

**SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION**

**I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Date of Incident:	June 20, 2018
Time of Incident:	11:00 am
Location of Incident:	██████████
Date of COPA Notification:	June 20, 2018
Time of COPA Notification:	1:23 pm

On June 20, 2018, Complainant ██████████ had an interaction with Department members who she alleged had unlawfully entered her garage, which is located at ██████████. The Complainant alleges that the Accused officers opened her overhead garage door and took a cellphone photo of a dog that was housed inside. When the Complainant confronted the Accused about entering her garage without her consent, the Accused allegedly told her that they were concerned about a dog she had in the garage that they alleged was partially open. Subsequently, the Complainant phoned 911 requesting a supervisor be sent to her residence and the responding Accused sergeant refused to document her complaint about the Accused officers' alleged actions.

**II. INVOLVED PARTIES**

Involved Officer #1:	██████████ #██████, Employee ID #██████, DOA ██████1994, PO Unit of Assignment: ██████ District, DOB ██████1959, M/W
Involved Officer #2:	██████████ #██████, Employee ID #██████, DOA ██████97, PO, Unit of Assignment: ██████ District, DOB ██████69, M/HI
Involved Officer #3:	██████████ #██████, Employee ID #██████, DOA ██████94, SGT, Unit of Assignment: ██████ District, DOB ██████69, M/W
Involved Individual #1:	██████████ DOB: ██████84, F/B
Involved Individual #2:	██████████ DOB ██████60, F/B

**III. ALLEGATIONS**

Officer	Allegation	Finding / Recommendation
Officer [REDACTED]	1. It is alleged that on June 20, 2018, at approximately 11:00 a.m., at or near [REDACTED], Officer [REDACTED] conducted a search of the garage belonging to the Complainant, without lawful justification.	Not sustained
Officer [REDACTED]	1. It is alleged that on June 20, 2018, at approximately 11:00 a.m., at or near [REDACTED], Officer [REDACTED] conducted a search of the garage belonging to the Complainant, without lawful justification.	Not sustained
Sgt. [REDACTED]	1. It is alleged that on June 20, 2018, at approximately 11:00 a.m., at or near [REDACTED], Sgt. [REDACTED] failed to document and process a complaint made by [REDACTED] regarding an interaction she had with Department members, after she requested the Accused to do so.  2. It is alleged that on June 20, 2018, at approximately 11:00 a.m., at or near [REDACTED], failed to prepare and maintain a supervisory log for the date in question and did not document the interaction the Accused had with the Complainant, [REDACTED]	Sustained/Retired Sustained/Retired <sup>1</sup>          Sustained/Retired

<sup>1</sup> Sgt. [REDACTED] retired from the Department on January 15, 2020. See Attachment34.

#### IV. APPLICABLE RULES AND LAWS

---

##### Rules

---

1. Rule 2: Any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department.
2. Rule 3: Any failure to promote the Department's efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals
3. Rule 5: Failure to perform any duty
4. Rule 6: Disobedience of an order or directive, whether or oral
5. Rule 10: Inattention to duty

---

##### General Orders

---

1. G01-01 – CPD Vision Mission Statement, and Core Values
2. G08-01-02 Specific Responsibilities Regarding Allegations of Misconduct

---

##### Special Orders

---

1. S08-01-01 Conduct of Complaint Investigations

---

##### Federal Laws

---

1. The 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the US Constitution

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

##### a. Interviews

##### Interview of Complainant ██████████ ██████████

The Complainant was interviewed by COPA on June 19, 2018 at the Agency's office. Ms. ██████████ stated that on June 20, 2018 around 12:00 pm, she was in the bathroom of her home taking a shower when she overheard her mother asking somebody why they were in the garage. Curious about what was happening, Ms. ██████████ stepped outside of her home and discovered that her mother was speaking to two male Chicago Police officers. Ms. ██████████ approached one of the officers and asked him why he had been in her garage. According to Ms. ██████████ the officer told

---

<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> Attachment #8.

her in response to her question that there was a dog inside the garage, to which Ms. ██████ asked how he could know that, given that the garage was closed. When asked to clarify, Ms. ██████ stated that the overhead garage door was half-way open, then later stated the door was six inches to a foot off the ground. Ms. ██████ stated the officer had taken a photo of the dog inside using his cellphone camera and showed her the picture he took. Ms. ██████ indicated that in order for the officer to take the picture, he would've had to enter the garage because the clearance between the ground and the garage door was not high enough to capture the dog's image from that vantage point. Ms. ██████ stated she asked the officers which CPD district they were from, and the officer told her they were from the ██████ District. Displeased that the officers had trespassed on her property as evinced by the photo of the dog inside her garage, Ms. ██████ told the officers she already has a complaint against the ██████ District and that she wanted the officers to leave her premises. The officers complied and left her property.

Ms. ██████ then placed a call to the Civilian Police Accountability Council (CPAC), which her attorney describes as the Civilian Police Accountability Council, who advised her to call 911 and request a supervisor come to her location so she can file a complaint. Ms. ██████ states a supervising sergeant responded to her call and refused to take her complaint, telling her that the officers were conducting an investigation regarding a dog in response to an anonymous complaint. Ms. ██████ indicated she recorded a portion of her discussion with the responding CPD sergeant which she has supplied to COPA. After arguing with the sergeant for an unspecified amount of time, the sergeant departed, and Ms. ██████ returned inside her home. Ms. ██████ indicated that she did not call 911 or the ██████ District any additional times, and that neither her mother nor herself consented to a search of her garage.

Ms. ██████ believed that the attention the CPD was subjecting her residence to was in retaliation to another complaint (CR ██████) she had filed with COPA involving her juvenile son. She bases her assertion on her knowledge of multiple videos she's aware of that capture ██████ District officers planting evidence on residents and engaging in misconduct.

Ms. ██████ reiterated that there are no functioning locks on the garage doors and that the garage is usually unlocked. She mentioned a neighbor, ██████, saw the officers in the alley prior to the confrontation with Ms. ██████

### **Interview of witness ██████ ██████**

Witness ██████ ██████ mother of ██████ was interviewed by COPA on July 1, 2019. ██████ ██████ stated that on the incident date and time, she observed two Department members inside a marked SUV outside of her home attempting to take pictures of the front door of the home. ██████ stepped outside to ask why the officers were taking pictures of her residence, blocking the address numbers with her body. The Officers told her they were taking pictures because there was a dog "hanging"<sup>5</sup> inside the garage. ██████ stated she was curious to know how the officers could tell there was a dog in the garage given that the doors were closed, and it was not possible to see into the garage without opening it. She stated to the officers

---

<sup>4</sup> Attachment #25.

<sup>5</sup> Attachment #25 @ 2:55 minutes.

“How you know there’s a dog in the garage? The garage is not letting up that high to see in the garage. The only way you could see in there you had to get out of the car and look in the garage.”<sup>6</sup>

The Officers told her they had received a call that there was a dog “hanging” inside her garage<sup>7</sup>. [REDACTED] countered that the though the dog was tied up on a long rope. She stated, “He has room where he can go to the back of the garage, to the front of the garage and out the door.”<sup>8</sup> She admitted the dog could go out of the overhead door and the door to the backyard.

The officers remained in their vehicle for the entire interaction. She never saw the officers in the alley, nor did she ever see them open the overhead garage door or go into the garage. She never saw either of the officers get out of the squad car and go into the garage, but believed they did, as the overhead door had been raised about a foot when she went to look at the garage after the officers left. The overhead garage door had previously been closed but did not say when the last time was that she checked on it.

### Interview of Officer [REDACTED]

Officer [REDACTED] was interviewed by COPA on August 15, 2019 at the office of the Independent Police Review Authority, located at 1615 West Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. Officer [REDACTED] stated that he was on duty and working with his partner, Officer [REDACTED] on June 20, 2019. He was assigned to the [REDACTED] District and working from 7:00 am to 4:00 pm. He believes he and his partner were in plain clothes and assigned to marked CPD squad car, working a Burglary mission.

At approximately 11:00 am, he and his partner were driving southbound in the alley behind [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] was driving the squad car and Officer [REDACTED] was in the front passenger seat. Officer [REDACTED] observed the overhead garage door for [REDACTED] to be open about 3-4 feet. Officer [REDACTED] stopped the squad car and exited to investigate, while his partner remained in the vehicle. He was able to look inside the garage and see a chained-up dog inside. Officer [REDACTED] thought this was a problem, as it was June and the dog could be in jeopardy due to the heat. Officer [REDACTED] informed the COPA investigators that he never went into the garage.

Officer [REDACTED] got back into the squad car and drove around to the front of [REDACTED] because he wanted to let the owner know the garage door was open and there was a dog chained inside. When they arrived in front of the house, a woman exited the residence and became belligerent and started yelling at the officers. She yelled “Why you going into my garage?”<sup>10</sup> Officer [REDACTED] thought there may have been another woman with the person yelling at he and his partner but could not be sure. He believed the interaction with the woman lasted a few minutes and that he did not swear at the woman or say anything inappropriate to her. He could not remember, though, what he said to the woman about the dog in the garage.

After a few minutes of the woman yelling at them, Officer [REDACTED] and his partner drove away. He believes the woman notified his sergeant about this incident, but it was after they left. Officer [REDACTED] did not activate his BWC for the interaction between him and Ms. [REDACTED]

---

<sup>6</sup> Attachment #25 @ 3:05 minutes

<sup>7</sup> Attachment #25 @ 3:55 minutes.

<sup>8</sup> Attachment #25 @ 5:20 minutes.

<sup>9</sup> Attachment #27.

<sup>10</sup> Attachment #27 @ 15:30 minutes.

however, he admitted that he did not think of it at the moment it probably would have been relevant to document his interaction with the woman.<sup>11</sup>

### Interview of Officer [REDACTED]

Officer [REDACTED] was interviewed by COPA on August 15, 2019 at the office of the Independent Police Review Authority, located at 1615 West Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. Officer [REDACTED] stated that he was on duty and working with his partner, Officer [REDACTED] on June 20, 2019. He was assigned to the [REDACTED] District and worked Second Watch from 7:00 am to 4:00 pm. He and his partner (driver) were in plain clothes and assigned to marked CPD SUV, working a Burglary mission.

At approximately 11:00 am, he and his partner were driving through the alley between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] on the [REDACTED] following up on an investigation commenced by Officer [REDACTED] while Officer [REDACTED] was on furlough. The alley is located in a high burglary area.

As they drove southbound in the alley, they observed an overhead garage door open approximately 2-3 feet with a dog inside at [REDACTED]. They stopped their vehicle and Officer [REDACTED] exited and looked in the garage. Officer [REDACTED] got back into the squad car and drove around to the front of the house to locate the owner of the garage. When they arrived in front of the house, Officer [REDACTED] saw a woman by the porch. She started yelling "What the f\*\*\* are you doing in my garage?"<sup>13</sup> Either he or his partner (he was unsure) told the woman that her garage door was open with a dog inside. The woman continued to be belligerent, so the officers drove away.

Officer [REDACTED] stated that the reason they wanted to talk to the owner was to prevent a garage burglary, protect the well-being of the dog and try and prevent a young child from being bitten by the dog. Neither he nor his partner ever entered the garage or raised the garage door more than it already was raised. Officer [REDACTED] believed the whole interaction with the woman lasted about one minute. Officer [REDACTED] did not activate his BWC for the interaction between him and Ms. [REDACTED]<sup>14</sup>

### Interview of Sgt. [REDACTED]

Sgt. [REDACTED] was interviewed by COPA on October 22, 2019 at the office of the Independent Police Review Authority, located at 1615 West Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. Sgt. [REDACTED] was on duty on June 20, 2019 and working alone. He was assigned to Beat [REDACTED], driving a marked SUV and wearing his uniform. He was the Zone [REDACTED] sergeant that day, as is his usual assignment, and was working 2<sup>nd</sup> Watch, from 7:00 am to 4:00 pm.

---

<sup>11</sup> COPA acknowledges that the Accused Officers did not activate their BWC's. However, allegations were not served by the investigator as this incident does not fall within the prescribed law-enforcement activities where activation is mandatory. (See Special Order S03-14(III)(A)).

<sup>12</sup> Attachment #26

<sup>13</sup> Attachment #26 @ 14:40 minutes.

<sup>14</sup> COPA acknowledges that there is evidence of a violation of the BWC activation policy. However, allegations were not served by the investigator. Given the age of this matter, the manpower issue existing at COPA and the lack of COPA's ability to punish CPD officers for failure to activate their BWC's, COPA does not feel that serving allegations in this matter, for this violation, would be a constructive use of its resources.

Sgt. ██████ was shown the video which ██████ shot on June 20, 2019. Other than what he saw in the video, Sgt. ██████ informed the COPA investigators that he had no independent recollection of this incident and could only comment on what was in the video. He remembered having been to ██████ before, but thought it was for a domestic incident.

After viewing the video, Sgt. ██████ did not believe that what he observed was told to him by the woman in the video did not rise to the level of misconduct by the officers whom she complained to him about. The woman had informed him that the officers were “harassing her house while conducting an investigation of her garage.”<sup>15</sup> Sgt. ██████ did not believe a house could be harassed, just a person, which she never alleged. She never made any allegation of misconduct on the video.

Part of his duties as a sergeant are to take complaints from citizens regarding alleged misconduct by CPD officers. He determines if the complaint has merit. If it does, he initiates a CR number on the officer(s). If it does not, he simply notes the interaction in the Supervisor Log he completes daily. In that log he lists the type of assignment, the address and the disposition. At the end of his shift, that Supervisor Log is placed, by him, into a basket at the front desk of the ██████ District Station. He was certain he completed a Supervisor Log for that date. He also normally supplies a complainant with the number to COPA if he does not feel there is enough for a CR number. He could not remember if he did so in this instance because the video does not show the entire interaction between him and the woman.

Sgt. ██████ was unsure if he spoke with the officers involved before speaking with the woman but stated that is what he normally does. He also could not remember what, if any, conversation he had with the woman prior to the time period covered in the video tape. He was shown a copy of the Event Query<sup>16</sup> and was able to determine that from the time he acknowledged the supervisor request, to the time he left ██████, was approximately sixteen (16) minutes. Sgt. ██████ did not activate his BWC for this incident but acknowledged that he is supposed to do so when responding to a citizen complaint. He explained he must have forgotten to activate it when he went to ██████.

## **b. Digital Evidence**

### **BWC Video from Officer ██████ (Post-incident)<sup>17</sup>**

The BWC from Officer ██████ captures a two minute and forty-four second period of time beginning at 11:24 am. In the video, a radio dispatch can be heard regarding a request for a Sergeant at ██████.<sup>18</sup> The reason for the request was the person was “not happy with police service”. Officer ██████ can be heard stating “Should I call ██████ and let him know?”<sup>19</sup> One of the officers can be heard saying “We gotta meet so we can show him the pictures.”<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Attachment #30 @ 5:10 minutes.

<sup>16</sup> Attachment #10.

<sup>17</sup> Attachment #32.

<sup>18</sup> Attachment #32 @ 1:05 minutes.

<sup>19</sup> Attachment #32 @ 1:27 minutes.

<sup>20</sup> Attachment #32 @ 2:19 minutes.

Video shot by [REDACTED]

The video was furnished by the Complainant, but only captures the interaction between herself, [REDACTED] and Sgt. [REDACTED]. When the footage begins, the Complainant, her mother, and Sgt. [REDACTED] are already engaged in a heated discussion. Only Sgt. [REDACTED] is visible; the voices of the Complainant and her mother can be heard off camera. The Complainant is demanding that Sgt. [REDACTED] take her complaint documenting her displeasure about the previous actions of some unseen officers. Sgt. [REDACTED] refuses to take her complaint, insisting that the officers the Complainant was complaining about were only doing their jobs and therefore were not guilty of misconduct. The Complainant insists on being allowed to make her complaint, and Sgt. [REDACTED] remains uncooperative. A Department issue BWC is visible on Sgt. [REDACTED] chest.

**c. Physical Evidence**

N/A

**d. Documentary Evidence**

OEMC Event Query # [REDACTED] details a call [REDACTED] placed to 911 requesting a supervisor. The call was placed at 11:23:16 am on June 20, 2018.<sup>21</sup>

Email from Officer [REDACTED] # [REDACTED] regarding no record of Sgt. [REDACTED] supervisory log from June 20, 2019.<sup>22</sup>

**VI. LEGAL STANDARD**

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

1. Sustained - where it is determined the allegation is supported by a preponderance of the evidence;
2. Not Sustained - where it is determined there is insufficient evidence to prove the allegations by a preponderance of the evidence;
3. Unfounded - where it is determined by clear and convincing evidence that an allegation is false or not factual; or
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*

---

<sup>21</sup> Attachment #10.

<sup>22</sup> Attachment #33.



*Automobile Insurance Co.*, 216 Ill. 2d 100, 191 (2005), (a proposition is proved by a preponderance of the evidence when it has found to be more probably true than not). If the evidence gathered in an investigation establishes that it is more likely that the misconduct occurred, even if by a narrow margin, then the preponderance of the evidence standard is met.

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

## VII. ANALYSIS

The complaint that comprises this case has two parts that will be examined separately. The first issue pertains to the alleged trespass and search of the Complainant's garage without her consent. The alleged entry and search of the garage by Officer [REDACTED] and Officer [REDACTED] leads Ms. [REDACTED] to request a supervisor. According to the officer's statements to COPA, they were working a burglary mission, which placed them in the alley behind the [REDACTED] home. The officers described checking vulnerable garages/structures as part of their responsibilities on these burglary missions, and as a part of burglary prevention measures, they may alert a homeowner to a non-secure structure. There is no dispute that the officers were in the vicinity of [REDACTED] garage. Nor is there a dispute that Officer [REDACTED] exited his vehicle and looked into the garage. The Officers both admit to driving to the front of the home to look for the owner of the garage, having a brief conversation with the Complainant and leaving, shortly thereafter, because of the belligerence of Ms. [REDACTED]. What is in dispute is whether or not the accused officers actually entered Ms. [REDACTED] garage, and if so, what legal justification did they have to do so.

Ms. [REDACTED] alleges, in her complaint to COPA, that the Accused officers exited their vehicle, entered her garage, and took a picture of the dog that was housed inside. The Accused were never asked by COPA if they took pictures of the dog, however, taking pictures of a dog that is inside a private garage, without entering the garage, is not, in and of itself, a violation.

The accused officers both claim that after observing the garage door open and seeing a dog inside the garage, they drove around and stopped their vehicle in front of [REDACTED] home in order to inform her of that information, but that the woman became belligerent and started yelling at them about going into her garage. However, both officers deny ever entering into the garage and only admit to looking into the garage. Neither the Complainant, nor her mother, ever witnessed the Accused officers physically enter the garage or occupy it for any span of time.

The Complainant was in the shower when the incident began and her mother, [REDACTED] admitted that she had not actually seen the officers in the garage. When the Complainant joined the interaction, she claims one of the accused showed her a picture he had taken of the dog inside her garage, which indicated to the complainant that the accused had been inside her garage. However, the officers clearly explained to COPA that they were able to look into the garage without entering. No evidence exists which places the officers in the garage. [REDACTED] eyewitness observations of Officer [REDACTED] and Officer [REDACTED] occur in front of the residence at [REDACTED], not in the in the alley or in the garage. At no point does [REDACTED] state

she witnessed seeing Officer [REDACTED] or Officer [REDACTED] actually inside the garage or on the [REDACTED] property.

A preponderance of the evidence exists that supports the finding that the accused officers did not enter or search the Complainant's garage at [REDACTED]. Therefore, these allegations are **Not Sustained**.

The second issue pertains to the Complainant's interaction with the, Sgt. [REDACTED]. At issue is whether the Complainant articulated a complaint and did Sgt. [REDACTED] fail to document that complaint and take appropriate investigative steps. As of January 15, 2020, Sgt. [REDACTED] is no longer employed by the Department.

The Complainant called OEMC to request to see a supervisor, because she was aggrieved by the actions of Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] concerning her garage. It is clear from the video Ms. [REDACTED] shot, that she vocalized her intent to file a complaint about the conduct of the officers.

Sgt. [REDACTED] does not dispute that Ms. [REDACTED] was making a complaint; instead, he claims there is nothing objectionable about his officers' behavior, because they had received a vague "anonymous tip" about a dog, and they were within their legal rights to perform an investigation. Sgt. [REDACTED] saw no complaint, because he already determined that the Officer's actions were within policy.

This is in stark contrast to the explanation he provided to COPA during his interview with the agency. In his statement, Sgt. [REDACTED] claims to not understand, or find [REDACTED] complaint possible, due to her phrasing of the allegation. As shown above, [REDACTED] states that "the officers were harassing her house," which Sgt. [REDACTED] states did not make sense to him. Sgt. [REDACTED] told COPA he did not see a valid complaint since, in his mind, a house or building cannot be harassed. Thus, in a departure from his reasoning contemporaneously captured on video on June 20, 2018, he claims that the reason he did not take [REDACTED] complaint was because it was non-sensical, as opposed to his initial reasoning, being that the officers were engaged in department sanctioned activity.

By his own admission, Sgt. [REDACTED] did not undertake a complete and comprehensive investigation for two distinctively different reasons, as illustrated by the video footage and by his COPA statement. According to his reasoning in the video, he had conferred with Officer [REDACTED] and Officer [REDACTED] and determined their presence on [REDACTED] property was lawful due to an anonymous complaint about a dog that the officers were investigating. On the other hand, he told COPA that because he did not believe Ms. [REDACTED] had ever articulated a viable complaint, there was no need for further action, so he again chose to not perform a complete and comprehensive investigation into her allegation. Sgt. [REDACTED] took no investigative steps to attempt to understand or flesh out the complaint that Ms. [REDACTED] was making. Ms. [REDACTED] layperson description of what she believes happened to her should have been sufficient for Sgt. [REDACTED] to, at a minimum, conduct a preliminary investigation into the allegation.

Therefore, COPA finds Sgt. [REDACTED] claim, to not perceive the complaint Ms. [REDACTED] was making, to be deficient, given the totality of the evidence and the contradiction between what he is heard stating in the video from the day of the incident versus what Sgt. [REDACTED] stated during his

COPA interview. COPA finds that Sgt. █████ failed to document and process Ms. █████ complaint, as is his responsibility as the on-scene supervisor. Sgt. █████ exceeded his supervisory purview when he took it upon himself to determine the validity and plausibility of █████ complaint, instead of simply documenting the complaint and forwarding it for further investigation. Therefore, Allegation #1, against Sgt. █████ is **Sustained**.

As to the second allegation against Sgt. █████, that he failed to prepare and maintain a supervisory log for the date in question and did not document the interaction the Officers had with the Complainant, █████ COPA makes a finding of **Sustained**. While Sgt, █████ stated that he was sure that he had completed a Supervisory Log for the date in question, the fact remains that no Supervisory Log for June 20, 2018, prepared by Sgt. █████ exists, as is documented in Attachment #33, the email from Officer █████.

**VIII. CONCLUSION**

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

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Officer █████	1. It is alleged that on June 20, 2018, at approximately 11:00 a.m., at or near █████, Officer █████ conducted a search of the garage belonging to the Complainant, without lawful justification.	Not sustained
Officer █████	1. It is alleged that on June 20, 2018, at approximately 11:00 a.m., at or near █████, Officer █████ conducted a search of the garage belonging to the Complainant, without lawful justification.	Not sustained

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Sgt. █████	1. It is alleged that on June 20, 2018, at approximately 11:00 a.m., at or near █████, Sgt. █████ failed to document and process a complaint made by █████ regarding an interaction she had with Department members, after she requested the Accused to do so.	Sustained/Retired

	<p>2. It is alleged that on June 20, 2018, at approximately 11:00 a.m., at or near [REDACTED], failed to prepare and maintain a supervisory log for the date in question and did not document the interaction the Accused had with the Complainant, [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Sustained/Retired</p>
--	--	--------------------------

Approved:

[REDACTED]

4-13-2020

\_\_\_\_\_  
Angela Hearts-Glass  
*Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Appendix A

Assigned Investigative Staff

---

<b>Squad#:</b>	█
<b>Investigator:</b>	██████████
<b>Supervising Investigator:</b>	██████████
<b>Deputy Chief Administrator:</b>	<b>Angela Hearts-Glass</b>