

**SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION**

**I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Date of Incident:	June 1, 2015
Time of Incident:	3:37 AM
Location of Incident:	██████████
Date of COPA Notification:	July 5, 2018
Time of COPA Notification:	9:42 AM

On June 1, 2015, the complainant, ██████████, was the subject of the traffic stop which resulted in his arrest. ██████ alleged the arresting officers stopped him without justification, searched his car without probable cause, provided false statements, arrested him without justification, and did not allow him to produce a valid driver’s license. COPA’s findings are discussed in the analysis portion of this report.

**II. INVOLVED PARTIES**

Involved Officer #1:	██████████, Star # ██████, Employee ID # ██████, Date of Appointment: ██████████, 2012, Police Officer, ██████ District, Date of Birth: ██████████, 1985, Male, Hispanic
Involved Officer #2:	██████████, Star # ██████, Employee ID # ██████, Date of Appointment: ██████████, 2005, Police Officer, ██████ District, Date of Birth: ██████████, 1977, Male. Hispanic
Involved Individual #1:	██████████ Date of Birth: ██████████, 1982, Male, Black

**III. ALLEGATIONS**

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Officer ██████	1. Performed a traffic stop on ██████ without justification, in violation of Rule 1.	Exonerated
	2. Searched ██████ car without probable cause, in violation of Rule 1.	Exonerated
	3. Provided a false statement that cannabis was found in ██████ vehicle, in violation of Rule 14.	Unfounded

	<p>4. Provided a false statement that [REDACTED] was alone in his vehicle, in violation of Rule 14.</p> <p>5. Arrested [REDACTED] without justification, in violation of Rule 1.</p> <p>6. Provided a false statement about where the jar containing a green leafy substance was found, in violation of Rule 14.</p> <p>7. Failed to document that there was a passenger in [REDACTED] vehicle when he was stopped, in violation of Rule 6 and Rule 10.</p>	<p>Exonerated</p> <p>Exonerated</p> <p>Unfounded</p> <p>Sustained</p>
<p>Officer [REDACTED]</p>	<p>1. Performed a traffic stop on [REDACTED] without justification, in violation of Rule 1.</p> <p>2. Searched [REDACTED] car without probable cause, in violation of Rule 1.</p> <p>3. Provided a false statement that cannabis was found in [REDACTED] vehicle, in violation of Rule 14.</p> <p>4. Provided a false statement that [REDACTED] was alone in his vehicle, in violation of Rule 14.</p> <p>5. Arrested [REDACTED] without justification, in violation of Rule 1.</p> <p>6. Did not allow [REDACTED] to provide his driver's license, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 8.</p> <p>7. Provided a false statement about where the jar containing a green leafy substance was found, in violation of Rule 14.</p> <p>8. Failed to document that there was a passenger in [REDACTED] vehicle when he was stopped, in violation of Rule 6 and Rule 10.</p>	<p>Exonerated</p> <p>Exonerated</p> <p>Unfounded</p> <p>Exonerated</p> <p>Exonerated</p> <p>Unfounded</p> <p>Sustained</p>

**IV. APPLICABLE RULES AND LAWS**

---

Rules

- 
- Rule 1:** Prohibits violation of any law or ordinance.

2. **Rule 2:** Prohibits any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department.
3. **Rule 8:** Prohibits disrespect to or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty.
4. **Rule 10:** Prohibits inattention to duty.
5. **Rule 14:** Prohibits make a false report, written or oral.

---

### Special Orders

---

1. **S04-13-09:** Contact Information System.<sup>1</sup>
- 

### Federal Laws

---

1. **Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution:** Guarantees protection from unlawful arrest and unreasonable search and seizure to all persons in this country.

## INVESTIGATION<sup>2</sup>

### a. Interviews

COPA interviewed the complainant, ██████████, on July 6, 2018.<sup>3</sup> Per ██████████, on June 1, 2015 at about 3:30 AM, he was picking up a friend. Once his friend, ██████████, got in his car, ██████████ drove west on ██████████ and he was pulled over for not having his lights on. ██████████ was not certain if he had his lights on because it was a rental car. ██████████ later learned this car had automatic lights, so he believed the lights were on. An officer (believed to be Officer ██████████) asked for ██████████ license and registration. ██████████ showed the officers his military ID and went to get his driver's license from the glove box. Another officer (believed to be Officer ██████████) then opened the passenger door, reached over ██████████, took the keys out of ignition, and pulled ██████████ out of the car. The driver's door was then opened, and Officer ██████████ told ██████████ to exit before ██████████ provided the officers his license and the rental agreement. Both officers proceeded to search the vehicle. A jar of sage and 9mm firearm were recovered during the search. The gun was in-between the front seats. ██████████ did not know to whom the gun belonged or how it got into the car, but knew the gun was in the car. ██████████ asserted the jar contained sage, not marijuana. ██████████ was allowed to leave the scene and was not searched or arrested. The officers then brought ██████████ to the station. One of the officer's drove ██████████ vehicle from the scene. ██████████ was also issued a traffic ticket. In court, one officer said the jar was found on a seat while another said it was found in a gym bag. ██████████ reported the herbs were in a gym bag on the rear floor. During court proceedings, officers also said ██████████ was alone.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Contact Information System policy referenced in this report was effective from January 2015 until January 2016 (See Att. 45).

<sup>2</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>3</sup> Att. 5

COPA interviewed **Officer** [REDACTED] [REDACTED] on November 2, 2018.<sup>4</sup> On June 1, 2015, Officer [REDACTED] was operating a marked vehicle and partnered with Officer [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] performed a traffic stop on [REDACTED] for driving without headlights after sunset. Officer [REDACTED] approached on the passenger's side while Officer [REDACTED] approached the driver's side. [REDACTED] was unable to produce a driver's license. He reached towards a bag on the floor behind the passenger's seat. Officer [REDACTED] saw a jar containing a substance he believed to be cannabis when [REDACTED] was going through the bag's contents. Officer [REDACTED] alerted his partner and [REDACTED] was asked to exit his vehicle. Officer [REDACTED] did not recall reaching into the passenger's side and opening the door or removing the keys from ignition. Officer [REDACTED] did not recall removing a female passenger from the vehicle. Officer [REDACTED] did not recall [REDACTED] stating the suspect cannabis was another type of herb, such as sage. Officer [REDACTED] asserted he can tell the difference between sage and cannabis. Officer [REDACTED] did not recall [REDACTED] bag containing any additional, non-narcotic herbal substances. Officer [REDACTED] found a firearm next to the driver's seat near the center console after he found the cannabis. [REDACTED] was arrested for cannabis possession and for the gun.

A second interview was held with **Officer** [REDACTED] on December 14, 2018.<sup>5</sup> Officer [REDACTED] confirmed he had no recollection of a passenger in [REDACTED] vehicle on June 1, 2018. After reviewing documentation that Officer [REDACTED] and his partner ran [REDACTED] name and the name [REDACTED], Officer [REDACTED] did not recall [REDACTED].<sup>6</sup> Officer [REDACTED] did not know why [REDACTED] name was searched.

**Officer** [REDACTED] was interviewed by COPA on November 16, 2018.<sup>7</sup> On June 1, 2015, Officer [REDACTED] was on routine patrol with Officer [REDACTED]. The officers stopped [REDACTED] because he did not have his headlights on. Officer [REDACTED] approached the driver's side and asked for [REDACTED] license and insurance. [REDACTED] related he was driving a rental car and did not have driver's license on his person. [REDACTED] did not show the officers a rental agreement. Officer [REDACTED] did not recall if [REDACTED] had a passenger. [REDACTED] searched for identification in a bag located in the rear passenger's seat. [REDACTED] "was fumbling" with items in the backseat and a clear mason jar "popped out" of his bag.<sup>8</sup> Officer [REDACTED] saw a substance he believed to be cannabis in the jar. Officer [REDACTED] recalled that [REDACTED] had no additional herbal substances in his bag. Officer [REDACTED] asserted he can tell the difference between sage and cannabis and the green leafy substance was not sage. Per Officer [REDACTED], [REDACTED] admitted to the officers that the substance was cannabis for personal use. Officer [REDACTED] asked [REDACTED] to exit the vehicle and arrested him for failing to produce a driver's license. Officer [REDACTED] did not recall who reached into the car. Officer [REDACTED] searched [REDACTED] vehicle and recovered a gun between the driver's seat and the center console.

**Officer** [REDACTED] was interviewed again on December 14, 2018.<sup>9</sup> Officer [REDACTED] reiterated that he did not recall [REDACTED] having a passenger in his vehicle on June 1, 2015. Officer [REDACTED] was shown OEMC event query showing that he and Officers [REDACTED] ran a name query for both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].<sup>10</sup> Officer [REDACTED] related he did not recall why he ran two names and did not

---

<sup>4</sup> Att. 18

<sup>5</sup> Att. 38

<sup>6</sup> Att. 31

<sup>7</sup> Att. 23

<sup>8</sup> Approximately 6:13 – 6:41 minute mark of Att. 23.

<sup>9</sup> Att. 33

<sup>10</sup> Att. 31

remember ██████ presence. Officer ██████ believed he would have completed a contact card for ██████ had she been in ██████ vehicle.

#### b. Digital Evidence

A request to CPD for **Department video** was met with negative results.<sup>11</sup> Body Worn Camera was not in effect in 2015 and In Car Camera had been purged by the time COPA received this complaint.

#### c. Physical Evidence

An **Illinois State Police Laboratory Report** reported that the plant material recovered from ██████ tested positive for cannabis.<sup>12</sup>

#### d. Documentary Evidence

██████ **Arrest Report** was obtained from June 1, 2015 with **RD #** ██████.<sup>13</sup> ██████ was charged with felony unlawful use of a weapon; misdemeanor charges of no valid Firearm Owner Identification (FOID), possession of ammunition, and cannabis possession; and two traffic citations for no headlights and no driver's license. The arresting officers saw ██████ vehicle traveling without headlights and curbed ██████. Officer ██████ asked ██████ for his driver's license and insurance. ██████ related he was driving a rental car and began searching for his driver's license. The officers then saw a glass container "containing a crushed green leafy substance" in plain view. ██████ could not provide a driver's license and was ordered out of the car. Officer ██████ removed the jar, "discovering it to contain a clear plastic baggie which contained a crushed green leaf like substance suspect cannabis." Officer ██████ also saw "what appeared to be night sights of a handgun glowing" and found a loaded 9mm firearm. ██████ was taken to the ██████ District.

An **Original Case Incident Report** was also obtained for **RD #** ██████.<sup>14</sup> Per this narrative, after the officers found the glass container, ██████, "freely stated [...] 'the weed was for personal use only.'" Once at the ██████ District, ██████ told Officers ██████ and ██████ he had the weapon since "'its [*sic*] Chicago and theres [*sic*] some dumb mother fuckers out there shooting at people.'"

A **Detective Supplementary Report** was obtained for **RD #** ██████ which contained no additional, relevant details.<sup>15</sup>

**Inventory Sheets** were obtained for **RD #** ██████.<sup>16</sup> In addition to personal items, a bag containing suspect cannabis, a glass jar, 9mm bullets, a magazine, and a 9mm semiautomatic gun were inventoried.

---

<sup>11</sup> Att. 10

<sup>12</sup> Att. 28

<sup>13</sup> Att. 3

<sup>14</sup> Atts. 4, 14

<sup>15</sup> Att. 15

<sup>16</sup> Att. 16

An **Office of Emergency Management and Communications (OEMC) Event Query Report** was identified with **Event # [REDACTED]**.<sup>17</sup> A traffic stop was performed on June 1, 2015, near [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] streets at about 3:34 AM. The license plate was searched, in addition to [REDACTED] and a woman named [REDACTED].<sup>18</sup> Beat [REDACTED] reported heading to the [REDACTED] District with one subject at approximately 3:42 AM. An RD number was generated at roughly 3:50 AM.

Per **Department Reports** under **RD # [REDACTED]**, [REDACTED] was reported missing on June 16, 2015.<sup>19</sup> [REDACTED], a staff member at [REDACTED], reported [REDACTED] as missing.<sup>20</sup> [REDACTED] “returned safely on” June 16, 2015 “and was not a victim of a crime.”

**Dockets** were obtained through the Cook County Clerk of Courts stemming from [REDACTED] June 1, 2015 arrest.

- **Case Number [REDACTED]** was filed on June 1, 2015.<sup>21</sup> [REDACTED] was charged with: felony unlawful use of a weapon-felon in possession; misdemeanor possession of firearm without a valid FOID, possessing ammunition without a FOID, and cannabis possession; and two traffic violations. On June 8, 2015, the complaint was amended, and the case was transferred to the criminal division.
- **Case Number [REDACTED]** was filed on June 11, 2015.<sup>22</sup> [REDACTED] was charged with six felony counts of aggravated unlawful use of a weapon. [REDACTED] pleaded not guilty on June 22, 2015. Over the following months, several motions, continuances, and discovery answers were filed. On August 30, 2017, a petition for a violation of bail bond was filed. On September 24, 2018, [REDACTED] was put on electronic home monitoring. As of the date of this report, [REDACTED] case is still pending.

A transcript from June 22, 2015 for Case Number [REDACTED] was obtained.<sup>23</sup> Officer [REDACTED] testified on this date and stated on June 1, 2015, he and Officer [REDACTED] were on patrol and curbed [REDACTED] for failing to have his headlights on. When the officer asked for [REDACTED] license and registration, [REDACTED] fumbled trying to look for his driver’s license and related that the vehicle was a rental. The officers then saw a glass container on the floor behind the passenger’s seat with a crushed green leafy substance inside. The officers ordered [REDACTED] out of his car and placed him in custody. Officer [REDACTED] reported he only saw [REDACTED] state ID and his military ID, not a driver’s license. [REDACTED] was “placed in custody for not providing a valid” driver’s license. Officer [REDACTED] removed the container and saw “between the driver’s seat and the center console what appeared to be a handgun.” Officer [REDACTED] told Officer [REDACTED] what he saw and Officer [REDACTED] recovered a loaded

<sup>17</sup> Att. 31

<sup>18</sup> COPA identified a Twitter profile, [REDACTED], purportedly belonging to a user named [REDACTED], suggesting [REDACTED] also may go by the name [REDACTED]. Source: [REDACTED].

<sup>19</sup> Att. 32

<sup>20</sup> Per online map and general internet searches, [REDACTED] is part of a large apartment complex. An organization named [REDACTED] apparently has (or had) units at this location. [REDACTED] serves “[REDACTED]” Sources:

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

“.9 millimeter semi-automatic handgun.” The officers determined ■■■ did not have a FOID or concealed carry permit. Once at the station, the officers read ■■■ his Miranda Rights. ■■■ told the officers “it’s Chicago and there’s mother fuckers shooting out there.”

## V. ANALYSIS

**Allegation 1** against both officers, that they performed a traffic stop on ■■■ without justification, is **Exonerated**.

A lawful traffic stop requires “at least [an] articulable and reasonable suspicion that the particular person stopped is breaking the law,” including traffic law. *United States v. Rodriguez-Escalera*, 884 F.3d 661, 667-68 (7th Cir. 2018) (citing *Delaware v. Prouse*, 440 U.S. 648, 663 (1979)). Articulable and reasonable suspicion means that the police “must be able to identify some ‘particularized and objective basis’ for thinking that the person to be stopped is or may be about to engage in unlawful activity,” amounting to more than a hunch. *United States v. Miranda-Sotolongo*, 827 F.3d 663, 666 (7th Cir. 2015) (quoting *United States v. Cortez*, 449 U.S. 411, 417 (1981)). Police need not meet the higher threshold of probable cause to perform a traffic stop, but if the stop *is* supported by probable cause, its lawfulness is still evaluated under *Terry*. *Rodriguez v. United States*, 135 S. Ct. 1609, 1617-18 (2015). An officer’s subjective intent does not enter into the analysis; even where officers hope to effectuate a goal unrelated to addressing a traffic violation (such as uncovering criminal activity), intent alone does not invalidate a stop that is otherwise objectively justified by reasonable articulable suspicion. *See Whren v. United States*, 517 U.S. 806, 812 (1996).

Officers ■■■ and ■■■ assert they stopped ■■■ vehicle because he was driving without head lights. In ■■■ statement to COPA he admitted to driving a rental car that was unfamiliar to him. ■■■ posited that the rental car had an automatic light function and therefore, the lights were on when he was stopped. However, there was no evidence that the automatic light function was enabled at the time. Accordingly, COPA does not find ■■■ conclusion persuasive. COPA finds the officers provided credible and consistent statements and reports. Therefore, the allegation is Exonerated.

**Allegation 2** against both officers, that they searched ■■■ car without probable cause, is **Exonerated**.

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)). Officers are not limited to searching the driver’s possessions; “police officers with probable cause to search a car may [also] inspect

passengers' belongings found in the car that are capable of concealing the object of the search.” *Wyoming v. Houghton*, 526 U.S. 295, 307 (1999).

Both officers reported seeing suspect cannabis in plain view. [REDACTED] himself admitted that he had a green leafy substance in a jar that was in plain view in his car. [REDACTED] claims the jar the officers found contained sage, not cannabis. However, the Illinois State Police (ISP) lab found the recovered substance contained cannabis in direct contradiction to [REDACTED] claim. Because the officers saw what they believed to be cannabis in plain view, they had probable cause to search the vehicle and this allegation is Exonerated.

**Allegation 3** against both officers, that they provided a false statement that cannabis was found in [REDACTED] vehicle, is **Unfounded**. To sustain a Rule 14 allegation the statement must be (1) material; (2) false; and (3) willful.<sup>24</sup> As articulated in allegation 1, COPA finds that the officers provided credible and consistent statements and reports. Moreover, [REDACTED] does not dispute that he possessed and herb in a mason jar, he simply argues the herb was sage. The ISP lab report confirms the jar contained cannabis. Therefore, the allegation is Unfounded.

**Allegation 4** against both officers, that they provided a false statement that [REDACTED] was alone in his vehicle, is **Exonerated**. At no point did either officer expressly assert [REDACTED] was alone in the vehicle. The reports do not reference whether [REDACTED] was alone. Officer [REDACTED] testimony also did not reference whether [REDACTED] was alone. Additionally, in their statements with COPA, the officers both state that they did not remember if there was a passenger at the time of the arrest. Even after being confronted with the OEMC event query documenting they ran [REDACTED] name, both officers asserted they did not remember. While COPA finds factually that [REDACTED] was a passenger at the time the vehicle was stopped, there is no evidence that the officers provided willful false statement. That allegation is therefore Exonerated.

**Allegation 5**, that the officers arrested [REDACTED] without justification, is **Exonerated**.

An officer must have probable cause to arrest a subject. *People v. Johnson*, 408 Ill. App. 3d 107 (citing *Beck v. Ohio*, 379 U.S. 89, 91, (1964)). “Probable cause to arrest exists when the totality of the facts and circumstances known to a police officer would lead a person of reasonable caution to believe that the person apprehended has committed a crime, and its existence depends on the totality of the circumstances at the time of the arrest.” *People v. D.W. (In re D.W.)*, 341 Ill. App. 3d 517, 526 (1st Dist. 2003). The officer’s subjective belief is not determinative; rather probable cause is an objective standard. *People v. Chapman*, 194 Ill. 2d 186, 218-19, (2000).

The officers had probable cause to arrest [REDACTED] because he had cannabis in his vehicle. He also had a firearm in his vehicle, but no FOID card. [REDACTED] told COPA the gun was not his, but he knew the weapon was in the car. [REDACTED] reportedly told the arresting officers that the gun was his. Regardless, the weapon was in [REDACTED] immediate reach and he was transporting it. The presence of the cannabis and the firearm made [REDACTED] arrest justified and legal, and this allegation is Exonerated.

---

<sup>24</sup> Agreement Between the City of Chicago Department Police and the Fraternal Order of Police Chicago Lodge No. 7, Section 6.2(J).



**Allegation 6** against **Officer [REDACTED]**, that he did not allow [REDACTED] to provide his driver's license, is **Unfounded**. Per the officers, [REDACTED] was searching through a bag for identification when the green leafy substance emerged into plain view. [REDACTED] stated he was getting his identification from the glove box when the officers asked him to exit the vehicle and handcuffed him. Regardless, the officers were justified in arresting [REDACTED] as soon as they saw the cannabis and this allegation is Unfounded.

**Allegation 6** against **Officer [REDACTED]** and **Allegation 7** against **Officer [REDACTED]**, that they provided a false statement about where the jar containing a green leafy substance was found is also **Unfounded**. Per [REDACTED], one officer said the jar was found on a seat while the other said it was found in a gym bag. Both officers told COPA that the jar was found in a gym bag and the bag was on a seat. [REDACTED] related that the bag was on the rear floor. [REDACTED] allegation that the officers lied seems to be an issue of semantics, not substance. The lie is immaterial, as there is not a significant difference as to whether the bag was on the ground or on the seat. There is also no evidence that any misstatement was willful. As such, this allegation is Unfounded.

**Allegation 7** against **Officer [REDACTED]** and **Allegation 8** against **Officer [REDACTED]**, that they failed to document that there was a passenger in [REDACTED] vehicle when he was stopped is **Sustained**. Special Order S04-13-09 requires officers to complete a contact card when they conduct an investigatory stop that does not result in arrest. [REDACTED] was the passenger of the vehicle. Therefore, [REDACTED] was detained by Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] when the car was pulled over. More importantly, the officers did not simply tell [REDACTED] to leave while they investigated [REDACTED]. The officer performed investigatory activities by running [REDACTED] name as evidenced by the event query. By failing to include her name or presence in the arrest report or document the contact through a formalized contact card, they violated the special order requiring the documentation of persons detained for an investigatory stop but not arrested. Therefore, this allegation is sustained.

## VI. RECOMMENDED DISCIPLINE FOR SUSTAINED ALLEGATIONS

### a. Officer [REDACTED]

#### i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History

COPA has considered both the complimentary and disciplinary history of the officer.

#### ii. Recommended Penalty, by Allegation

##### 1. Allegation No. 7

Officer [REDACTED] participated in a stop where the passenger was detained, her name was run by OEMC and she was released. Accordingly, Officer [REDACTED] should have completed a contact card for the passenger. Roughly one-week after the encounter Ms. [REDACTED] was reported as a missing person. [REDACTED] was later located but documenting that she had an encounter with police could have proved helpful had the situation been different. What these facts exemplify is the necessity to document contact with members of the public. COPA recommends a written reprimand for Officer [REDACTED].

**b. Officer [REDACTED]**

**i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History**

COPA has considered both the complimentary and disciplinary history of the officer.

**ii. Recommended Penalty, by Allegation**

**1. Allegation No. 8**

We reiterate the same reasoning as provided for Officer [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] should have completed a contact card for his encounter with Ms. [REDACTED]. COPA suggest a written reprimand for Officer [REDACTED].

**VII. CONCLUSION**

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

<b>Officer</b>	<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Finding</b>
Officer [REDACTED]	1. Performed a traffic stop on [REDACTED] without justification, in violation of Rule 1.	Exonerated
	2. Searched [REDACTED] car without probable cause, in violation of Rule 1.	Exonerated
	3. Provided a false statement that cannabis was found in [REDACTED] vehicle, in violation of Rule 14.	Unfounded
	4. Provided a false statement that [REDACTED] was alone in his vehicle, in violation of Rule 14.	Exonerated
	5. Arrested [REDACTED] without justification, in violation of Rule 1.	Exonerated
	6. Provided a false statement about where the jar containing a green leafy substance was found, in violation of Rule 14.	Unfounded
	7. Failed to document that there was a passenger in [REDACTED] vehicle when he was stopped, in violation of Rule 6 and Rule 10.	Sustained
Officer [REDACTED]	1. Performed a traffic stop on [REDACTED] without justification, in violation of Rule 1.	Exonerated

<p>2. Searched [REDACTED] car without probable cause, in violation of Rule 1.</p>	<p>Exonerated</p>
<p>3. Provided a false statement that cannabis was found in [REDACTED] vehicle, in violation of Rule 14.</p>	<p>Unfounded</p>
<p>4. Provided a false statement that [REDACTED] was alone in his vehicle, in violation of Rule 14.</p>	<p>Exonerated</p>
<p>5. Arrested [REDACTED] without justification, in violation of Rule 1.</p>	<p>Exonerated</p>
<p>6. Did not allow [REDACTED] to provide his driver's license, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 8.</p>	<p>Exonerated</p>
<p>7. Provided a false statement about where the jar containing a green leafy substance was found, in violation of Rule 14.</p>	<p>Unfounded</p>
<p>8. Failed to document that there was a passenger in [REDACTED] vehicle when he was stopped, in violation of Rule 6 and Rule 10.</p>	<p>Sustained</p>

Approved:

[REDACTED]

February 13, 2019

[REDACTED]

*Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator*

Date

Appendix A

Assigned Investigative Staff

---

<b>Squad#:</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Investigator:</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Supervising Investigator:</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Deputy Chief Administrator:</b>	[REDACTED]