

## SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

### I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Date of First Incident:	February 2, 2018
Time of First Incident:	8:53 pm
Location of First Incident:	A traffic stop at [REDACTED]
Date of Second Incident:	March 1, 2018
Time of Second Incident:	9:35 am
Location of Second Incident:	Execution of Search Warrant ([REDACTED]) at [REDACTED]
Date of Third Incident:	April 11, 2018
Time of Third Incident:	3:49 pm
Location of Third Incident:	Execution of Search warrant ([REDACTED]) at [REDACTED]
Date of COPA Notification:	April 18, 2018
Time of COPA Notification:	11:55 am

Chicago Police Department E-4 Narcotics Team (the Team) obtained and executed search warrants on the complainant, [REDACTED], and his various residences for alleged narcotics activity. During the execution of these warrants, the Team recovered cannabis, Ecstasy, heroin, cocaine, and narcotics paraphernalia. [REDACTED] was arrested and charged with possession of the recovered narcotics. In his statement to COPA, [REDACTED] admitted ownership of the cannabis and narcotics paraphernalia but alleged that the Ecstasy, heroin, and cocaine were planted by members of the Team. Additionally, [REDACTED] alleged that between February and March of 2018, he was subjected to a pattern of harassment by various members of the Chicago Police Department.

During this investigation COPA located four instances of various CPD Members stopping [REDACTED] between February and March of 2018. Based on a review of all four interactions, COPA determined only the February 2, 2018 interaction warranted allegations.<sup>1</sup>

### II. INVOLVED PARTIES

Involved Officer #1:	Police Officer [REDACTED] Star#[REDACTED] / Employee ID#[REDACTED] Date of Appointment [REDACTED] 2015
----------------------	--

<sup>1</sup> The three additional interactions [REDACTED] had with CPD were all based on dispatched calls for service related to firearms. During two of the interactions [REDACTED] consented to a search of his person. For the remaining interaction [REDACTED] was the driver of a vehicle that was reported to contain firearms. Based on the information contained within the Event Queries, Investigatory Stop Reports, and [REDACTED] admitted criminal activity COPA does not believe these interactions constitute harassment or misconduct. Att. 25.

	Unit [REDACTED] Date of Birth [REDACTED], 1989 Male / White
Involved Officer #2:	Police Officer [REDACTED] Star#[REDACTED] / Employee ID#[REDACTED] Date of Appointment [REDACTED] 2015 Unit [REDACTED] Date of Birth [REDACTED], 1992 Male / White
Involved Officer #3:	Police Officer [REDACTED] Star#[REDACTED] / Employee ID#[REDACTED] Date of Appointment [REDACTED], 2013 Unit [REDACTED] Date of Birth [REDACTED], 1981 Male / White
Involved Officer #4:	Police Officer [REDACTED] Star#[REDACTED] / Employee ID#[REDACTED] Date of Appointment [REDACTED], 2013 Unit [REDACTED] Date of Birth [REDACTED] 1982 Male / Hispanic
Involved Officer #5:	Police Officer [REDACTED] Star#[REDACTED] / Employee ID#[REDACTED] Date of Appointment [REDACTED], 2000 Unit [REDACTED] Date of Birth [REDACTED], 1961 Female / Black
Involved Officer #6:	Police Officer [REDACTED] Star#[REDACTED] / Employee ID#[REDACTED] Date of Appointment [REDACTED] 1993 Unit [REDACTED] Date of Birth J [REDACTED] 1963 Male / White
Involved Officer #7:	Police Officer [REDACTED] Star#[REDACTED] / Employee ID#[REDACTED] Date of Appointment [REDACTED], 1986 Unit [REDACTED] Date of Birth [REDACTED], 1971 Male / Hispanic

Involved Officer #8:

Police Officer [REDACTED]  
Star#[REDACTED] / Employee ID#[REDACTED]8  
Date of Appointment [REDACTED], 2005  
Unit [REDACTED]  
Date of Birth [REDACTED], 1981  
Female / White

Involved Individual #1:

[REDACTED]  
Date of Birth [REDACTED] 1984  
Male / Black

### III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	It is alleged that during the first incident, that Officer [REDACTED]: 1. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED], in violation of Rule 6. 2. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED], in violation of Rule 6. 3. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 6. 4. Unlawfully searched [REDACTED], in violation of Rule 6. 5. Unlawfully searched [REDACTED] vehicle, in violation of Rule 6.	Exonerated. Exonerated. Exonerated. Exonerated. Exonerated.
Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	It is alleged that during the first incident, that Officer [REDACTED]: 1. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED], in violation of Rule 6. 2. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED], in violation of Rule 6. 3. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED], in violation of Rule 6. 4. Unlawfully searched [REDACTED] vehicle, in violation of Rule 6.	Exonerated. Exonerated. Exonerated. Exonerated.
Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	It is alleged that during the first incident, that Officer [REDACTED]:	

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED], in violation of Rule 6.</li> <li>2. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED], in violation of Rule 6.</li> <li>3. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED], in violation of Rule 6.</li> <li>4. Unlawfully searched [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 6.</li> <li>5. Unlawfully searched [REDACTED], in violation of Rule 6.</li> <li>6. Unlawfully searched [REDACTED] vehicle, in violation of Rule 6.</li> </ol>	<p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p>
Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	<p>It is alleged that during the first incident, that Officer [REDACTED]:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 6.</li> <li>2. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 6.</li> <li>3. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 6.</li> <li>4. Unlawfully searched [REDACTED], in violation of Rule 6.</li> <li>5. Unlawfully searched [REDACTED] vehicle, in violation of Rule 6.</li> </ol>	<p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p>
Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	<p>It is alleged that during the second incident, that Officer [REDACTED]:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Planted narcotics inside [REDACTED], in violation of Rule 2.</li> </ol>	<p>Not Sustained.</p>
Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	<p>It is alleged that during the third incident, that Officer [REDACTED]:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Planted narcotics inside [REDACTED], in violation of Rule 2.</li> </ol>	<p>Not Sustained.</p>
Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	<p>It is alleged that during the third incident, that Officer [REDACTED]:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unlawfully arrested [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 6.</li> </ol>	<p>Exonerated.</p>

Officer ██████████	It is alleged that during the third incident, that Officer ██████████: 1. Unlawfully arrested ██████████ in violation of Rule 6.	Exonerated.
--------------------	---	-------------

#### IV. APPLICABLE RULES AND LAWS

##### Rules

1. Rule 2: Prohibits any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goal or brings discredit upon the Department.
2. Rule 6: Prohibits disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.

##### General Orders

1. G06-01-01: Field Arrest Procedures, effective December 8, 2017

##### Special Orders

1. S04-13-09: Investigatory Stop System, effective July 10, 2017

#### V. INVESTIGATION<sup>2</sup>

##### a. Interviews<sup>3</sup>

##### i. Complainant's Statement

In a **statement to COPA**<sup>4</sup> on April 17, 2018, ██████████, stated that between February and March of 2018 he was subjected to a pattern of harassment by various unidentified CPD members in the form of traffic stops and search warrants.<sup>5</sup>

█████████ stated that, on March 1, 2018, CPD officers conducted a traffic stop on his van on the ██████████ and ordered him to exit the van. Once out of the van, the officers detained ██████████, placed him in the rear of a marked CPD vehicle, and informed him that they had a search warrant (█████████ for his person and residence located on the second floor of ██████████ ██████████ was transported to ██████████ and remained in the CPD vehicle as he observed officers enter the building to execute the search warrant. ██████████, admitted to selling cannabis<sup>6</sup> and the possession of the various narcotics paraphernalia<sup>7</sup> recovered during the

<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> ██████████ and ██████████ did not respond to any requests for a statement.

<sup>4</sup> Atts. 6 and 70. ██████████ did not provide any description of the traffic stop on February 2, 2018, which COPA discovered via the investigation.

<sup>5</sup> ██████████ made allegations related to four search warrants. ██████████ had no direct knowledge of and was not the target of two of the search warrants, therefore COPA does not believe the execution of those warrants constitute harassment of ██████████

<sup>6</sup> Pg. 21, Line 7 of Att. 70.

<sup>7</sup> Pg. 20, Lines 12 – 24 of Att. 70

execution of search warrant, but he alleged that the Ecstasy recovered was planted by a CPD officer.

Additionally, ██████ stated that on April 11, 2018, he was at ██████ when CPD officers stopped him, detained him, transported him to ██████ and informed him they had a search warrant (██████) to search his person and the residence at that address. ██████ remained in the CPD vehicle and observed the officers entered ██████ to search. ██████ alleges that he does not live at the residence and that the heroin and cocaine recovered were planted by a CPD officer.

## ii. Officers' Statements about the First Incident – February 2, 2018

In a **statement to COPA**<sup>8</sup> on July 6, 2018, **Witness Sergeant** ██████, stated that on numerous occasions he has received information from a Confidential Informant about a black male at ██████ known as “█████”<sup>9</sup> selling cannabis and possessing firearms. Sgt. ██████ explained that on February 2, 2018, he received information from the Confidential Informant that ██████ would be exiting ██████, armed with a firearm, and entering a vehicle. Sgt. ██████ could not recall what, if anything, the Confidential Informant said about how he knew this information. Sgt. ██████ contacted a member of a ██████ District Tactical Team and relayed this information. Sgt. ██████ could not recall the exact details of the conversation he had with the Tactical Team or which member of the team he spoke to; however, he recalled relaying that an armed black male would be exiting ██████ and entering a vehicle.

Finally, Sgt. ██████ added that he considered the Confidential Informant highly credible because the Informant seemed to provide firsthand knowledge of ██████ activity. Sgt. ██████ explained that the Informant would provide contemporaneous information related to ██████ narcotics and firearm possessions. Sgt. ██████ recounted a phone call in which the Informant stated, in a hushed tone, “I seen the drugs now. I just stepped out. I gotta go back in.”<sup>10</sup>

In a **statement to COPA**<sup>11</sup> on June 21, 2018, **Accused Officer** ██████, stated that on February 2, 2018, he received a telephone call from Sgt. ██████, during which Sgt. ██████ informed him an armed ██████, accompanied by other males, would be leaving ██████ entering a silver ██████. After receiving the information from Sgt. ██████, Officer ██████ provided the information to Officers ██████, ██████ and ██████ (collectively “the Officers”). All four of the Officers went to the ██████ where they observed an unoccupied silver ██████ parked near ██████. A LEADS inquiry on the ██████ license plate confirmed the SUV belong to ██████ and that he was a convicted felon. The Officers began surveillance on the SUV.

While conducting surveillance on the vehicle, the Officers observed three black males exit ██████ and enter the SUV. Officer ██████ estimated that he and Officer ██████ were

---

<sup>8</sup> Atts. 100 and 101

<sup>9</sup> Sgt. ██████ explained that due the passage of time he could not recall the name of the black male. In the Complaint for Search Warrant ██████, ██████ is identified with an Also Known As name of 50. Pgs. 38 and 39 of Att. 13.

<sup>10</sup> Relevant portions at 00:43 of Att. 101

<sup>11</sup> Att. 93

positioned approximately one block away from the SUV. After the males entered the SUV, it pulled out of a parallel parking space without using a signal. The Officers stopped the SUV. Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were in an unmarked vehicle behind the SUV while Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were in an unmarked vehicle in front of the SUV.

Once [REDACTED] SUV was stopped, the Officers requested each occupant to exit.<sup>12</sup> As [REDACTED] exited, Officer [REDACTED] observed a bulge in [REDACTED] pocket. Based on the information from Sgt. [REDACTED] and his observations of the bulge in [REDACTED] pocket, Officer [REDACTED] placed [REDACTED] in handcuffs and conducted a protective pat down. During the pat down, Officer [REDACTED] discovered that the bulge was a roll of currency.

After completing the protective pat down of [REDACTED] Officer [REDACTED] began to search [REDACTED] vehicle. Officer [REDACTED] searched the front driver's seat, rear passenger seat, and the trunk area of the SUV. As he was searching the trunk area he recalled moving clothing and other items from the area to assist in the search. Officer [REDACTED] recounted that he had located a small amount of cannabis in the trunk area during the search. Additionally, Officer [REDACTED] explained that the search of [REDACTED] SUV was based on the information provided by Sgt. [REDACTED] and his own observations, which matched the information provided by Sgt. [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] explained that the search of the SUV was an attempt to locate weapons. Officer [REDACTED] explained that he has never known Sgt. [REDACTED] to provide him with inaccurate or false information.

In a **statement to COPA**<sup>13</sup> on June 21, 2018, **Accused Officer [REDACTED]** stated essentially the same information as Officer [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] estimated that he and Officer [REDACTED] were approximately three quarters of a block away from the SUV. Additionally, Officer [REDACTED] explained that the officers placed [REDACTED] in handcuffs as he exited the SUV and performed a protective pat down because of the information Sgt. [REDACTED] had provided. Officer [REDACTED] remarked that as he was searching the front passenger area of the SUV, he observed a cellular telephone on the seat receiving text messages. Without unlocking the phone, Officer [REDACTED] was able to observe the text messages and believed they referenced if predetermined plans and meetings were going to occur.<sup>14</sup> Officer [REDACTED] also searched the rear passenger seat and the trunk area of the vehicle compartment of the SUV. Officer [REDACTED] recalled observing a small amount of cannabis in the trunk area of the SUV. Officer [REDACTED] confirmed that he searched the SUV for any firearms.

Further, Officer [REDACTED] noted an error on the Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) for [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] explained that the answer to the question "Was a search beyond a protective pat down conducted of the person?" should have been "no." Officer [REDACTED] explained that when the ISR was completed there was confusion over the meaning of the question. The officers erroneously answered "yes" because they searched [REDACTED] SUV.

---

<sup>12</sup> [REDACTED] was the driver of the vehicle, [REDACTED] was the front seat passenger, and [REDACTED] was the rear seat passenger.

<sup>13</sup> Att. 97.

<sup>14</sup> The BWC depicts Officer [REDACTED] picking up the cellular telephone and remarking about the text messages; however, COPA was unable to read the messages displayed on the lock screen. Relevant portions from 13:23 to 13:45 of File [REDACTED] – [REDACTED] of Att. 33.

<sup>15</sup> Att. 23.

In a **statement to COPA**<sup>16</sup> on June 21, 2018, **Accused Officer** [REDACTED] stated that essentially the same information as Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] recalled he and Officer [REDACTED] parked near [REDACTED] to surveil the SUV. Additionally, Officer [REDACTED] explained that once [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were at the SUV, he observed them approach the front of the vehicle and possibly hide an object in the engine compartment; however, he could not provide any details to support his assertion an object was possibly hidden in the engine compartment. Additionally, Officer [REDACTED] observed the males open the tailgate of the SUV and possibly place objects in the rear of the SUV; however, he could not provide any details to support his assertion an object was possibly placed in the rear of the SUV.

Further, Officer [REDACTED] did not recall completing a protective pat down of [REDACTED] but explained that the protective pat down of [REDACTED] was based on the information provided by Sgt. [REDACTED] and that he observed a bulge at his waist band. Additionally, [REDACTED] explained that the search of [REDACTED] UV included the engine compartment and rear tailgate area because of the observations he made when the males approached the vehicle. Officer [REDACTED] added that in his experience he has encountered instances in which armed subjects store firearms in the engine compartment of vehicles; however, could not provide any instances in which he knew [REDACTED], [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] stored weapons in such a manner.

In a **statement to COPA** on July 16, 2018, **Accused Officer** [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated essentially the same information as Officers [REDACTED] [REDACTED], and [REDACTED]. Additionally, Officer [REDACTED] recalled observing [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] standing near the front of the SUV for a few seconds prior to entering the SUV. Officer [REDACTED] stated he completed a protective pat down of [REDACTED] because of the information provided by Sgt. [REDACTED] and because he observed a large bulge in the right front pocket of his pants. During the protective pat down, Officer [REDACTED] discovered the bulge in [REDACTED] pocket was a plastic bag containing a roll of currency. Officer [REDACTED] explained that he asked to look at the money [REDACTED] had in his pocket a second time because it was a large amount of currency stored in a plastic bag and in his experience, currency stored in this manner is often stored with contraband – specifically narcotics. Officer [REDACTED] added that he searched the engine compartment of the SUV because he is aware of instances where people will store firearms and other contraband in and around engines; however, Officer [REDACTED] was clear he has never personally encountered such an instance.

Finally, Officer [REDACTED] noted an error on the ISRs for [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] explained that the box checked next to “Fits Description from Flash Message” should not have been checked as there was no flash message but rather information relayed to Officer [REDACTED] by Sgt. [REDACTED].

### **iii. Officers’ Statements about the Second Incident – March 1, 2018 and Third Incident – April 11, 2018**

In a **statement to COPA**<sup>17</sup> on May 21, 2018, **Accused Officer** [REDACTED], stated that on March 1, 2018, she was part of CPD E-4 Narcotics Team when search warrant [REDACTED] was executed at [REDACTED]. During the execution of the warrant Officer [REDACTED] located a

---

<sup>16</sup> Att. 89.

<sup>17</sup> Att. 42.



blue suitcase in the living room that contained cannabis, Ecstasy, and the narcotics paraphernalia detailed in the Evidence Recovery log. Officer ██████ added that at no time did she plant any narcotics – specifically Ecstasy. Officer ██████ was not present when ██████ was detained by other members of the E-4 Team. Officer ██████ explained that ██████ is known to engage in the sale of narcotics and, in her opinion, is a low-level narcotics dealer.

Additionally, Officer ██████ stated that on April 11, 2018, she was part of the CPD E-4 Narcotics Team when search warrant ██████ was executed at ██████. Officer ██████ explained that she was responsible for monitoring the detained occupants of the residence and did not assist in searching. Officer ██████ added that she has never known Officer ██████ to be in possession of narcotics outside of his official duties and that she is unaware of any instances where Officer ██████ planted narcotics during an investigation or execution of a search warrant.

In a **statement to COPA**<sup>18</sup> on May 21, 2018, **Accused Officer ██████** stated that on March 1, 2018, he was part of the CPD E-4 Narcotics Team when search warrant ██████ was executed at ██████. Officer ██████ explained that he assisted with the detention of ██████ and that he did not observe any officer draw a firearm nor did he hear any profanities being used. Office ██████ recounted that he obtained the keys to ██████ from ██████. Officer ██████ added during the execution of the warrant, he assisted in searching the residence. Officer ██████ was aware Ecstasy was recovered but did not personally recover any narcotics inside the residence. Officer ██████ explained that ██████ is known to engage in the sale of narcotics and, in his opinion, is a low-level narcotics supplier.

Additionally, Officer ██████ stated, that on April 11, 2018, he was part of CPD E-4 Narcotics Team when search warrant ██████ was executed at ██████. During the execution of the warrant, Officer ██████ located a dresser in the front upstairs bedroom. In one drawer of the dresser he located a knotted clear plastic bag that contained heroin, a single rock of crack cocaine, and razor blades. Officer ██████ added that at no time did he plant any narcotics – specifically heroin or cocaine. Officer ██████ was clear that he has never known Officer ██████ to be in possession of narcotics outside of her official duties and that he is unaware of any instances where Officer ██████ planted narcotics during an investigation or the execution of a search warrant.

In a **statement to COPA**<sup>19</sup> on May 21, 2018, **Accused Officer ██████** stated that on March 1, 2018, he was not present for the execution of search warrant ██████ at ██████. because he was preparing to escort the Confidential Informant home from the courthouse. Officer ██████ explained that the search warrant was signed at 8:58 am and it was executed at 9:30 am. Office ██████ explained that ██████ is known to engage in the sale of narcotics and, in his opinion, is a low-level narcotics dealer.

Additionally, Officer ██████ tated, that on April 11, 2018, he was part of the CPD E-4 Narcotics Team when search warrant ██████ was executed at ██████. During the execution of the warrant, Officer ██████ searched the upstairs rear bedroom and the closets

---

<sup>18</sup> Att. 46.

<sup>19</sup> Att. 50.

immediately outside of the room. Officer ██████ did not recover any narcotics. Officer ██████ learned that Officer ██████ recovered narcotics when he reviewed the Evidence Recovery Log prior to completing ██████ Arrest Report. ██████ explained that ██████ was arrested for the recovered heroin and cocaine. Officer ██████ was clear that he has never known Officers ██████ or ██████ to be in possession of narcotics outside of their official duties and that he is unaware of any instances where Officers ██████ or ██████ planted narcotics during an investigation or the execution of a search warrant.

In a **statement to COPA**<sup>20</sup> on May 21, 2018, **Accused Officer ██████**, stated that on March 1, 2018, she was part of the CPD E-4 Narcotics Team and assisted with the execution of search warrant ██████ at ██████. Officer ██████ explained that while assisting with detaining ██████ she did not observe any officer with a firearm drawn nor did she hear any profanities being used. Officer ██████ noted that while detaining ██████ she detected a strong odor of cannabis coming from the vehicle he was in and observed a baggie of suspected cannabis on the floor board of the rear seats. Officer ██████ placed ██████ in a CPD vehicle and returned to ██████. ██████ remained in the CPD vehicle during the search. Officer ██████ was responsible for documenting and recovering any evidence. Officer ██████ located a blue suitcase in the living room that contained cannabis, Ecstasy, and various narcotics paraphernalia. Officer ██████ photographed and recovered the narcotics and paraphernalia. Officer ██████ confirmed that the photographs in Attachment 27 accurately reflect her observations. Additionally, Officer ██████ explained that ██████ is known to engage in the sale of narcotics and, in her opinion, is a street dealer.

Additionally, Officer ██████ stated, that on April 11, 2018, she was part of the CPD E-4 Narcotics Team when search warrant ██████ was executed at ██████. During the execution of the warrant, Officer ██████ was again responsible for documenting and recovering any evidence. Officer ██████ recalled Officer ██████ calling her to the upstairs front bedroom to photograph and recover the heroin and cocaine he had located. Officer ██████ explained that in the same dresser, documents with ██████ name and photograph were located. Officer ██████ added that ██████ was arrested for possession of heroin and cocaine. Officer ██████ confirmed that the photographs in Attachment 28 accurately reflect her observations. Officer ██████ was clear that she has never known Officers ██████ or ██████ to be in possession of narcotics outside of their official duties and that she is unaware of any instances where Officers ██████ or ██████ planted narcotics during an investigation or execution of a search warrant.

## **b. Digital Evidence**

### **i. First Incident – February 2, 2018**

Footage from **Officer ██████ Body Worn Camera**<sup>21</sup> (BWC) depicts him exiting the passenger seat of the CPD vehicle and approaching ██████' SUV. Once Officer ██████ is at the SUV, ██████ exits the SUV and Officer ██████ conducts a pat down. Officer ██████ handcuffs ██████. Officer ██████ begins to search the SUV. Officer ██████ searches in,

---

<sup>20</sup> Att. 54.

<sup>21</sup> File ██████ – ██████ of Att. 33.

around, and under the front driver's seat during which he opens and searches the center console. After searching the area of the driver's seat, Officer [REDACTED] searches the driver's door and removes and searches contents from the door pocket. Officer [REDACTED] then begins to search in, around, and under the rear driver's side seat. Officer [REDACTED] lowers the seat forward and searches the area behind the seat during which he opens and searches a metal box. Officer [REDACTED] then searches the front passenger door and in, around, and under the front passenger seat. Officer [REDACTED] proceeds to search the rear passenger side door and in, around, and under the seat. Next, Officer [REDACTED] searches the trunk area of the SUV, during which he searches and moves the contents from the trunk area to the rear seat. As Officer [REDACTED] is searching the trunk area, he is heard remarking to Officer [REDACTED] that he sees cannabis in the trunk area. The footage shows a leafy substance consistent with cannabis on top of the spare tire that is stored under the carpet.<sup>22</sup> After searching the trunk area, Officer [REDACTED] returns to the driver's seat and unlatches the hood. Finally, Officer [REDACTED] searches for concealed compartments within the SUV.

Footage from Officer [REDACTED] BWC<sup>23</sup> depicts [REDACTED] exiting the front passenger seat and Officer [REDACTED] patting him down. Officer [REDACTED] escorts [REDACTED] to the rear of the SUV and watches as Officer [REDACTED] places [REDACTED] in handcuffs. Officer [REDACTED] remains at the rear of the SUV with [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED]. After approximately seven minutes and twenty-five seconds, Officer [REDACTED] walks to the driver's seat of the SUV and attempts to unlatches the hood but is unable to do so. Officer [REDACTED] then asks Officer [REDACTED] how to open the hood, however he was unable to provide an assistance. Officer [REDACTED] returns to the driver's seat and is eventually able to unlatch the hood. Once the hood is unlatched, Officer [REDACTED] opens the hood and searches in and around the engine compartment of the SUV. Officer [REDACTED] then closes the hood and returns to [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. After approximately four minutes and six seconds, Officer [REDACTED] returns to the front driver's door and pulls on the door panel, while remarking about possible hidden compartments. Officer [REDACTED] then searches the rear seat. Finally, Officer [REDACTED] searches under the driver's seat.

Footage from Officer [REDACTED] BWC<sup>24</sup> depicts him exiting the CPD vehicle and approaching [REDACTED]' SUV while ordering the occupants to show their hands. Officer [REDACTED] reaches into the vehicle and unlocks the driver's door. [REDACTED] opens the door and exits. While patting [REDACTED] down, Officer [REDACTED] asks [REDACTED] what is in his pocket. [REDACTED] informs him that it is \$1,200 in cash. Officer [REDACTED] handcuffs [REDACTED] and escorts him to the rear of the SUV. Officer [REDACTED] obtains identification and/or names from [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED]. Once Officer [REDACTED] has the identifying information, he returns to the CPD vehicle and conducts a name check. After approximately seven minutes and twenty-three seconds, Officer [REDACTED] exits the CPD vehicle and stands near [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED]. After approximately one minute and five seconds, Officer [REDACTED] approaches [REDACTED] and informs him that he is going to check the money again, while simultaneously asking [REDACTED] where he got the money from. [REDACTED] informs Officer [REDACTED] the money is from selling cars. After, checking [REDACTED] money, Officer [REDACTED] returns to monitoring [REDACTED], and [REDACTED]. After approximately two minutes and twenty-eight seconds, Officer [REDACTED] approaches the SUV, leans into the rear driver's side window,

---

<sup>22</sup> Relevant portion at 11:25 of file [REDACTED] – [REDACTED] of Att. 33.

<sup>23</sup> File [REDACTED] – [REDACTED] of Att. 33.

<sup>24</sup> File [REDACTED] – [REDACTED] of Att. 33

moves the seat backwards and shines his light into the passenger compartment. Officer [REDACTED] then asks Officer [REDACTED] to unlatch the hood. Once Officer [REDACTED] unlatches the hood of the SUV, Officer [REDACTED] searches in and around the engine compartment. After searching in and around the engine compartment, Officer [REDACTED] closes the hood and checks the SUV for possible hidden compartments. While checking for hidden compartments, Officer [REDACTED] opens and searches the center console, he also searches in, around, and under the front passenger seat.

Footage from Officer [REDACTED] BWC<sup>25</sup> depicts [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] seated on the passenger side of the SUV with their hands raised. [REDACTED] exits the vehicle and is detained by Officer [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] opens the front passenger door while asking [REDACTED] to exit. Once [REDACTED] exits the vehicle, Officer [REDACTED] pats him down and escorts him to the rear of the SUV. Officer [REDACTED] handcuffs [REDACTED], and then returns to the front passenger seat. Officer [REDACTED] searches in, around, and under the front passenger seat. During the search he removes and searches a drawer from under the seat. After searching the front passenger seat, Officer [REDACTED] searches the rear passenger seat. After searching the rear passenger seat, Officer [REDACTED] walks to the CPD vehicle where Officer [REDACTED] is completing the name checks. After approximately six minutes and four seconds, Officer [REDACTED] returns to the SUV and searches in and around the trunk area. While searching in and around the trunk area, Officer [REDACTED] searches and moves the contents from the trunk area to the rear seat. Officer [REDACTED] is heard remarking to that he observes cannabis in the trunk area. The footage shows a leafy substance consistent with cannabis on top of the spare tire that is stored under the carpet.<sup>26</sup> After searching the trunk area, Officer [REDACTED] searches in, around, behind, and under the rear driver's side seat. Officer [REDACTED] then searches the front passenger seat, during which he observes a cellular telephone sitting on the seat. The cellular telephone is receiving text messages and without unlocking the phone, Officer [REDACTED] states the text messages ask "we really gonna do this shit, I'm on 55?" and "Where you at?"<sup>27</sup> After reviewing the incoming text messages, Officer [REDACTED] searches the glove compartment, during which he removes the contents. After searching the glove compartment, Officer [REDACTED] remarks that [REDACTED] is sweaty and maybe nervous. During the entire time that [REDACTED] is searching the SUV the cellular telephone in the front passenger seat receives numerous phone calls, FaceTime calls, and text messages.

## ii. Second Incident – March 1, 2018

**Photographs**<sup>28</sup> taken on March 1, 2018, during the execution of [REDACTED], depict the recovered cannabis, Ecstasy, narcotics paraphernalia, and proof of [REDACTED] residency.

## iii. Third Incident – April 11, 2018

**Photographs**<sup>29</sup> taken on April 11, 2018, during the execution of [REDACTED] depict the recovered heroin, cocaine, and proof of [REDACTED] residency.

---

<sup>25</sup> File [REDACTED] – A [REDACTED] Att. 33.

<sup>26</sup> Relevant portions at 10:54 of file [REDACTED] – [REDACTED] of Att. 33.

<sup>27</sup> Relevant portions at 13:20 to 13:48 of file [REDACTED] – [REDACTED] of Att. 33. The content of the messages are not visible on the recording.

<sup>28</sup> Att. 27.

<sup>29</sup> Att. 28.

### c. Documentary Evidence

#### i. First Incident – February 2, 2018

**Investigatory Stop Reports**<sup>30</sup> detail that Officers [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] (the Officers), received information from a Confidential Informant that a [REDACTED] was occupied by [REDACTED] and other males ([REDACTED] and [REDACTED]), and that the occupants were armed. The Officers stopped a SUV matching the description after observing it fail to signal when pulling out of a parallel parking spot. The Officers requested that all the occupants exit the SUV. When [REDACTED] exited, the Officers observed a large bulge in the front pocket of [REDACTED] pants, and bulges in the pants of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Based on the information provided by the Confidential Informant and their own observations, the Officers completed protective pat downs of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and searched the SUV for weapons. After completing the searches, the Officers provided [REDACTED] a Stop Receipt, however [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] refused a Stop Receipt. All three males were released.

#### ii. Second Incident – March 1, 2018

A **Complaint for Search Warrant**<sup>31</sup> and **Search Warrant** [REDACTED]<sup>32</sup> dated March 1, 2018, detail that Officer [REDACTED] learned from a Confidential Informant that [REDACTED] was selling cannabis from the second-floor northern apartment of [REDACTED]. Upon learning this information, Officer [REDACTED] sought and was granted a search warrant. The warrant authorized the search of [REDACTED] and the second-floor northern apartment of [REDACTED] for cannabis, any paraphernalia used in the weighing, cutting or mixing of illegal drugs, any money, and any records detailing illegal drug transactions.

A **Narcotic's Division Supplementary Report under** [REDACTED]<sup>33</sup> dated March 1, 2018, details [REDACTED] driving from [REDACTED], while not wearing a seat belt. Officers stopped [REDACTED] and while speaking to him detected a strong odor of cannabis. Officers recovered cannabis from the vehicle, detained [REDACTED], and relocated him to [REDACTED]. Once at the location, [REDACTED] as informed of search warrant [REDACTED] and he provided keys to the apartment. During the execution of the warrant, officers recovered items listed on the Evidence Recovery Log.

An **Evidence Recovery Log**<sup>34</sup> and **Inventory Reports**<sup>35</sup> dated March 1, 2018, detail that during the execution of [REDACTED] officers recovered a heat sealer, boxes and rolls of packing material, scales, a shifter, a currency counter, \$2477.00, a bag of cannabis, and pills of Ecstasy.

[REDACTED] **Arrest Report**<sup>36</sup> dated March 1, 2018, details that [REDACTED] was arrested for possession of the cannabis and Ecstasy recovered during the execution of [REDACTED].

---

<sup>30</sup> Atts. 23, 34 and 35.

<sup>31</sup> Pgs. 7 and 8 of Att. 13.

<sup>32</sup> Pg. 6 of Att. 13.

<sup>33</sup> Pgs. 3 – 5 of Att. 13.

<sup>34</sup> Pg. 10 of Att. 13.

<sup>35</sup> Pgs. 11 – 23 of Att. 13.

<sup>36</sup> Att. 9.

### iii. Third Incident – April 11, 2018

A **Complaint for a Search Warrant**<sup>37</sup> and **Search Warrant** [REDACTED]<sup>38</sup> dated April 11, 2018, detail that Officer [REDACTED] learned from a Confidential Informant that [REDACTED] was selling cocaine from [REDACTED]. Upon learning this information, Officer [REDACTED] sought and was granted a search warrant. The warrant authorized the search of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] for cocaine, any paraphernalia used in the weighing, cutting or mixing of illegal drugs, any money, and any records detailing illegal drug transactions.

A **Narcotic's Division Supplementary Report under** [REDACTED]<sup>39</sup> dated April 11, 2018, details [REDACTED] was standing in the street when officers executed search warrant [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]. Officers informed [REDACTED] of the warrant and detained him. [REDACTED] instructed the officers to knock on the front door so one of the occupants could let them inside. During the execution of the warrant officers recovered cocaine, heroin, proof of [REDACTED] residency, and narcotics packaging material from a dresser in the second-floor front bedroom.

An **Evidence Recovery Log**<sup>40</sup> and **Inventory Reports**<sup>41</sup> dated April 11, 2018, detail that during the execution of [REDACTED] officers recovered narcotic packaging, a bag of heroin, crack cocaine, and proof of [REDACTED] residency.

[REDACTED] **Arrest Report**<sup>42</sup> dated April 11, 2018, details that [REDACTED] was arrested for possession of the cocaine and heroin recovered during the execution of [REDACTED].

## VI. ANALYSIS

### a. Allegations Related to the First Incident – February 2, 2018

COPA recommends a finding of **Exonerated** for the allegations that Officers [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] unlawfully detained [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Police officers are permitted to detain occupants of a vehicle when the vehicle is observed committing a traffic offense. Additionally, police officers are permitted to stop and detain subjects for a reasonable amount of time if the officer reasonably infers, from all the circumstances known to the officer, that the subject is about to commit, is committing, or has committed a criminal offense.<sup>43</sup>

Here, the officers credibly stated they observed [REDACTED] commit a traffic violation – specifically starting from a parallel parked position without using a signal. Therefore, the officers possessed probable cause to conduct a traffic stop on the SUV. Additionally, once the SUV was stopped the officers' decision to request the occupants to exit was reasonable because of the

---

<sup>37</sup> Pgs. 38 and 39 of Att. 13.

<sup>38</sup> Pg. 37 of Att. 13.

<sup>39</sup> Pgs. 28 – 30 of Att. 13.

<sup>40</sup> Pg. 44 of Att. 13.

<sup>41</sup> Pgs. 31 – 36 of Att. 13.

<sup>42</sup> Att. 10.

<sup>43</sup> 725 ILCS 5/107-14.

information relayed to them by Sgt. [REDACTED] – specifically that [REDACTED] and his companions were armed. Further, as each occupant exited the SUV the officers observed bulges at their waistbands. Based on their observations, combined with the information provided by Sgt. [REDACTED] it was reasonable for the officers to place [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] in handcuffs.

COPA recommends a finding of **Exonerated** for the allegations that Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] unlawfully searched [REDACTED]. A lawfully detained person is subjected to a limited scope search (protective pat down) for weapons if an officer reasonably suspects, based on all the circumstances, that the subject may be armed or a danger of attack.<sup>44</sup>

Here, Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] received information from Sgt. [REDACTED] that an armed [REDACTED] and companions would be exiting [REDACTED] entering a silver SUV, and leaving the area to engage in a shooting. After committing a traffic violation, officers detained [REDACTED] and requested him to exit the SUV. Upon his exit, Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] observed a bulge in [REDACTED] waistband. Based on all the information known to Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], it was reasonable to infer that [REDACTED] was possibly armed and dangerous and therefore could be subjected to a protective pat down. Based on this information, COPA determined that Officers [REDACTED] [REDACTED] actions were proper and lawful.

COPA recommends a finding of **Exonerated** for the allegation that Officer [REDACTED] unlawfully searched [REDACTED]. A lawfully detained person is subjected to a limited scope search (protective pat down) for weapons if an officer reasonably suspects, based on all the circumstances, that the subject may be armed or a danger of attack.<sup>45</sup>

Here, Officer [REDACTED] received information form Officer [REDACTED] that an armed [REDACTED] and companions would be exiting [REDACTED] entering a silver SUV, and leaving the area to engage in a shooting. [REDACTED] n, and [REDACTED] were observed exiting [REDACTED] entering a silver SUV, and pulling out of a parallel parked position without a signal. A traffic stop was conducted, and [REDACTED] was discovered to be a passenger. As [REDACTED] exited the SUV, Officer [REDACTED] observed a bulge in his waistband. Based on all the information known to Officer [REDACTED] it was reasonable to infer that [REDACTED] was possibly armed and dangerous and therefore could be subjected to a protective pat down. Based on this information, COPA determined that Officer [REDACTED] actions were proper and lawful.

COPA recommends a finding of **Exonerated** for the allegation that Officer [REDACTED] unlawfully searched [REDACTED]. A lawfully detained person is subjected to a limited scope search (protective pat down) for weapons if an officer reasonably suspects, based on all the circumstances, that the subject may be armed and dangerous.<sup>46</sup>

Here, Officer [REDACTED] received information form Officer [REDACTED] that an armed [REDACTED] and companions would be exiting [REDACTED] entering a silver SUV, and leaving the area to engage in a shooting. [REDACTED] [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] were observed exiting [REDACTED] entering a silver SUV and pulling out of a parallel parked position without a signal. A traffic stop

---

<sup>44</sup> 725 ILCS 5/108-1.01

<sup>45</sup> 725 ILCS 5/108-1.01

<sup>46</sup> 725 ILCS 5/108-1.01

was conducted, and ██████ was discovered to be a passenger. As ██████ exited the SUV, Officer ██████ observed a bulge in his waistband. Based on all the information known to Officer ██████ it was reasonable to infer that ██████ was possibly armed and dangerous and therefore could be subjected to a protective pat down. Based on this information, COPA determined that Officer ██████ actions were proper and lawful.

COPA recommends a finding of **Exonerated** for the allegations that Officers ██████, ██████, ██████ and ██████ unlawfully searched ██████ vehicle. In accordance with *Carroll v. United States*,<sup>47</sup> peace officers are permitted to search a vehicle, without a warrant, when they possess probable cause that a vehicle contains evidence of a crime or contraband provided two factors are present. The first factor is that the vehicle is readily mobile.<sup>48</sup> The second factor is that the peace officer establish probable cause that the vehicle contains evidence of a crime or contraband sufficient enough that a magistrate could authorize a search.<sup>49</sup> Probable cause is established when “the known facts and circumstances are sufficient to warrant a man of reasonable prudence in the belief that contraband or evidence of a crime will be found.”<sup>50</sup> The facts and circumstances known to the officer can be established in several ways, including a tip provided by a reliable confidential informant.<sup>51</sup> Once both factors are met, a peace officer can search a vehicle as if they possessed a search warrant, which would permit a search of any area where the suspected evidence or contraband may reasonably located.<sup>52</sup>

Here, a confidential informant, who Sgt. ██████ believed was highly reliable in part because he provided contemporaneous information related to ██████ activity, provided predictive information that an armed ██████ and his companions would be exiting ██████ entering a silver SUV, and driving from the location. The officers located the unoccupied SUV and while confirming the SUV belong to ██████ learned ██████ was a convicted felon. The officers conducted surveillance on the SUV and observed, as predicted, ██████, and ██████ exit ██████ and approach and enter the SUV. Additionally, Officer ██████ recounted observing ██████, and ██████ open the tailgate of the SUV and stand around the front of the SUV in an attempt to possibly conceal a firearm. As the SUV pulled away from the curb, the driver ██████ was observed committing a traffic violation. The officers conducted a traffic stop, requested the occupants to exit, and completed a search of the SUV. Based on the predictive information provided by the confidential informant combined with the officers’ observations that confirmed substantial parts of the information provided by the confidential informant, the knowledge that ██████ was a convicted felon and the fact that the vehicle was readily mobile, COPA finds that it is more likely than not that the Officers possessed sufficient information to establish probable cause that the SUV contained evidence of a crime – specifically possession of a firearm by a convicted felon – or contraband – a firearm – and therefore were permitted to search the SUV as

---

<sup>47</sup>267 U.S. 132 (1925) (holding that there is no requirement to obtain a warrant to search a vehicle if law enforcement has probable cause to believe that a vehicle contains evidence of a crime or contraband.)

<sup>48</sup>*California v. Carney*, 471 U.S. 386 (1985) (finding that a vehicle must only be capable of movement and that movement is not necessary.)

<sup>49</sup>*United States v. Ross*, 456 U.S. 798, 823 (1982) (finding that “the prior approval of the magistrate is waived” but that the search must be of a nature that a magistrate could authorize.)

<sup>50</sup> *Ornelas v. United States*, 517 U.S. 690, 696 (1996)

<sup>51</sup> *Maryland v. Dyson*, 527 U.S. 465 (1990)

<sup>52</sup> *Cooper v. California*, 386 U.S. 58, 59 (1967) (holding that a warrantless search of a vehicle, as permitted by *Carroll*, permits a “search of every part of the vehicle and its contents that many conceal the object of the search.”)



if they had a search warrant in accordance with *Carroll*. Thus, COPA finds, that the search of [REDACTED] vehicle was lawful and proper.

#### **b. Allegations Related to the Second Incident – March 1, 2018**

COPA recommends a finding of **Not Sustained** for the allegation that Officer [REDACTED] planted narcotics inside [REDACTED]. During his statement, to COPA, [REDACTED] admitted he sells cannabis. [REDACTED] also admitted ownership of the recovered cannabis and narcotics paraphernalia. During the execution of search warrant [REDACTED] Officer [REDACTED] located cannabis, Ecstasy, and narcotics paraphernalia all within a blue suitcase located inside [REDACTED]. Additionally, Officer [REDACTED] confirmed and documented, with photographs and on the evidence recovery log, where the cannabis, Ecstasy, and narcotics paraphernalia was located prior to recovery. Further, COPA did not locate any evidence, other than [REDACTED] claims, that demonstrated CPD officer planted additional narcotics – specifically Ecstasy – inside [REDACTED]. However, there is not clear and convincing evidence to demonstrate that this did not occur.<sup>53</sup>

#### **c. Allegations Related to the Third Incident – April 11, 2018**

COPA recommends a finding of **Not Sustained** for the allegation that Officer [REDACTED] planted narcotics inside [REDACTED]. During his statement, to COPA, [REDACTED] admitted to selling cannabis but denied being in possession of heroin or cocaine. Additionally, [REDACTED] denied residing inside [REDACTED]. However, during the execution of search warrant [REDACTED], heroin, cocaine, narcotics paraphernalia, and proof of [REDACTED] residency were all located in or on the same dresser in the second-floor front bedroom of [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] stated that he also located the heroin and cocaine in the dresser. Additionally, Officer [REDACTED] confirmed and documented, with photographs and on the evidence recovery log, where the heroin and cocaine was located prior to recovery. Finally, COPA did not locate any evidence, other than [REDACTED] claims, that demonstrated any CPD Officer planted narcotics – specifically heroin or cocaine – inside [REDACTED]. However, there is not clear and convincing evidence to demonstrate that this did not occur.

COPA recommends a finding of **Exonerated** for the allegations that Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] unlawfully arrested [REDACTED]. A police officer may arrest a person when s/he has probable cause to believe that the person has committed an offense.<sup>54</sup>

Here, Officer [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] arrested [REDACTED] for possession of the heroin and cocaine recovered during the execution of search warrant [REDACTED]. This decision was based on the information that heroin, cocaine, and proof of [REDACTED] residency were all located in or on the same dresser inside the second-floor front bedroom of [REDACTED]. Therefore; COPA finds, based on the evidence, Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] decisions to arrest [REDACTED] was reasonable and lawful.

---

<sup>53</sup> For example, there is no BWC footage showing the officers recovering the narcotics.

<sup>54</sup> 725 ILCS 5/107-2(1)(c)

## VII. CONCLUSION

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

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Officer ██████ ██████	<p>It is alleged that during the first incident, that Officer ██████</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unlawfully detained ██████, in violation of Rule 6.</li> <li>2. Unlawfully detained ██████ in violation of Rule 6.</li> <li>3. Unlawfully detained ██████, in violation of Rule 6.</li> <li>4. Unlawfully searched ██████, in violation of Rule 6.</li> <li>5. Unlawfully searched ██████ vehicle, in violation of Rule 6.</li> </ol>	<p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p>
Officer ██████ ██████	<p>It is alleged that during the first incident, that Officer ██████</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unlawfully detained ██████, in violation of Rule 6.</li> <li>2. Unlawfully detained ██████, in violation of Rule 6.</li> <li>3. Unlawfully detained ██████ in violation of Rule 6.</li> <li>4. Unlawfully searched ██████ vehicle, in violation of Rule 6.</li> </ol>	<p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p>
Officer ██████ ██████	<p>It is alleged that during the first incident, that Officer ██████</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unlawfully detained ██████, in violation of Rule 6.</li> <li>2. Unlawfully detained ██████ in violation of Rule 6.</li> <li>3. Unlawfully detained ██████ in violation of Rule 6.</li> </ol>	<p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p>

	<p>4. Unlawfully searched [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 6.</p> <p>5. Unlawfully searched [REDACTED], in violation of Rule 6.</p> <p>6. Unlawfully searched [REDACTED] vehicle, in violation of Rule 6.</p>	<p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p>
Officer [REDACTED]	<p>It is alleged that during the first incident, that Officer [REDACTED]:</p> <p>1. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED], in violation of Rule 6.</p> <p>2. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED], in violation of Rule 6.</p> <p>3. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 6.</p> <p>4. Unlawfully searched [REDACTED], in violation of Rule 6.</p> <p>5. Unlawfully searched [REDACTED] vehicle, in violation of Rule 6.</p>	<p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p>
Officer [REDACTED]	<p>It is alleged that during the second incident, that Officer [REDACTED]:</p> <p>1. Planted narcotics inside [REDACTED], in violation of Rule 2.</p>	<p>Not Sustained.</p>
Officer [REDACTED]	<p>It is alleged that during the third incident, that Officer [REDACTED]:</p> <p>1. Planted narcotics inside [REDACTED], in violation of Rule 2.</p>	<p>Not Sustained.</p>
Officer [REDACTED]	<p>It is alleged that during the third incident, that Officer [REDACTED]:</p> <p>1. Unlawfully arrested [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 6.</p>	<p>Exonerated.</p>
Officer [REDACTED]	<p>It is alleged that during the third incident, that Officer [REDACTED]:</p> <p>1. Unlawfully arrested [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 6.</p>	<p>Exonerated.</p>

Approved:



---

Andrea Kersten  
*Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator*

July 16, 2019

---

Date

**Appendix A**

Assigned Investigative Staff

---

<b>Squad:</b>	█
<b>Investigator:</b>	██████████
<b>Supervising Investigator:</b>	██
<b>Deputy Chief Administrator:</b>	Andrea Kersten