████** gave a second digitally recorded interview to COPA as an accused officer on January 14, 2019. Officer ██████ stated she stood by her first statement given as a witness to COPA on July 23, 2018. Officer ██████ stated that she only talked to ██████ and never searched through his car. Officer ██████ stated she did not complete an Investigatory Stop Report (“ISR”) for the traffic stop involving ██████ and was under the impression that either

---

<sup>3</sup> Attachment 17

<sup>4</sup> Attachment 20

Officer [REDACTED] or Officer [REDACTED] completed an ISR for [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] stated she was under that impression because Officer [REDACTED] and Officer [REDACTED] usually work together and usually complete ISR's together. Officer [REDACTED] stated that Officer [REDACTED] and Officer [REDACTED] are partners and had worked together for about a year by December 10, 2017. Officer [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] was never given a traffic citation. Officer [REDACTED] also stated she did not complete a Traffic Stop Statistical Study – Driver Information Card (“TSSS Card”) for [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] stated she was under the impression that either Officer [REDACTED] or Officer [REDACTED] completed a TSSS Card for [REDACTED] because they work together and usually complete Driver Cards for traffic stops. Officer [REDACTED] stated she did not properly document the traffic stop involving [REDACTED] because she believed Officer [REDACTED] or Officer [REDACTED] properly documented the traffic stop. Officer [REDACTED] stated any officer in the car could have completed an ISR or TSSS Card for the [REDACTED].<sup>5</sup>

Officer [REDACTED] gave a digitally recorded interview to COPA as a witness on September 12, 2018. On the date and time of this incident, Officer [REDACTED] stated he was driving the unmarked vehicle and observed [REDACTED] recklessly enter the opposite lane of traffic and drive head on towards a vehicle, almost causing an accident. He stated that he then saw [REDACTED] merge back to his original lane to avoid an accident. Officer [REDACTED] stated the officers pulled [REDACTED] over for improper lane usage. Officer [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] was agitated when he was pulled over. Officer [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] window was lowered a few inches from the top, and he could not see [REDACTED] hands as he had an obstructed view due to the glare. Officer [REDACTED] then stated [REDACTED] did not want to exit his vehicle. Officer [REDACTED] stated that after talking to [REDACTED] opened the door and stood outside his car. Officer [REDACTED] stated that due to [REDACTED] irrational driving, he believed it was possible [REDACTED] was under the influence of a drug or alcohol, but it did not appear so when he stepped out of his vehicle.

Officer [REDACTED] stated he was near the driver side door when [REDACTED] opened it. Officer [REDACTED] stated he did not recall seeing any leafy substance or bottles in the car. Officer [REDACTED] stated he did not smell cannabis or see cannabis in the car. Officer [REDACTED] stated he did not see any cigars or cigarillos in [REDACTED] vehicle. Officer [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] provided the officers with his Driver's License, but proof of his insurance was still inside his vehicle and Officer [REDACTED] went into [REDACTED] car to retrieve his proof of insurance. Officer [REDACTED] stated he ran [REDACTED] information over the PDT<sup>6</sup> (Portable Data Terminal), -Officer [REDACTED] stood with [REDACTED] and Officer [REDACTED] went to [REDACTED] car to obtain [REDACTED] proof of insurance. Officer [REDACTED] stated that during the traffic stop [REDACTED] told the officers that he had proof of insurance in his vehicle and [REDACTED] asked if he should get it, to which Officer [REDACTED] responded that he would get it for [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] information came back clear. Officer [REDACTED] stated he returned to [REDACTED] and tried to explain why they stopped him. Officer [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] responded that he understood why the officers stopped him. Officer [REDACTED] then stated that the officers gave [REDACTED] a verbal warning, and [REDACTED] did not receive any paper documentation for the stop. Officer [REDACTED] stated that he could have given [REDACTED] a traffic citation.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Attachment 33

<sup>6</sup> Portable Data Terminal

<sup>7</sup> Attachment 24

Officer ██████ gave a second digitally recorded interview to COPA on January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2019, as an accused officer. In his second statement, Officer ██████ stated he stood by his first statement given to COPA. Officer ██████ stated that he did not believe any officer searched ██████ vehicle, but Officer ██████ looked for ██████ proof of insurance. Officer ██████ stated he did not complete an ISR for his contact with ██████ and he would assume either Officer ██████ or Officer ██████ would have completed an ISR since he did not. Officer ██████ stated that any of the officers could have completed an ISR for ██████ traffic stop. Officer ██████ stated he did not issue ██████ a traffic citation and he did not believe any of the other officers did. Officer ██████ stated he did not recall if he gave ██████ a TSSS Card. Officer ██████ also stated he would not know if Officer ██████ or Officer ██████ completed a TSSS Card for ██████. Officer ██████ stated he did not recall if he or his team completed a TSSS Card for ██████ but it would have had to be completed following a traffic stop.<sup>8</sup>

Officer ██████ #█████ (“Officer ██████ gave a digitally recorded interview to COPA as an accused officer on September 20, 2018. Officer ██████ stated on December 10, 2017 he and his team were on patrol and noticed a car in the left lane – which was the wrong lane - with another car coming directly at the vehicle, causing one of the vehicles to swerve to avoid an accident. Officer ██████ then stated he and his team initiated a traffic stop of the offending vehicle. Officer ██████ stated Officer ██████ spoke to ██████ from the driver side window, while he approached ██████ from the passenger side. Officer ██████ stated Officer ██████ was standing near the back of ██████ vehicle. Officer ██████ stated Officer ██████ asked ██████ to roll down his window further, but ██████ was reluctant to do so. Officer ██████ stated ██████ appeared to be uncooperative through his attitude and tone of voice. Officer ██████ then stated he walked around to the driver’s side of the vehicle and asked ██████ to step out of the vehicle. Officer ██████ stated that he told ██████ if he refused to get out of his vehicle the situation could escalate. Officer ██████ stated ██████ exited his vehicle voluntarily. Officer ██████ stated that Officer ██████ asked ██████ if he had proof of insurance, to which ██████ responded he did, and it was in the car. Officer ██████ stated ██████ asked if he should get his proof of insurance, to which Officer ██████ stated the officers would get his proof of insurance, as Officer ██████ did not want him to get back into the vehicle and possibly grab something. Officer ██████ stated the officers led him to the back of his vehicle, did not place ██████ into handcuffs but asked him to place his hands on the hood of their police vehicle.

Officer ██████ stated he went into ██████ vehicle to find ██████ proof of insurance, and that is why he searched ██████ vehicle. Officer ██████ stated he believed ██████ may have been under the influence of something due to ██████ reckless driving and his uncooperative state. Officer ██████ stated he looked for evidence of intoxicants, and he sniffed ██████ mug to smell any possible odor of alcohol or other intoxicant. Officer ██████ stated he searched the center console and some papers to try and find ██████ insurance card, and briefly looked for a possible intoxicant. Officer ██████ stated he decided to look for intoxicants after he could not see where the insurance card was. Officer ██████ stated he

---

<sup>8</sup> Attachment 38

wanted to make sure [REDACTED] was not under the influence of any intoxicants. Officer [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] did not give him permission to search his car. Officer [REDACTED] stated he searched through a bag on the back seat of [REDACTED] vehicle to make sure there were no intoxicants. Officer [REDACTED] stated he did not smell an odor of alcohol or cannabis. Officer [REDACTED] stated he saw crumbles of suspect cannabis underneath the driver seat. Officer [REDACTED] stated he believed the crumbs were cannabis based off his experience as a police officer. Officer [REDACTED] stated he did not believe [REDACTED] smelled of cannabis, but he advised [REDACTED] that he should look underneath the driver side and clean it if someone else was using his vehicle. Officer [REDACTED] stated none of the officers issued [REDACTED] a citation but gave him a warning. Officer [REDACTED] stated he did not know of any paper documentation being completed or given to [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] stated that if Chicago Police Officers do not issue a traffic citation they still complete a TSSS Card, but he could not recall if a TSSS Card was completed for [REDACTED] and this traffic stop. Officer [REDACTED] stated any of the officers could have completed the TSSS Card.<sup>9</sup>

#### b. Digital Evidence

**Body Worn Camera (BWC)** footage captures the alleged incident. Officer [REDACTED] Officer [REDACTED] and Officer [REDACTED] were each equipped with a BWC and all three captured the officers' interaction with [REDACTED] the BWC is corroborative of [REDACTED] version of events.<sup>10</sup>

#### c. Documentary Evidence

An **Attendance and Assignment Record Sheet** for District [REDACTED] 4<sup>th</sup> watch, for the date of 12/10/2017, shows that Officer [REDACTED] Officer [REDACTED] and Officer [REDACTED] were working together as a team of three officers. The Record shows that the three officers worked Beat [REDACTED] and worked in car [REDACTED].

## VI. LEGAL STANDARD

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

---

<sup>9</sup> Attachment 28

<sup>10</sup> Attachment 19

<sup>11</sup> Attachment 7

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** can be described as 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 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 can be 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.

## VII. ANALYSIS

### a. Officer ██████ improperly searched ██████ vehicle

Under the "automobile exception" to the search warrant requirement, "law enforcement officers may 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 (Ill. 1994) (citing *Carroll v. United States*, 267 U.S. 132 (1925)). "When officers have such probable cause, the search may extend to 'all parts of the vehicle in which contraband or evidence could be concealed, including closed compartments, containers, packages, and trunks.'" *United States v. Richards*, 719 F.3d 746, 754 (7th Cir. 2013) (citing *United States v. Williams*, 627 F.3d 247, 251 (7th Cir. 2010)).

The BWC footage demonstrates that ██████ did not consent to a search of his vehicle. Officer ██████ stated that he searched ██████ vehicle to look for (1) ██████ insurance card and (2) evidence of intoxicants.

First, Officer ██████ was not permitted to search ██████ vehicle for ██████ insurance card. ██████ insurance card would not constitute proof of a crime. While Officer ██████ may have wanted to verify that ██████ had proof of insurance in the vehicle, as required by Illinois law, ██████ specifically stated he possessed proof of insurance and offered to go back inside his vehicle to retrieve the insurance card. While Officer ██████ was not required to permit ██████ to return to his vehicle to retrieve the insurance card and was legally permitted to order ██████ out of the vehicle, he could not then use this as a lawful basis to search ██████ vehicle.

Second, Officer ██████ did not have probable cause to believe he would find evidence of intoxicants in the vehicle. Officer ██████ stated that he believed that ██████ was intoxicated



because he observed [REDACTED] driving in a reckless manner and [REDACTED] was not cooperative during the initial part of the traffic stop. However, Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] did not report smelling alcohol or drugs or any other observations which would lead a reasonable officer to believe that intoxicants would be located in the vehicle.<sup>12</sup> Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] also did not articulate any other reasonable basis to believe [REDACTED] was intoxicated (e.g. slurred speech, blood shot eyes) and did not even conduct a field sobriety test on [REDACTED]. Under the totality of the circumstances, it was objectively unreasonable for Officer [REDACTED] to believe he had probable cause that evidence of intoxicants was located inside [REDACTED] vehicle.

Third, Officer [REDACTED] did not identify any other lawful basis to search the vehicle and no other lawful basis existed. For example, when officers perform a traffic stop, they may search the passenger compartment for weapons if they “possess an articulable and objectively reasonable belief that the suspect is potentially dangerous.” *Michigan v. Long*, 463 U.S. 1032, 1051 (1983). In the instant case, none of the officers reported suspecting [REDACTED] was armed and there was no objectively reasonable basis to believe that [REDACTED] was dangerous. Indeed, the officers did not even frisk [REDACTED].

For these reasons, Officer [REDACTED] improperly searched [REDACTED] vehicle and COPA concludes the finding for **Allegation #1** against Officer Rodriguez is **Sustained**.

**b. Officers [REDACTED] Jr and [REDACTED] did not properly document the traffic stop involving [REDACTED] and the search of his vehicle**

With limited exceptions, Special Order S04-14-09 expressly requires Department members to document traffic stops. No exception is applicable in this case. Generally, the Traffic Stop Statistical Study—Driver Information Card Information Card<sup>13</sup> must include information about the stop including the basis for the stop and whether a search was conducted. It is undisputed that none of the officers completed the Information Card or otherwise documented the traffic stop and search. Although only one of the officers had to complete the Information Card, all of the officers were responsible for ensuring that the Information Card was completed. Therefore, COPA recommends a finding of **Sustained** for **Allegation #2** against Officer [REDACTED] and **Allegation #1** against Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

## VIII. RECOMMENDED DISCIPLINE FOR SUSTAINED ALLEGATIONS

**a. Officer [REDACTED] # [REDACTED]**

**i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History**

1. Officer [REDACTED] has the following complimentary history:

Attendance Recognition Award: 1

Emblem of Recognition – Physical Fitness: 3

<sup>12</sup> The fact that [REDACTED] possessed a travel mug, a lawful item, also did not provide probable cause to search the vehicle. The officers did not assert that the mug provided a basis to search the vehicle.

<sup>13</sup> In cases where a personal service citation is issued, this information must be included on a Traffic Stop Statistical Study Sticker.

Department Commendation 3  
Honorable Mention: 63  
Complimentary Letter 2  
Honorable Mention Ribbon Award 1  
Top Gun Arrest Award 2  
Annual Bureau Award of Recognition 1  
Unit Meritorious Performance Award 2

2. Officer [REDACTED] has the following disciplinary history:

Reprimand – 005 – Court Appearance Violation  
1 Day Off – 022A – Current IL License Plates And/Or City  
Vehicle Stickers

**ii. Recommended Penalty, by Allegation**

1. COPA recommends a penalty of a one (1) day suspension for Allegation No. 1. Additionally, the officer should be provided appropriate additional training.
2. COPA recommends a penalty of Reprimand for Allegation No. 2. Additionally, the officer should be provided appropriate additional training.

**b. Officer [REDACTED] # [REDACTED]**

**i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History**

1. Officer [REDACTED] has the following complimentary history:

Attendance Recognition Award: 1  
Department Commendation: 3  
Honorable Mention: 55  
Complimentary Letter: 2  
Top Gun Arrest Award: 2  
Unit Meritorious Performance Award: 1

2. Officer [REDACTED] has the following disciplinary history:

None

**ii. Recommended Penalty, by Allegation**

1. COPA recommends a penalty of Reprimand for Allegation No. 1. Additionally, the officer should be provided appropriate additional training.

**c. Officer [REDACTED] # [REDACTED]**

**i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History**

1. Officer [REDACTED] has the following complimentary history:

Emblem of Recognition: 2  
 Honorable Mention: 28  
 Complimentary Letter: 4  
 Life Saving Award: 1  
 Unit Meritorious Performance Award: 1

2. Officer [REDACTED] has the following disciplinary history:  
 None

**ii. Recommended Penalty, by Allegation**

1. COPA recommends a penalty of Reprimand for Allegation No. 1. Additionally, the officer should be provided appropriate additional training.

**IX. CONCLUSION**

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

<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Finding/Recommendation</b>
[REDACTED]	
1. It is alleged that on December 10, 2017, at approximately 10:30 am, at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Officer [REDACTED] conducted an improper search of [REDACTED] vehicle.	Sustained/One (1) day suspension and training
2. It is alleged that on December 10, 2017, at approximately 10:30 am, at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Officer [REDACTED] did not properly document the traffic stop involving Mr. [REDACTED] and the search of his vehicle.	Sustained/ Reprimand and training

<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Finding</b>
[REDACTED]	
1. It is alleged that on December 10, 2017, at approximately 10:30 am, at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Officer [REDACTED] did not properly document the traffic stop involving Mr. [REDACTED] and the search of his vehicle.	Sustained/ Reprimand and training

**Allegation**

**Finding/Recommendation**

1. It is alleged that on December 10, 2017, at approximately 10:30 am, at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Officer [REDACTED] did not properly document the traffic stop involving Mr. [REDACTED] and the search of his vehicle.

Sustained/ Reprimand and training

Approved:

[REDACTED]

*Deputy Chief Administrator*

3-27-19

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

[REDACTED]

*Chief Administrator*

March 28, 2019

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Appendix A

Assigned Investigative Staff

---

**Squad #:**

10

**Investigator:**

**Supervising Investigator:**

**Deputy Chief Administrator:**

