

SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Date of Incident:	June 17, 2018
Time of Incident:	1:00 AM
Location of Incident:	[REDACTED] Beat [REDACTED]
Date of COPA Notification:	November 5, 2011
Time of COPA Notification:	04:00 AM

On June 17, 2018, [REDACTED] was involved in a traffic accident with a parked vehicle. According to [REDACTED], he was confronted by an armed civilian, who was angry about his car being struck, which caused [REDACTED] to flee in fear. When officers arrived at the scene, the determination was made to arrest [REDACTED] for fleeing the scene and other minor offenses, which resulted in his vehicle being impounded. [REDACTED] alleged that Officers failed to investigate [REDACTED]'s aggravated assault claims.

II. INVOLVED PARTIES¹

Involved Officer #1:	[REDACTED], [REDACTED]; Star: [REDACTED] Employee ID: [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: [REDACTED], 2008 Rank: Field Training Officer Unit of Assignment: [REDACTED] DOB: [REDACTED], 1974 Gender: Female Race: Hispanic
Involved Officer #2:	[REDACTED], [REDACTED] Star: [REDACTED] Employee ID: [REDACTED] DOA: [REDACTED], 2017 Rank: Probationary Police Officer UOA: [REDACTED] DOB: [REDACTED], 1995 Gender: Female Race: Black
Involved Officer #3:	[REDACTED], [REDACTED] Star: [REDACTED] Employee ID: [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: [REDACTED], 2016 Rank: Police Officer Unit of Assignment: [REDACTED] DOB: [REDACTED], 1991 Gender: Male Race: White
Involved Officer #4:	[REDACTED], [REDACTED] Star: [REDACTED] Employee ID: [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: [REDACTED], 2012 Rank: Police Officer Unit of Assignment: [REDACTED] DOB: [REDACTED], 1983 Gender: Male Race: Black

¹ Officers [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] were not interviewed in connections with this investigation because it was clear from the body-worn cameras and documentary evidence that the allegations against them would be exonerated.

Involved Officer #5: [REDACTED] Star: [REDACTED] Employee ID: [REDACTED]
 Date of Appointment: [REDACTED], 2008 Rank: Field Training
 Officer Unit of Assignment: [REDACTED]
 DOB: [REDACTED], 1972 Gender: Male Race: Hispanic

Involved Officer #6: [REDACTED], [REDACTED] Star: [REDACTED] Employee ID: [REDACTED]
 Date of Appointment: [REDACTED], 2017
 Rank: Probationary Police Officer Unit of Assignment:
 [REDACTED] DOB: [REDACTED], [REDACTED] Gender: Male Race:
 Unknown

Involved Individual #1: [REDACTED], [REDACTED]: Black Gender Male DOB: [REDACTED],
 1986

Involved Individual #2: [REDACTED], [REDACTED]: Black Gender: Female DOB [REDACTED],
 1987

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	1. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] arrested [REDACTED] without justification. 2. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] failed to investigate complaints by [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] threatened him with a gun. 3. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] had the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] towed without justification. 4. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] failed give Miranda warnings to [REDACTED].	EXONERATED UNFOUNDED EXONERATED SUSTAINED
Officer [REDACTED]	1. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] arrested [REDACTED] without justification.	EXONERATED

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] failed to investigate complaints by [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] threatened him with a gun. 3. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] had the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] towed without justification. 4. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] failed give Miranda warnings to [REDACTED]. 	<p>UNFOUNDED</p> <p>EXONERATED</p> <p>EXONERATED</p>
<p>Officer [REDACTED]</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] arrested [REDACTED] without justification. 2. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] failed to investigate complaints by [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] threatened him with a gun. 3. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] failed give Miranda warnings to [REDACTED]. 4. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] had the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] towed without justification. 	<p>EXONERATED</p> <p>UNFOUNDED</p> <p>EXONERATED</p> <p>EXONERATED</p>
<p>Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] arrested [REDACTED] without justification. 2. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] failed to investigate complaints by [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] threatened him with a gun. 3. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] had the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] towed without justification. 	<p>EXONERATED</p> <p>UNFOUNDED</p> <p>EXONERATED</p>

	<p>4. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] failed give Miranda warnings to [REDACTED].</p>	<p>EXONERATED</p>
<p>Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p>	<p>1. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] arrested [REDACTED] without justification.</p> <p>2. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] failed to investigate complaints by [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] threatened him with a gun.</p> <p>3. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] had the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] towed without justification.</p> <p>4. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] failed give Miranda warnings to [REDACTED].</p>	<p>EXONERATED</p> <p>UNFOUNDED</p> <p>EXONERATED</p> <p>EXONERATED</p>
<p>Officer [REDACTED]</p>	<p>1. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] arrested [REDACTED] without justification.</p> <p>2. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] failed to investigate complaints by [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] threatened him with a gun.</p> <p>3. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] had the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] towed without justification.</p> <p>4. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] failed give Miranda warnings to [REDACTED].</p>	<p>EXONERATED</p> <p>UNFOUNDED</p> <p>EXONERATED</p> <p>EXONERATED</p>

IV. APPLICABLE RULES AND LAWS

Rules

-
1. Rule 1: prohibits an officer from violating any law or ordinance.
 2. Rule 3: prohibits an officer from engaging in any conduct that would amount to a failure to promote the Department's policy or goals.
 3. Rule 6: prohibits an officer from disobeying any order or directive, whether written or oral.
 4. Rule 10: requires an officer to be attentive to his or her duties.
-

General Orders

1. General Order G04-03, Custodial Interrogations
 2. General Order G04-01, Preliminary Investigations
 3. General Order G07-03, Vehicle Towing and Relocation Operations
-

Special Orders

1. Special Order S07-03-05, Impoundment of Vehicles for Municipal Code Violations
 2. Special Order S04-13-09, Investigatory Stop System
 3. Special Order S04-14-05, Traffic Violators, Name Checks, and Bonding
-

Federal Laws

1. U.S. Constitution Fourth Amendment
 2. U.S. Constitution Fifth Amendment
-

State Laws

1. 625 ILCS 5.0/18B-103,392.82, Cell Phone Use While Operating a Motor Vehicle
2. 625 ILCS 5.0/11-502B, Transporting Open Alcohol
3. 625 ILCS 5.0/11-402-A, Leaving the Scene of an Accident
4. Municipal Code 9-92-035, Authority to Impound Fleeing Vehicle

V. INVESTIGATION ²

A. Interviews

██████████³ gave a statement to the Civilian Office of Police Accountability ("COPA") on June 22, 2018. In his statement, ██████████ told COPA that he and his wife, ██████████, were returning home after a party. While driving, ██████████ was changing the song on his phone when he side-swiped a parked car on ██████ Street. The car continued up the curb, where ██████████ regained control and stopped the car. The tire "busted" after striking the curb, causing it to rapidly lose air pressure. A man, now known to be ██████████, came out of his home, went back into his house, then came back out with an unknown object in his hand. ██████████ was followed by a woman

² COPA conducted a thorough and complete investigation. The following is a summary of the material evidence gathered and relied upon in our analysis.

³ Attachment 10

and two additional men. [REDACTED] made the decision to leave, fearing for their safety and planned to return after he called the police. ^{4 5 6}

[REDACTED] advised he drove in a large circle, attempting to navigate his way back to the scene. Shortly after leaving the scene, [REDACTED] pulled over to call his insurance company, then exited his vehicle and began to change his tire. [REDACTED] told COPA that he was in the process of changing his tire when he was confronted by [REDACTED]. [REDACTED]'s vehicle approached from behind. [REDACTED] then exited his car holding a gun. [REDACTED] began berating them about the accident. [REDACTED] attempted to assure [REDACTED] that he was returning to the scene. [REDACTED] demanded their insurance information. [REDACTED] asked [REDACTED] to get their insurance card. [REDACTED] gave the card to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] gave it to [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] took the card and drove away, then blocked the street in front of them, where he remained for a time. As [REDACTED] started to head back in their direction, [REDACTED] stated that he and [REDACTED] ran into a nearby yard to hide. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] then called the police several times. According to [REDACTED], [REDACTED] never pointed the gun at him or in his direction.

Shortly thereafter, [REDACTED] advised the police arrived, and they emerged from their hiding place. [REDACTED] felt that the officers were not listening to their claim that [REDACTED] had a gun nor investigate to see if [REDACTED] had a gun. He felt that the police treated them as the suspects as if he had been in possession of the gun. The officers told [REDACTED] that he had fled the scene to which he argued that he was only trying to stay safe. [REDACTED] admitted that he was yelling at [REDACTED] over the police. He acknowledged that the police kept trying to settle him down and when he would not, he was arrested. [REDACTED] advised he was searched on the scene and arrested without being read his rights.

[REDACTED] told investigators that he was not questioned at the station, was not asked to comply with a field sobriety test. [REDACTED] later learned that his car was towed. [REDACTED] said he was unaware that there was an open container of alcohol in the car. [REDACTED] also told COPA that he called his cousins in between police calls and they also came to the scene.

[REDACTED]⁷ gave a statement to the Civilian Office of Police Accountability ("COPA") on June 22, 2018. [REDACTED] told COPA that she and her husband were leaving a party at their cousin's home. They drove eastbound on [REDACTED] Street, where they side-swiped a black, four-door car. After striking the black car, [REDACTED] said that her husband, [REDACTED], hit the curb, causing a flat tire. Immediately after the collision, [REDACTED] emerged from his home and began yelling at [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. According to [REDACTED], [REDACTED] threatened that he had additional people coming to deal with them. [REDACTED] then went back into his home and reemerged with an object in his hand. Three other people came back out with [REDACTED].

According to [REDACTED], [REDACTED] instructed her to get back into the car, fearing the object was a weapon. [REDACTED] then drove away from the scene to get away from [REDACTED]. They continued for two more blocks before turning to go back because one-way streets prevented them from turning sooner. They turned onto [REDACTED] Street and parked. Immediately after parking, [REDACTED] appeared

⁴ Attachment 55

⁵ Attachment 52

⁶ Attachment 54

⁷ Attachment 9

behind them in a white SUV. [REDACTED] was immediately combative with them. [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] that they had insurance. [REDACTED] then handed the insurance information to [REDACTED], who took the information, drove off and parked his car in a manner that blocked the street and their exit. [REDACTED] asked [REDACTED] to call the police, telling her that [REDACTED] had a gun. [REDACTED] then commence to change the tire.

[REDACTED] called 9-1-1⁸ and told them her location. Dispatchers told [REDACTED] to stay put. While [REDACTED] was changing the tire, [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] started to head back down the street in their direction. At this point, [REDACTED] advised that [REDACTED] ceased changing the tire and told [REDACTED] to run. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] ran to hide in a nearby yard. [REDACTED] then called the police repeatedly. After the last call, they noticed the police lights. They came out with their hands up. [REDACTED] said that the police immediately seized upon [REDACTED] and took him aside, not letting [REDACTED] interact with him.

[REDACTED] tried to explain to the officer that they fled for their safety, not because they were trying to flee the scene. She attempted to explain that she called the police to report the man with the gun but felt that the police were treating them as the suspects. She notified the police that the man in the white truck, [REDACTED], was the assailant. [REDACTED] felt that no one was listening to her. [REDACTED] saw family members on the scene, who tried comforting her. [REDACTED] watching as her husband is arrested asked for an explanation and was directed to speak with the Sergeant on scene. [REDACTED] stated, when she spoke with Sergeant [REDACTED] he was very confrontational with her, told her that the white truck was not on the scene and the information she provided irrelevant. Sergeant [REDACTED] then told her to gather her belongings from the vehicle because it was being seized.

While at the station, [REDACTED] stated that Officer [REDACTED] expressed that she (Officer [REDACTED]) believed that she, not her husband, was actually driving to which [REDACTED] denied. Officer [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] was being released with traffic citations. [REDACTED] said that no one would tell her where the car was located or return her phone. She advised they left several hours later with all of their belongings except the car.

[REDACTED]⁹ gave a statement to the Civilian Officer of Police Accountability on July 20, 2018. In his interview, [REDACTED] told COPA that at around 1:30 AM, he was upstairs when he heard a crash. His daughter was looking out the window and told him that someone hit a tree. When he went outside to check on the person who hit the tree, he saw that his car had also been hit and knocked onto the sidewalk. As he came down to investigate, the person, now known to be [REDACTED], was pulling away from the tree and then drove away.

[REDACTED] got into his other vehicle, a white SUV, and followed [REDACTED] for a few blocks to see if he would stop and turn around. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] was unaware that [REDACTED] was following him. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] exited his vehicle and began to change his tire. [REDACTED] described the damage to [REDACTED]'s car as "the tire came off the car. He was riding on his rim." [REDACTED] confronted [REDACTED]s about fleeing the scene. According to [REDACTED], [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] that he was planning to come back to the scene after he changed his tire. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] began

⁸ Attachment 50

⁹ Attachment 4

arguing, then ██████'s girlfriend, ██████, called the police.¹⁰ ██████ then gave ██████ his insurance information. ██████ then drove away to block the street, fearing that ██████ was going to flee again. ██████ also called the police.¹¹

The police arrived. ██████ took the police to ██████' car and no one was there. A neighbor pointed ██████ out to the police. The police took down both drivers' information. Several of ██████' family members arrived at the scene shortly after the police. ██████' family members were being disruptive and threatening. The police separated the parties. ██████ said that ██████ was initially calm, then when the police and his family showed up to the scene, his demeanor changed. ██████ described ██████ as the belligerent one. According to ██████, ██████ was being crazy and "possibly drunk," so the police handcuffed him.

██████ denied ever having a gun. ██████ said that one of the officers talked to him about the situation and said that if he were in ██████'s shoes, he would have had a gun on him because you "cannot know what those people would be capable of." ██████ told investigators that he presented himself for the officer to verify that he did not have a gun, though the officer never actually searched him. ██████ said he was wearing boxers and a shirt at the time. ██████ stated that ██████ did not present to him as drunk, but ██████ did. ██████ concluded the interview by saying that the police did not do anything wrong and were doing everything reasonable to keep people safe.

Officer ██████¹² gave a statement to the Civilian Office of Police Accountability on December 17, 2018. In her statement, Officer ██████ told investigators that she was the second officer on the scene and watched as ██████ emerged from hiding in someone's yard. ██████ told Officer ██████ that they were hiding because ██████ had pulled a gun on them and drove off with their information. Officer ██████ told investigators that other officers on the scene investigated the claim that ██████ had a gun and did not find it to be credible, which prompted her to focus her investigation on the hit-and-run claim. Officer ██████ told investigators that she did not find ██████ to be credible because she felt that his story changed repeatedly over the course of their discussion.

Officer ██████ told investigators that due to the scene becoming chaotic, the decision was made to arrest ██████ on the suspicion that he was intoxicated. Officer ██████ referenced the appearance of several members of ██████' family showing up to the scene of the incident. Officer ██████ told investigators that she suspected ██████ was intoxicated because of his rapid highs and lows, the fact that he was coming from a party, and the discovery of an open bottle of vodka in his car. In the station, Officer ██████ noticed the smell of alcohol around his person but determined that he was not intoxicated based on the change in his demeanor and the fact he appeared coherent. As a result, she did not feel chemical testing was necessary. Officer ██████ then charged ██████ with the traffic offenses that he admitted to on body worn camera – using his cell phone while driving, having an open container of alcohol, and leaving the scene of an accident.

¹⁰ Attachment 51

¹¹ Attachment 53

¹² Attachment 44

Officer ██████ admitted that ██████ was not given Miranda warnings. Officer ██████ explained that it was her understanding that Miranda warnings were not required for traffic offenses. Officer ██████ told investigators that ██████' vehicle was towed for leaving the scene of an accident despite the fact that the tow report said the vehicle was towed for "fleeing and eluding." Officer ██████ explained that there was a difference between fleeing and eluding the police and leaving the scene of an accident but noted that both were impound-worthy offenses. Officer ██████ also mentioned that the vehicle was damaged and inoperable and could not have been left safely on the scene.

B. Digital Evidence

Officer ██████'s Body Worn Camera¹³ captured a conversation with him and Officer ██████ explaining that ██████ and ██████ said they were upset about ██████ pulling a gun on them and taking their insurance information, even though they hit his car and ran away. Officer ██████ references vehicle tracks on the lawn as proof of their driving away.

██████'s body worn camera also captures ██████ speaking to Officer ██████ and Sergeant ██████. Officer ██████ asks ██████ why he was in the alley. ██████ responds, "because he pulled a gun out, ma'am. My wife is crying. I pulled a gun out." After being questioned about ██████ having a gun, ██████ states, "he pulled out the gun out." "I don't own no gun." At this point, Sergeant ██████ tells ██████ to turn around and put his hands behind his back, to which ██████ responds, "please lock me up." As ██████ is led to the police car, ██████ begins complaining that no read him his right. Civilians at the scene begin arguing with the police over the arrest claiming the police ignored ██████' allegation that the man had a gun. Officer ██████ then unfolds a piece of paper that is ██████' insurance and passes it to another officer. Officer ██████ then indicates to a female officer that the scene was pretty tense.

Thereafter, ██████ is observed being allowed to retrieve some possessions from the vehicle. The vehicle is then locked, and the officers discuss towing the vehicle. The sergeant then passes a substantially consumed bottle of vodka and a bag with some unknown items to Officer ██████ for inventory.

Officer ██████'s Body Worn Camera¹⁴ captured Sergeant ██████ discussing the incident with ██████ and an unidentified person. Sergeant ██████ tells ██████ that she was complaining about a person in a white Ford, but there was no one with that car present. ██████ tells Sergeant ██████ that she could point the person out. ██████ says that she was the one who passed the insurance card to the person with the gun. She then says specifically that it was the person "right there... in the white shirt" who was off camera. Officer ██████ is then heard speaking with another officer on the scene, who informed her of both sides of the argument, and that he sympathized with ██████'s alleged gun use, saying that he too would be nervous to approach a person who hit his car and ran away. This officer also states his suspicion that ██████, not ██████, was actually driving and that ██████ seemed very intoxicated. Sergeant ██████ is then seen allowing ██████ to retrieve some possessions from the vehicle.

¹³ See Attachment 45

¹⁴ See Attachment 45

Officer ██████████'s Body Worn Camera¹⁵ captured Officer ██████████ investigating the accident. Officer ██████████ observes Sergeant ██████████ talking with ██████████. ██████████ explains that she did not feel safe because the man with the gun took their information. Sergeant ██████████ tells ██████████ that her story, her husband's story, and the witnesses' stories were not the same. ██████████ says that Sergeant ██████████ never listened to her. Sergeant ██████████ tells ██████████ that the man with the gun was not there. ██████████ then offers to point the person with the gun out. Officer ██████████ walks away. ██████████ was allowed to retrieve some belongings from the vehicle while Officer ██████████ observes. ██████████ told Officer ██████████ that the alcohol in the car was from a party earlier that night but was not her husband's alcohol.

Officer ██████████' Body Worn Camera 1 (on scene)¹⁶ captured ██████████ explaining to Officer ██████████ and Sergeant ██████████ that after he sideswiped ██████████'s car, he began to turn his vehicle around and realized he had a flat tire. After stopping to change his tire, ██████████ found him and pulled the gun on him. It goes on to capture, ██████████ and ██████████ engaging in a verbal altercation over the gun issue, requiring the officers to separate them. Sergeant ██████████ then pulls Officer ██████████ to the side and tells her that the witnesses said the man in the white truck did not point a gun. Sergeant ██████████ also states that when he arrived on the scene, ██████████ had ██████████ blocked in with his white truck.

When Officer ██████████ and Sergeant ██████████ re-approached ██████████, they began inquiring about what he had to drink that night. ██████████ denied drinking anything. ██████████ told the officers that he was changing songs on his cell phone when he accidentally sideswiped the car. ██████████ explains that there were four people in the car at the time – ██████████, ██████████, ██████████' uncle, and his uncle's girlfriend. After the accident, ██████████ let his uncle and girlfriend out of the car. ██████████ tells the officers that he planned to come back to the scene when his tire blew out. ██████████ told them that he then stopped the vehicle and attempted to change his tire. While he was changing his tire, ██████████ was confronted by ██████████ with a gun. ██████████ then stated inadvertently, "I pulled the gun out." Shortly after, he is observed being taken into custody and placed in the back of Officer ██████████'s squad car.

Officer ██████████ then goes to ██████████' vehicle and retrieves a bag with cranberry juice and a bottle of vodka from the front passenger seat. Officer ██████████ then drove to the scene of the accident to identify the vehicle that was struck. She identifies a vehicle with the license plate "██████████." The vehicle – a black sedan - had significant damage to the driver's side of the vehicle and had been knocked on to the grass from the street. Officer ██████████ continued to transport ██████████ to the district. Inside of the district, Officer ██████████ questions ██████████ about what he had to drink. ██████████ again denies drinking. ██████████ recounts the story again, mentioning that after he was confronted by ██████████, his wife and ██████████ began to argue. He intervened and gave his insurance information to ██████████ because ██████████ had a gun in his hand.

¹⁵ See Attachment 45

¹⁶ See Attachment 45

Officer ██████████' Body Worn Camera 1 (in district) ^{17 18 19} captured Officer ██████████' custodial interviews of ██████████. Officer ██████████ inquiries about ██████████ potentially having a gun on the scene, the vodka recovered in his vehicle, whether ██████████ or ██████████ was driving, and more discussion related to the citations ██████████ received that day.

Officer ██████████' Body Worn Camera²⁰ captured her interactions with ██████████. ██████████ tells officer ██████████ that their car got a flat tire during the accident. She further explains that ██████████ backed his car off the tree they hit, then drove around the block. ██████████ says that they pulled over onto the street to call their insurance company while her husband changed the tire when they were confronted by ██████████. ██████████ tells Officer ██████████ that she argued with ██████████ and told him there was no need to yell at her because it was already being taken care of with insurance. ██████████ says that they gave ██████████ their insurance, expecting him to swap information, but he drove away with their information instead. ██████████ says that ██████████ drove down and blocked the street with his truck. ██████████ tells Officer ██████████ that they fled to the alley because ██████████ pulled out a gun on them. ██████████ tells Officer ██████████ that she called the police from the alley.

At the scene, ██████████ was taken into custody for "further investigation." Officer ██████████, who was partnered with Officer ██████████, transported ██████████ away, first stopping at the scene of the accident. At the scene of the accident, Officer ██████████ converses with an off-camera, young female, who says that her dad followed the driver of the other car. The young woman says that she saw the silver car swerving in and out of lanes before hitting the young woman's family car and then a tree. She says that the people inside initially got out of the car and started walking away, then saw her father and hopped back in the car and drove away. The young woman tells Officer ██████████ that her father got in the car and followed him. Officer ██████████'s interrupted the discussion and hurried Officer ██████████ to drive away. Officer ██████████ then called for a tow truck.²¹

Sergeant ██████████'s Body Worn Camera²² captured his interactions on the scene. Sergeant ██████████ speaks with two bystanders off to the side and asked about what they observed. Additionally, Sergeant ██████████ engages in a conversation with ██████████'s cousin in which he describes ██████████ as too intoxicated to understand what is being said. He explains to the cousin that the person ██████████ alleged pulled a gun on her was no longer present. ██████████ offered to point out the suspect. ██████████ identifies an off-camera man in a white t-shirt. Sergeant ██████████ said there was no white Ford on the scene anymore either.

Officer ██████████'s (PPO) Body Worn Camera²³ captured his on-scene activities, including his interaction with ██████████. Shortly after Officer ██████████ arrived at the scene, ██████████ and ██████████ had to be separated. ██████████ shouts at ██████████ about a gun. Officers and family members of both sides were intermixed in the streets and sidewalks. A woman can be heard saying,

¹⁷ See Attachment 45

¹⁸ See Attachment 45

¹⁹ See Attachment 45

²⁰ See Attachment 45

²¹ Attachment 56

²² See Attachment 45

²³ See Attachment 45

“he said he left because the dude pulled a gun on him.” [REDACTED] reacts saying, “I don’t have no gun. I don’t own no gun.” Later, [REDACTED] produced [REDACTED]’ insurance information. [REDACTED] tells Officer [REDACTED] that he blocked [REDACTED] in because he thought they would run. [REDACTED] tells Officer [REDACTED] that he called the police and said [REDACTED] may have had a gun. Officer [REDACTED] appears to agree that [REDACTED] committed a hit-and-run. [REDACTED] and his daughter express concern over [REDACTED]’ family lingering in the area near their home. [REDACTED] is arrested. [REDACTED] postulates that [REDACTED] may have dumped a gun in the alley. Sergeant [REDACTED] appears to check the alley for the same.

Officer [REDACTED]’s Body Worn Camera²⁴ captured his interaction with a witness near the scene of the collision who is believed to be [REDACTED]’s daughter, [REDACTED].

Event Number [REDACTED] Audio²⁵ captured a call from [REDACTED], at 0049hours, who said that a car struck her parked car and a tree, then drove away. The incident occurred at [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

Zone [REDACTED] Audio 0000 – 0200 hours²⁶ captured the zone radio transmissions on June 17, 2018. At approximately 01:01:00 into the audio, a report of a man with a gun in the vicinity of [REDACTED] came across the radio. There were no further details at the time. A call was made requesting assistance for the responding unit. Later, the dispatcher broadcasts that the caller and his wife were hiding in the alley. Unit [REDACTED] found the unoccupied vehicle belonging to the “offender.” The “victim” informed the responding unit that his car had been struck by a hit-and-run driver. Several minutes later, the officers were still unable to locate the offender. The description of a black male with a white shirt and black pants was given.

Someone responded to a request for information about additional passengers to the fleeing vehicle that all of the parties were there on scene. LEADS was responding slowly, so license plates and drivers’ license numbers were unable to be run. [REDACTED] requested an RD number and was given [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] called to request a tow.

C. Documentary Evidence

In the **Arrest Report for RD# [REDACTED]²⁷** Arresting Officer [REDACTED] wrote that [REDACTED], driving a vehicle with the license plate [REDACTED], fled the scene after striking a vehicle with the license plate [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] wrote that she found the arrestee’s vehicle at [REDACTED] and found the arrestee in a nearby yard. Officer [REDACTED] noted that a bottle of Kettle One Vodka with a broken seal was recovered from the passenger side floor. Officer [REDACTED] transported the arrestee to the [REDACTED] District for possible DUI and “due to scene becoming chaotic.” Upon further investigation, Officer [REDACTED] determined that [REDACTED] was not intoxicated. [REDACTED] was then cited with the charges he admitted on body worn camera. According to the report, [REDACTED] admitted that he looked away while driving to change the music on his phone and struck the vehicle with the license plate [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] admitted that he continued to [REDACTED], where he discovered that he had a flat tire.

²⁴ See Attachment 45

²⁵ Attachment 48

²⁶ Attachment 58

²⁷ Attachment 11

██████ was cited with using his cell phone while driving, leaving the scene of an accident, and transporting open alcohol. ██████ produced his driver's license and proof of insurance. ██████' vehicle was impounded under report SS# ██████.

Event Query Report ██████²⁸ details a 00:51:25 call to OEMC reporting an attempted hit-and-run. The incident occurred at ██████. The caller identified herself as ██████, the owner of the Toyota Camry. The caller stated that her father was outside trying to block the offending vehicle from leaving.

The report also copies portions from other reports. A caller also stated that a man they were in an auto accident with took their information and threatened them with guns.

Event Query Report ██████²⁹ details a 00:57:46 call to OEMC regarding an auto accident. The incident occurred at ██████. The caller identified as "██████." The caller stated that her dad is outside trying to block the offending vehicle from leaving.

Event Query Report ██████³⁰ details a 00:58:05 call to OEMC regarding an auto accident. The incident occurred at ██████. The caller identified as ██████. The caller stated that the male they were involved in the accident with took their information and threaten them with guns. The caller stated that she did not feel safe waiting for the police. The dispatcher advised the caller to go to the police station. The caller said that she could not. The caller is in a silver Chevy Malibu.

Event Query Report ██████³¹ details a 00:59:31 call to OEMC regarding a traffic accident. The caller was identified as ██████. The incident occurred at ██████. The caller stated that the car involved in the hit-and-run was in front of the location of the call attempting to change his tire.

Event Query Report ██████³² details a 01:00:26 OEMC call reporting a person with a gun. The incident occurred at ██████. The caller identified as ██████. Units ██████, ██████, and ██████ responded. ██████ arrived on-scene first. OEMC noted that "SCR was involved in A/A Ford White Explore Caller is in 2017 Chevy Malibu." OEMC further noted, "caller is in alley hiding behind recycle garbage can offender took callers insurance card and threatened to shoot caller and wife thinks it was a white ford explorer."

Event Query Report ██████³³ details a call to OEMC at 01:01 by ██████. According to the report, ██████ indicated that his car was struck by an intoxicated black male, who was driving a grey Malibu. During the call, CPD arrived on scene.

²⁸ Attachment 47

²⁹ Attachment 22

³⁰ Attachment 23

³¹ Attachment 24

³² Attachment 25

³³ Attachment 37

Event Query Report [REDACTED]³⁴ details a call to OEMC at 01:04:42 reporting a person with a gun. The caller identified himself as [REDACTED]. The incident occurred in the [REDACTED] of [REDACTED]. OEMC noted that the “C/S M/S....A/A.... hit-and-run.. caller is a silver Malibu.... Other driver took his insurance info....then pulled a gun on him and his wife...in the alley.....then took off....NFI.”

Event Query Report [REDACTED]³⁵ details a call to OEMC at 01:10 by [REDACTED]. In the call, [REDACTED] stated that he was involved in an auto accident and that the other driver pulled a gun on him. [REDACTED] stated that they were hiding in the alley. CPD arrived during the call.

The **Vehicle Tow Report Packet**³⁶ contained a series of reports related to the impoundment of [REDACTED]’ vehicle. The Motor Vehicle Inventory Report cites “fleeing/eluding” as the reason for the tow. The box marked “Other ILCS seizure” was checked and the charge was cited as “flee scene,” corresponding to 625 ILCS 5.0/11-404, which refers to a driver’s duties after striking an unattended vehicle. In the narrative section, the officer wrote, “r/o’s responded to a call of an auto accident. Upon arrival victim related vehicle fled the scene of accident. See arrest report.”

There was a hold placed on the vehicle for investigation related to charge of fleeing and eluding the police. In the administrative hearing of *City of Chicago v. [REDACTED]*, the judge found that the city failed to present or prosecute a case for a violation of Municipal Code 9-92-035. The vehicle was ultimately released without any fees.

Number Plate Search³⁷ results for license plate “[REDACTED]” indicate that the plate was searched by Officer [REDACTED] in unit [REDACTED], Officer [REDACTED] in unit [REDACTED], and Officer [REDACTED] in unit [REDACTED].

GPS search results³⁸ indicate that unit [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED] were all in the vicinity of the incident between 00:00:00 and 02:00:00 on June 17, 2018.

Inventory [REDACTED]³⁹ and **Inventory** [REDACTED]⁴⁰ show that a bottle of Ketel One vodka and a bottle of cranberry juice, respectively, were confiscated following the arrest.

[REDACTED] was issued three **traffic citations**⁴¹ for offenses including, 625 ILCS 5.0/18B-103,392.82 for use of cell phone while operating a motor vehicle, 625 ILCS 5.0/11-402-A for

³⁴ Attachment 8

³⁵ Attachment 38

³⁶ Attachment 40

³⁷ Attachment 34

³⁸ Attachments 32 & 33

³⁹ Attachment 17

⁴⁰ Attachment 18

⁴¹ Attachment 6

leaving the scene of an accident, and 625 ILCS 5.0/11-502-B for transporting open alcohol in the passenger cabin. Each citation was dismissed for want of prosecution^{42 43 44}.

D. Additional Evidence

Officer ██████████'s Body Worn Camera⁴⁵ did not add any novel information to the investigation.

VI. ANALYSIS

I. 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
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.

Allegations against all officers:

The following analysis applies to the allegations made against each officer respectively.

⁴²Attachment 13

⁴³ Attachment 14

⁴⁴ Attachment 15

⁴⁵ See Attachment 45

For example, the analysis for allegations 1 against Officer ██████ is the same analysis for allegation 1 against Officers ██████, ██████, ██████, ██████, and ██████.

1. On June 17, 2018, Officer ██████ arrested ██████ without justification.

Officer ██████ and all involved officers are **EXONERATED** of the allegation that they arrested ██████ without justification in violation of rules 1 and 6. Rule 1 forbids an officer from violating any law or ordinance. The law at issue here is the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The Fourth Amendment gives the right of citizens to be free of unreasonable searches and seizures. Rule 6 requires an officer to comply with all directives and orders, written or verbal. Here, the directives at issue are General Order G04-01, Preliminary Investigations, and Special Order S04-13-09, Investigatory Stop System, which require an officer to investigate an incident and arrest a suspect when there is probable cause. We believe there was sufficient probable cause to arrest ██████ based on the evidence presented.

First, COPA recognizes that police officers are tasked with deciding whether, in that moment, there is probable cause to believe a crime had been committed. Police have sole discretion of whether to arrest a suspect. “Probable cause exists where the police have knowledge of facts that would lead a reasonable person to believe that a crime has occurred and that the subject has committed it.”⁴⁶

Officer ██████ told investigators that the evidence she gathered from her preliminary investigation showed that there was a car accident, that ██████ was the driver of the car, and that he had driven away from the scene of the accident. There is no dispute that ██████ struck ██████’s vehicle and left the scene. ██████ admitted so himself repeatedly. That admission alone would be sufficient probable cause to arrest ██████, despite ██████’ instance that he fled in fear of his life.
47

Police can arrest individuals for even minor traffic violations.⁴⁸ Even if the ██████ was not arrested for fleeing the scene, ██████ admitted to using his cellular phone while driving. ██████’ admission of that act was probable cause to arrest him. Following the accident, police found an open container of vodka in the passenger compartment of the vehicle. Though ██████ denied drinking and denied that it was his alcohol, the presence of an open alcohol container in the passenger compartment alone is a traffic offense for which he could have been arrested.

██████ admitted to each offense for which he was cited on the Arrest Report. For this reason the allegation that ██████ was arrested without justification against the officers is **EXONERATED**.

2. On June 17, 2018, Officer ██████ failed to investigate complaints by ██████ that ██████ threatened him with a gun.

⁴⁶ Special Order S04-13-09.

⁴⁷ Officers did consider ██████’ defense but found it to be unpersuasive under the circumstances. That will be addressed more in the next allegation.

⁴⁸ *Atwater v. Lago Vista*, 532 U.S. 318 (2001)

The allegation that Officer [REDACTED] and all involved officers failed to investigate the complaint by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] threatened them with a gun is **UNFOUNDED**. Rule 10 requires an officer to be attentive to his or her duties, which include investigating complaints of criminal conduct. The complaint is unfounded because there was in fact there was an investigation into the allegation that [REDACTED] pulled out a gun.

Officers are expected to work together when investigating a crime, but each officer is not expected to repeat each investigative action. The investigative actions taken by some officers on the scene apply to all of the officers on the scene. Here, Sergeant [REDACTED] approached two disinterested bystanders who expressly stated that [REDACTED] was lying about the existence of a gun. Sergeant [REDACTED] then relayed that information to Officer [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] told investigators that based on that statement and her overall perception of the situation, she did not believe that there was a gun and delved into the hit-and-run. [REDACTED] calmly denied having a gun and even offered to let an officer search him.

The credibility of the witnesses is a factor in how thoroughly a claim should be investigated. Officers are not obligated to believe every account they are given, especially when confronted by two parties making allegations against each other. Officers are expected to weigh the evidence against the accounts and make the best decision possible.

Officer [REDACTED] explained that she did not believe [REDACTED] because his version of the story changed repeatedly. Officer [REDACTED] also held on to the fact that [REDACTED] never mentioned calling the police about the accident, only the gun. [REDACTED] misspoke and indicated that he had a gun, discussed multiple types of guns, and had a FOID card. Notwithstanding the strange circumstances of their interaction with the police, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]'s credibility was in doubt because of questions about their sobriety.

In light of the above, COPA finds that the Officers' investigation into whether [REDACTED] pulled a gun was reasonable under the circumstances.

3. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] had the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] towed without justification.

The law at issue is the Fourth Amendment's prohibition against unlawful seizures. Rule 6 prohibits an officer from violating any order or directive. General Order G07-03 and Special Orders S07-03-05 and S04-14-05 set the rules for when a car may be impounded following an arrest or municipal violation. General Order G07-03 authorizes a vehicle to be towed when it has evidentiary value, when it cannot be safely driven to the detention facility, or when the arrestee does not authorize someone else to take control. Additionally, MCC 7-24-226 authorizes police to tow a vehicle when the driver is intoxicated. Several of these rules apply here.

According to the Arrest Report, [REDACTED] was arrested for suspicion of driving under the influence of alcohol and a bottle of vodka was inventoried from the vehicle. General Order G07-03 says a tow will be canceled if an arrestee is released, unless the vehicle is being held for further investigation or the vehicle is seized pursuant to a Driving Under the Influence arrest. Despite his

ultimate release, [REDACTED]' car would have been validly towed at the time of the arrest. Further, upon review of the evidence, the tow was requested while [REDACTED] was still being questioned about his intoxication. The vehicle was towed at 3:43 AM, but [REDACTED] was not released until 7:11 AM.

Further, [REDACTED]' car was evidence of the collision with [REDACTED]'s car and could have justly been seized as such. Moreover, as a result of hitting [REDACTED]'s car, [REDACTED]' car had a flat tire and was not immediately drivable, which prevented it from being driven safely. The inability to safely operate the vehicle is also a reason to have it towed.

It should be noted that, contrary to the Tow Report, [REDACTED] did not engage in "fleeing and eluding," under its legal meaning, nor was he charged with fleeing and eluding. While fleeing the police, which is to flee from an active police pursuit, is an offense for which an arrestee's vehicle can be impounded, hitting-and-running is not, at least not on its own. Officer [REDACTED] believed that a hit-and-run was also a tow-able offense. Special Order S07-03-05, which details an extensive list of reasons for which a vehicle may be towed, does not list "leaving the scene of an accident" among them.

However, there were multiple reasons why [REDACTED]' vehicle was lawfully towed following his arrest. For those reasons, this allegation is EXONERATED as to Officer [REDACTED] and the other involved officers

Allegations against Officers [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED]:

4. On June 17, 2018, Officers [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] failed to Mirandize [REDACTED] prior to taking him into custody.

Officers [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] are EXONERATED of the allegation that they failed to Mirandize [REDACTED] before taking him into custody. Rule 6 requires an officer to comply with all directives and orders, written or verbal. General Order G04-03 lays out the rules for when and how the Miranda warnings must be given. General Order G04-03 largely follows the U.S. Constitutional requirements of the Fifth Amendment. The Fifth Amendment gives citizens the right to refuse to testify against themselves in criminal proceedings, which includes statements to the police.

According to General Order G04-03, "a person need not be advised of their rights if the police are engaged in general on-the-scene questioning about a crime or other general questioning of witnesses in the fact-finding process, as long as the questioned person has not been taken into custody or has not become the focus of the investigation.⁴⁹" It is true that [REDACTED] was not Mirandized prior to being taken into custody, however, Miranda warnings were not required at that time. At the time [REDACTED] was being questioned on the scene, the officers were still trying to determine what happened. As referenced above, both parties were essentially calling the police on each other, which resulted in confusion over the nature of the call. Both parties were interviewed about what transpired. It was [REDACTED] who repeatedly insisted that Officers "lock [him] up," as the

⁴⁹ The phrase "become the focus of the investigation" refers to outdated law and is a higher threshold than the Constitutional requirements. The issue was not addressed in this case because of the intervening circumstances of the chaotic scene causing the officers to move the investigation to a safer location. See below.

officers asked him about what had occurred. Prior to making the decision to arrest [REDACTED], Officers also questioned a number of other disinterested parties.

Additionally, according to the G04-03, Miranda “warnings need not be given on the scene immediately to a person in custody when the urgency of a situation poses a threat to the public safety or the safety of the officer.” Here, we know that the scene was chaotic. Officers were not entirely clear on what call they were responding to or the identities of the involved parties. At the time of the investigation, officers had been told there was a suspect with a gun, which was never recovered. Both parties had family members on the scene, some were being aggressive with the officers. Multiple officers discussed the tension on the scene and the fear that more people would need to be arrested.

For the foregoing reasons, the officers were not obligated to give [REDACTED] Miranda warnings. This allegation is EXONERATED as to Officers [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED].

Allegations against Officer [REDACTED] Only:

On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] failed give Miranda warnings to [REDACTED] in violation of rule 6.

This allegation is **SUSTAINED**. Rule 6 prohibits an officer from violating any order or directive General Order G04-03 says expressly that:

“[b]efore the interrogation of an individual **who is in custody**, including in the field, **regardless of the offense**, the sworn investigating member will, in the presence of another sworn Department member if possible, expressly warn the individual of their constitutional rights by orally reciting each of the warnings and obtaining a response for each warning.” (Emphasis added.)

Officer [REDACTED] admitted that [REDACTED] was never given Miranda warnings. Officer [REDACTED] told investigators that she believed that detentions related to traffic offenses did not require Miranda warnings. The issue is whether Officer [REDACTED] was required to give Miranda warnings under the circumstance. COPA believes that Miranda warnings were required.

As discussed above, there is a distinction regarding whether Miranda is proper for traffic offences: in the field while on scene and in the station while in custody. As explained above, none of the officers, including [REDACTED], were required to provide Miranda while on the scene.

However, once [REDACTED] was in custody, Officer [REDACTED] was required to give Miranda warnings prior to continuing to question [REDACTED]. General Order G04-03 defines “custodial interrogation” as “questioning initiated by law enforcement officers after a person has been taken into custody or has otherwise been deprived of his freedom of action by the authorities in any significant way.” G04-03 references *Berkemer v. McCarty*, which states that “... a person subjected to custodial interrogation is entitled to the benefit of the procedural safeguards enunciated in

Miranda, regardless of the nature or severity of the offense of which he is suspected or for which he was arrested.⁵⁰”

Similar to here, the underlying arrest in *Berkemer* was for driving under the influence, where the suspect was arrested for suspicion of DUI and was interviewed at the police station subsequent to his arrest without being given Miranda warnings. The Court in *Berkemer* found that subsequent interrogation without advisement of his *Miranda* rights was improper. Here, [REDACTED] was questioned in the field about his sobriety and about the traffic offenses for which he was later cited before being arrested. According to *Berkemer*, the on-scene investigation was proper.

After His arrest, [REDACTED] was again questioned without being given Miranda warnings. Specifically, [REDACTED] was questioned about whether he was actually driving the vehicle, where he was coming from, whether he drank while there, the alcohol found in the vehicle, and why he left the scene. Based on the *Berkemer* standard, Officer [REDACTED] was required to give Miranda warnings to [REDACTED] prior to initiating her questions at the station. This is in line with the General Orders. Officer [REDACTED] expressed her belief that Miranda warnings were not required because the questions only pertained to traffic violations. To Officer [REDACTED]’ credit, *Berkemer* also held that *Miranda* warnings are not necessary during the routine traffic stop out in the field. But, again, once the subject is in custody, **regardless of the offense**, an arrestee must be given his/her *Miranda* rights before custodial questioning.

The allegation that Officer [REDACTED] failed to give Miranda warnings in violation of rule 6 is **SUSTAINED**.⁵¹

VII. RECOMMENDED DISCIPLINE FOR SUSTAINED ALLEGATIONS

a. Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History

Officer [REDACTED]’ training and complimentary history were considered in determining discipline for this case. Officer [REDACTED] received a reprimand September 2018 for court appearance violation. Officer [REDACTED] also has a Sustained allegation for log 1090379, for failure to perform job duties, that resulted in no-penalty from July 2018.

Recommended Penalty, by Allegation

Officer [REDACTED] acknowledged that she was unaware of the necessity to Mirandize an individual while in custody, related to traffic offenses. COPA recommends a discipline of

⁵⁰ *Berkemer v. McCarty*, 468 U.S. 420, 434 (1984).

⁵¹ It should be noted that this is only a violation of the General Orders and not a violation of the U.S. Constitution. The 5th amendment rights against self-incrimination are only violated when admissions are used in criminal case against declarant. *Chavez v. Martinez*, 538 U.S. 760 (2003). Here, [REDACTED] ultimately was not charged with driving under the influence and all of the traffic tickets were dismissed without prosecution.

violation-noted. COPA also recommends that Officer [REDACTED] receive the necessary applicable training to ensure her understanding of the law in this regard.

VIII. CONCLUSION

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

Officer	Allegation	Findings/ Recommendations
Officer [REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] arrested [REDACTED] without justification. 2. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] failed to investigate complaints by [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] threatened him with a gun. 3. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] had the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] towed without justification. 4. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] failed give Miranda warnings to [REDACTED]. 	<p>EXONERATED</p> <p>UNFOUNDED</p> <p>EXONERATED</p> <p>SUSTAINED</p>
Officer [REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] arrested [REDACTED] without justification 2. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] failed to investigate complaints by [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] threatened him with a gun. 3. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] had the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] towed without justification. 4. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] failed give Miranda warnings to [REDACTED]. 	<p>EXONERATED</p> <p>UNFOUNDED</p> <p>EXONERATED</p> <p>EXONERATED</p>

Officer [REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] arrested [REDACTED] without justification. 2. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] failed to investigate complaints by [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] threatened him with a gun. 3. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] had the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] towed without justification. 4. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] failed give Miranda warnings to [REDACTED]. 	<p>EXONERATED</p> <p>UNFOUNDED</p> <p>EXONERATED</p> <p>EXONERATED</p>
Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] arrested [REDACTED] without justification. 2. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] failed to investigate complaints by [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] threatened him with a gun. 3. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] had the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] towed without justification. 4. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] failed give Miranda warnings to [REDACTED]. 	<p>EXONERATED</p> <p>UNFOUNDED</p> <p>EXONERATED</p> <p>EXONERATED</p>
Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] arrested [REDACTED] without justification. 2. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] failed to investigate complaints 	<p>EXONERATED</p> <p>UNFOUNDED</p>

	<p>by [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] threatened him with a gun.</p> <p>3. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] had the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] towed without justification</p> <p>4. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] failed give Miranda warnings to [REDACTED].</p>	<p>EXONERATED</p> <p>EXONERATED</p>
<p>Officer [REDACTED]</p>	<p>1. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] arrested [REDACTED] without justification.</p> <p>2. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] failed to investigate complaints by [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] threatened him with a gun.</p> <p>3. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] had the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] towed without justification.</p> <p>4. On June 17, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] failed give Miranda warnings to [REDACTED].</p>	<p>EXONERATED</p> <p>UNFOUNDED</p> <p>EXONERATED</p> <p>EXONERATED</p>

Approved:

[REDACTED]

March 28, 2019

[REDACTED]

Chief Administrator

Date

Appendix A

Assigned Investigative Staff

Squad#:	█
Investigator:	██████████
Supervising Investigator:	██████████
Deputy Chief Administrator:	██████████████████
Attorney:	██████████