

SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Date of Incident:	December 14, 2018
Time of Incident:	4:58 pm
Location of Incident:	██████████ Avenue, Chicago, IL 60619
Date of COPA Notification:	April 16, 2019
Time of COPA Notification:	3:23 pm

██████████ the mother of ninth-grade student ██████████ alleged that CPD members who arrested her son falsified reports to implicate ██████████ in a robbery. ██████████ asserted that the alleged robbery was fabricated by the purported victim, ██████████ and that the CPD members involved in the investigation deliberately ignored evidence that would have cleared her son. COPA investigated ██████████ allegations and determined that the involved CPD members acted in good faith based on information that was provided by the purported robbery victim.

II. INVOLVED PARTIES

Involved Officer #1:	██████████ star # ██████████ employee ID# ██████████ Date of Appointment ██████████, 2004, Detective, Unit of Assignment ██████████ DOB ██████████, 1978, Male, White
Involved Officer #2:	██████████ star # ██████████ employee ID# ██████████ Date of Appointment ██████████, 1990, Detective, Unit of Assignment ██████████ DOB ██████████, 1957, Male, Black
Involved Officer #3:	██████████ star # ██████████ employee ID# ██████████ Date of Appointment ██████████, 1998, Sergeant of Police, Unit of Assignment ██████████ DOB ██████████ 1971, Male, White
Involved Officer #4:	██████████ star # ██████████ employee ID# ██████████ Date of Appointment ██████████, 1999, Sergeant of Police, Unit of Assignment ██████████ DOB ██████████, 1972, Male, White
Involved Officer #5:	██████████ star # ██████████ employee ID# ██████████ Date of Appointment ██████████, 1990, Detective, Unit of Assignment ██████████ DOB ██████████, 1967, Male, White
Involved Individual #1:	██████████ DOB ██████████, 2969, Female, Black
Involved Individual #2:	██████████ DOB ██████████, 2003, Male, Black

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Detective ██████ ██████	<p>It is alleged by ██████ that on or about February 22, 2019, at approximately 3:40 pm, at or near ██████ South Wentworth Avenue, that Detective ██████ # ██████ committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions, by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Arresting ██████ without justification, and; 2. Creating false reports regarding ██████ involvement in an alleged robbery that occurred on December 14, 2018. 	<p>Unfounded</p> <p>Unfounded</p>
Detective ██████ ██████	<p>1. It is alleged by ██████ that on or about February 4, 2019, at approximately 6:30 pm, at or near ██████ South Cottage Grove, that Detective ██████ # ██████ committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions, by creating false reports regarding ██████ involvement in an alleged robbery that occurred on December 14, 2018.</p>	Unfounded
Sergeant ██████ ██████	<p>1. It is alleged by ██████ that on or about January 21, 2019, at approximately 3:19 pm, at or near ██████ South Wentworth Avenue, that Sergeant ██████ # ██████ committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions, by creating false reports regarding ██████ involvement in an alleged robbery that occurred on December 14, 2018.</p>	Unfounded
Sergeant ██████ ██████	<p>1. It is alleged by ██████ that on or about December 17, 2018, at approximately 7:33 pm, at or near ██████ South Cottage Grove, that Sergeant ██████ # ██████ committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions, by creating false reports regarding ██████ involvement in an alleged robbery that occurred on December 14, 2018.</p>	Unfounded
Detective ██████ ██████	<p>1. It is alleged by ██████ that on or about December 18, 2018, at approximately 8:28 am, at or near ██████ South Wentworth Avenue, that Detective ██████ # ██████ committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions, by creating false reports regarding ██████</p>	Unfounded

██████ involvement in an alleged robbery that occurred on December 14, 2018.

IV. APPLICABLE RULES AND LAWS

Rules

1. **Rule 1:** Violation of any law or ordinance.
 2. **Rule 2:** Any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department.
 3. **Rule 3:** Any failure to promote the Department's efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals.
 4. **Rule 6:** Disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.
 5. **Rule 14:** Making a false report, written or oral.
-

Special Orders

1. S06-02 Live Lineups, Photo Lineups, and Showups (effective January 1, 2016)
 2. S09-04-04 Juvenile Arrest Record Expungement (effective October 6, 2001)
-

State Laws

1. 705 ILCS 405/5-401(1)(a) (arrest of a minor based on probable cause)
 2. 705 ILCS 405/5-915 (automatic expungement of juvenile arrest records)
 3. 720 ILCS 5/31A-1.1 (contraband in penal institution)
 4. 725 ILCS 5/107A-2 (lineup procedure)
-

Federal Laws

1. United States Constitution, Amendment IV

V. INVESTIGATION¹

a. Interviews

██████████ was interviewed by COPA investigators on April 18, 2019.² ██████ told investigators the following: On December 14, 2018, ██████ left school in the afternoon and walked towards the library with his friend, ██████. As they were approaching a youth center located half-way between the school and the library, they encountered another schoolmate, ██████. All three of them were in the 9th grade and were acquainted with each other. ██████ asked ██████ “What’s in your pockets?” and ██████ asked ██████ the same question. Both ██████ and ██████ then attempted to reach into each other’s pockets, and ██████ believed they were just horse-playing. During the horse-play, ██████ kned ██████ in the stomach while they wrestled, and ██████ believed that ██████ may have taken things too far. At some point, ██████ succeeded in pulling ██████ phone out of ██████ pocket. ██████ joined in the horse-play and pulled on ██████ bookbag. ██████ also gave ██████ phone to ██████ and ██████ began to run with the phone, with ██████ chasing. As ██████ chased ██████ was smiling, and ██████ still believed they were just playing. Eventually, ██████ gave the phone back to ██████ and they shook hands. ██████ and ██████ continued walking to the library, while ██████ walked away. ██████ never saw the police on the day of the incident and was not aware that the police were involved until a month or two later. About a week after the incident, ██████ transferred out of their school, and ██████ told ██████ that ██████ transferred because he claimed to have been “jumped” by ██████ and ██████ however, ██████ believed that ██████ fabricated his claim of being “jumped” so that he would not get in trouble for skipping an after-school detention, and ██████ continued pressing this claim after his mother became involved. The day after the incident, ██████ received a five-day school suspension. ██████ did not know how school administrators became aware of the incident.

A month or two after the incident, ██████ mother received a telephone call from the police, and she brought ██████ to a police station. ██████ was placed in a small interview room with the door open, and a male detective spoke to him while standing in the doorway. ██████ mother and his attorney stood behind the detective in the hallway. The detective questioned ██████ about the incident with ██████ and ██████ implying that ██████ did not believe they were playing. After being questioned for about 15 minutes, ██████ was left alone in the interview room. Some time later, ██████ mom told him that she had spoken with the detective, and he was being charged for damaging ██████ bookbag. Two other police officers came to transport ██████ to a different location, and they asked if he had any weapons or drugs. ██████ was handcuffed and transported by van to a different building where he was fingerprinted. About ten minutes later, ██████ mother came to get him, and they left the facility. ██████ was offended because he was repeatedly asked if he had any weapons or drugs and because one of the transport officers held his arm firmly as they walked to the van, and his experience has made him distrustful of the police.

██████████ the mother of ██████ was interviewed by COPA investigators on April 18, 2019.³ Ms. ██████ told investigators the following: On December 14, 2018, Ms.

¹ COPA conducted a thorough and complete investigation. The following is a summary of the material evidence gathered and relied upon in our analysis.

² Attachments 1, 2.

³ Attachments 1, 3.

██████████ received a telephone call from the dean of ██████████ school, informing her that ██████████ and his friend ██████████ had been accused of robbing a fellow student. At Ms. ██████████ request, the school arranged for a meeting with the parents of the purported victim, ██████████ the following Wednesday, but the meeting was cancelled when the school principal informed Ms. ██████████ that her son was being suspended for bullying.

On either February 14 or February 15, 2018, Ms. ██████████ received a telephone call from Detective ██████████. The detective asked Ms. ██████████ to bring ██████████ in for an interview regarding the alleged robbery. The detective told Ms. ██████████ that ██████████ would be charged with robbery and ██████████ would be charged with theft, and they agreed that Ms. ██████████ would bring ██████████ in the following week. Ms. ██████████ then called ██████████ principal, and the principal told her that the victim's mother had been pushing the police to arrest ██████████ and ██████████. Ms. ██████████ later met with the principal and obtained copies of school reports regarding the incident, which she tendered to COPA. After further conversations with Detective ██████████ Ms. ██████████ obtained the services of a criminal defense attorney and arranged to bring ██████████ to the police station at ██████████ and ██████████ for an interview on March 2, 2019. ██████████ interview took place as scheduled, with Ms. ██████████ and the attorney present. During the interview, ██████████ maintained that he believed ██████████ and ██████████ were only playing and that no robbery had occurred. Following the interview, Detective ██████████ told Ms. ██████████ that ██████████ would be charged with a misdemeanor for criminal damage to property. On her attorney's advice, Ms. ██████████ and ██████████ declined to discuss the case further.

██████████ was transported in a police van to the Juvenile Intervention and Support Center (JISC) at 39th and California, while Detective ██████████ drove Ms. ██████████ in a separate vehicle. At the JISC, Detective ██████████ gave Ms. ██████████ expungement paperwork and explained that she could use it to have ██████████ record expunged. After Detective ██████████ left, a JISC staff member told Ms. ██████████ to take ██████████ and leave and also told Ms. ██████████ that the detective had completed the wrong paperwork. Ms. ██████████ later obtained a copy of the original police report from the alleged robbery. After conducting further research, she discovered that all of the officers who had worked on the case were Caucasian and that they had been involved in previous lawsuits and alleged misconduct, leading her to be suspicious of their conduct and motivation during the robbery investigation. Ms. ██████████ also learned that ██████████ photograph had been used in a lineup, and she believed this was illegal without a subpoena, court order, or warrant. Additionally, Ms. ██████████ believed that the police withheld evidence, as they received ██████████ photograph from his school in January but failed to show the photograph to the purported victim at the first opportunity. Ms. ██████████ also believed that officers who processed ██████████ committed misconduct when they repeatedly asked if he was in possession of weapons or drugs, leading her to believe that the police intended to plant something on ██████████. Ms. ██████████ also believes that detectives violated the law by failing to properly document the victim's refusal to be audio or video recorded when viewing a lineup. Ultimately, Ms. ██████████ complained that the involved CPD members created an arrest record for ██████████ without justification, and she explained that she wants all records of the arrest to be destroyed.

Detective ██████████ was interviewed by COPA investigators on June 11, 2019.⁴ Detective ██████████ recalled being assigned to investigate a robbery in December of 2018 involving

⁴ Attachment 4.

a 15-year-old victim, [REDACTED] Detective [REDACTED] called [REDACTED] mother, who told the detective that two classmates had robbed her son. Some time later, [REDACTED] and his mother came to the detective's office, and he interviewed [REDACTED] recounted leaving detention after school and being confronted by two fellow students, one that he knew as [REDACTED]. One of the kids told [REDACTED] to give up what he had, and [REDACTED] believed he was being robbed, although he could not understand why kids that he knew would rob him. [REDACTED] took [REDACTED] phone after the other student, later identified as [REDACTED] pushed [REDACTED] to the ground. [REDACTED] got up and chased after one of the students while the other grabbed [REDACTED] from behind, ripping [REDACTED] backpack and causing the items inside to scatter. [REDACTED] who sustained a scrape to his knee, was eventually able to retrieve his phone, and he later filed a police report. Detective [REDACTED] recalled that [REDACTED] was very upset when describing the incident and that [REDACTED] insisted the other students were not engaged in horseplay when they robbed him. Detective [REDACTED] described [REDACTED] mother as "adamant" about prosecuting the subjects who robbed her son and also noted that she was very upset that the school had not taken the incident seriously. Detective [REDACTED] examined [REDACTED] backpack and saw that it was ripped. Detective [REDACTED] later contacted [REDACTED] mother and arranged to interview [REDACTED] admitted to taking [REDACTED] phone, but claimed the entire incident was horseplay and was not a robbery. Detective [REDACTED] decided to arrest [REDACTED] based on the victim's statement, the victim's mother's insistence on pursuing the case, the school's decision to suspend [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] for their actions, the fact that [REDACTED] mother decided to remove [REDACTED] from the school, and [REDACTED] admissions. However, Detective [REDACTED] charged [REDACTED] for criminal damage to property and not for robbery.

b. Digital Evidence

COPA obtained copies of the **audio- and video-recorded interviews of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]** that were conducted by Detective [REDACTED] was interviewed on February 22, 2019. Detective [REDACTED] Mirandized [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] agreed to speak with the detective in the presence of his attorney.⁶ [REDACTED] provided an account of the incident involving [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] that is consistent with his later statement to COPA investigators. [REDACTED] was interviewed on February 11, 2019. [REDACTED] also described the December 14, 2018, encounter between himself, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] admitting that the incident occurred, but also describing it as horseplay rather than a robbery.

c. Physical Evidence

Evidence inventoried during the CPD investigation⁷ of the robbery reported by [REDACTED] includes DVD recordings of the interviews of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] a signed photograph of [REDACTED] records from a photo array shown to [REDACTED] and a torn black backpack.

⁵ Attachments 30, 31.

⁶ The video recording depicts [REDACTED] seated on the bench of a small interview room, with Detective [REDACTED] standing in the doorway. [REDACTED] attorney and his mother can be heard, but not seen, and they are apparently standing in the hallway behind the detective.

⁷ Attachments 11, 24, 25.

d. Documentary Evidence

An **Original Case Incident Report**⁸ completed on December 14, 2018, documents that [REDACTED] and his mother, [REDACTED] reported a robbery that occurred earlier that day at [REDACTED] Avenue. The offenders are described as two 14-year-old males, one unknown and the other named [REDACTED]. Per [REDACTED] the unknown offender pushed him to the ground and the offender he knew as [REDACTED] kicked him. The unknown offender held [REDACTED] by the neck while searching his pockets and taking his phone. The report was approved by Sgt. [REDACTED] on December 17, 2018.

Case Supplementary Reports⁹ document that Detective [REDACTED] was assigned to investigate the robbery.¹⁰ On December 19, 2018, Detective [REDACTED] spoke with [REDACTED] who told him that the offenders were students at her son's school. [REDACTED] also told the detective that the school was not taking the incident seriously and that she wanted to pursue criminal charges. Detective [REDACTED] documented unsuccessful attempts to locate and obtain any available surveillance video recordings depicting the alleged robbery. The principal of [REDACTED] School provided the identities of the involved students to the detective. On January 16, 2019, Detective [REDACTED] interviewed [REDACTED]. On February 4, 2019, Detective [REDACTED] at Detective [REDACTED] request, conducted a photo lineup with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] identified [REDACTED] as one of the robbery offenders. Detective [REDACTED] also showed [REDACTED] a single photograph of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] identified [REDACTED] as the second robbery offender.¹¹ Detective [REDACTED] interviewed [REDACTED] on February 11, 2019 and interviewed [REDACTED] on February 22, 2019.¹² Detective [REDACTED] concluded his investigation by noting that he "does not believe robbery charges are appropriate for this incident. [REDACTED] was charged with theft and damage to property and referred to Juvenile Court. [REDACTED] was charged with damage to property and referred to Juvenile Court."¹³

An **Arrest Report**¹⁴ documents that [REDACTED] was taken into custody on February 22, 2019 and charged with criminal damage to property. [REDACTED] was transported to the JISC and released after being given an informal station adjustment.¹⁵ Another **Arrest Report**¹⁶ documents that [REDACTED] was arrested on February 11, 2019 and charged with theft and criminal damage to property before being released to his mother.

⁸ RD No. [REDACTED] Attachment 5. An Event Query Report (Event No. [REDACTED]) documents that the report number was generated at the CPD District [REDACTED] station at 4:43 pm on December 14, 2018. Attachment 10.

⁹ Attachments 6-9.

¹⁰ The Case Supplementary Report documenting the assignment of Detective [REDACTED] was completed and approved by Detective [REDACTED] # [REDACTED] on December 18, 2018. Attachment 6.

¹¹ In his supplemental report, Detective [REDACTED] explained that he used a single photograph, rather than a lineup or photo array, because [REDACTED] was already known by the victim. Attachment 9, p. 4.

¹² Detective [REDACTED] summaries of these interviews in his supplemental report are consistent with the associated CPD electronically recorded interview (ERI) recordings obtained and reviewed by COPA. Attachments 30, 31.

¹³ Case Supplementary Report. Attachment 9, p. 4.

¹⁴ CB No. [REDACTED] Attachment 22.

¹⁵ An "informal station adjustment" is a procedure where the police determine that probable cause exists to believe that a minor has committed an offense, but the station adjustment does not constitute an adjudication of delinquency or a criminal conviction. *See* 705 ILCS 405/5-301.

¹⁶ CB No. [REDACTED] Attachment 23.

A [REDACTED] **Charter School Misconduct Report**,¹⁷ documents that [REDACTED] a ninth-grade student at [REDACTED] College Prep School, was suspended for five days after an incident that occurred on December 14, 2018. Per the report narrative, [REDACTED] admitted that he took a fellow student's phone and ran away, but eventually gave the phone back. The report further documents, "Peer acknowledged that this incident started playfully, and that he too was engaged playfully with student, but continued after student no longer wanted to play."¹⁸

A letter to [REDACTED] from the [REDACTED] **Charter School Director of Compliance**,¹⁹ captioned "Notification of Unauthorized Student Information Disclosure," documents that a school official made an unauthorized disclosure of [REDACTED] student directory information to a Chicago police officer who called the school while investigating a reported crime.

A letter from Cook County Assistant State's Attorney [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to the mother of [REDACTED]²⁰ dated March 22, 2019, documents that the state's attorney's office declined to bring formal charges against [REDACTED]

VI. LEGAL STANDARD

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

1. Sustained - where it is determined the allegation is supported by a preponderance of the evidence;
2. Not Sustained - where it is determined there is insufficient evidence to prove the allegations by a preponderance of the evidence;
3. Unfounded - where it is determined by clear and convincing evidence that an allegation is false or not factual; or
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 reviewed complied with Department policy. *See Avery v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co.*, 216 Ill. 2d 100, 191 (2005) ("A proposition proved by a preponderance of the evidence is one that has been found to be more probably true than not true."). If the evidence gathered in an investigation establishes that it is more likely that the conduct complied with Department policy than that it did not, even if by a narrow margin, then the preponderance of the evidence standard is met.

¹⁷ Attachment 21. A letter from the school's dean of discipline informing [REDACTED] of her son's suspension was also provided to COPA. Attachment 20.

¹⁸ Attachment 21, p. 1.

¹⁹ Attachment 26.

²⁰ Attachment 27.

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.* ¶ 28.

VII. ANALYSIS

The CPD members involved in the investigation of the alleged robbery reported by ██████████ and ██████████ did not create false reports and did not falsely arrest ██████████. All of the available evidence, including the statements of the involved parties, police reports, and school records, indicates ██████████ reported that two of her son's schoolmates accosted him after school, took his cell phone, and damaged his backpack. ██████████ appeared in person with her son to make a police report and further cooperated with the police investigation by making her son available to detectives. While ██████████ believes that the allegations made by ██████████ and ██████████ are false, COPA's investigation has uncovered no evidence to suggest that the CPD members involved in investigating the alleged robbery did anything other than accurately record the information that was provided to them by ██████████ and ██████████. Those members investigated the alleged robbery based on that information, ultimately arresting ██████████²¹. There is no reason to believe the involved CPD members had any personal stake in the investigation, nor any reason to believe that they fabricated their reports.

Detective ██████████ was assigned to investigate an alleged robbery. He used common tactics and procedures to complete his investigation, including interviewing the victim, arranging for a photo lineup, and interviewing the suspects identified by the victim. Notably, after interviewing both ██████████ and ██████████ Detective ██████████ concluded robbery charges were not appropriate, instead charging ██████████ and ██████████ with lesser offenses. Ultimately, ██████████ received an informal station adjustment and was not prosecuted for any offense.²² This sequence of events is not consistent with Ms. ██████████ allegation that Detective ██████████ disregarded evidence in a rush to charge ██████████ with a crime he did not commit. COPA, therefore finds by clear and convincing evidence that **Allegations 1 and 2 against Detective ██████████ are Unfounded**. Likewise, the only apparent role that Detective ██████████ played in the robbery investigation was to conduct a photo lineup (involving a different suspect, not ██████████) at Detective ██████████ request, and the only role that Sgt. ██████████ played was to approve

²¹ *See generally* *Beauchamp v. City of Noblesville*, 320 F.3d 733, 743 (7th Cir. 2003) ("The complaint of a single witness or putative victim alone generally is sufficient to establish probable cause to arrest unless the complaint would lead a reasonable officer to be suspicious, in which case the officer has a further duty to investigate."). *See also* *Kelley v. Myler*, 149 F.3d 641, 646 (7th Cir. 1998) ("[I]f an officer has established cause on every element of a crime, he need not continue investigating in order to test the suspect's claim of innocence.").

²² COPA also notes that under the terms of the Illinois Juvenile Court Act, records of the arrest of a juvenile that does not result in a petition for delinquency or criminal charges are automatically expunged during an annual expungement process, so long as there has been no subsequent arrest, petition for delinquency, or criminal charges. *See* 705 ILCS 405/5-915. CPD directives require that expunged records be physically destroyed and that electronic records be obliterated. *See* Chicago Police Department Special Order S09-04-04 § II.D. This process should ultimately result in Ms. ██████████ receiving the relief that she requested: the destruction of ██████████ arrest record without the need to file a petition for expungement.

the detective’s reports. COPA finds by clear and convincing evidence that **Allegation 1 against Detective ██████ is Unfounded** and that **Allegation 1 against Sgt. ██████ is Unfounded**.

Sergeant ██████ only apparent involvement in the investigation of the alleged robbery was to approve the Original Case Incident Report. Because all of the evidence reviewed by COPA indicates that the report was prepared in good faith, based on information provided by ██████ and ██████ COPA finds by clear and convincing evidence that Sgt. ██████ did not conspire with other CPD members to create false reports. Therefore, COPA finds that **Allegation #1 against Sgt. ██████ is Unfounded**. Likewise, Detective ██████ only apparent involvement in the robbery investigation was to review the original report and assign the investigation to Detective ██████ and COPA finds by clear and convincing evidence that Detective ██████ did not conspire with other CPD members to create false reports. Therefore, COPA finds that **Allegation #1 against Detective ██████ is Unfounded**.

██████ other suspicions regarding the CPD investigation, while entirely reasonable from her perspective, are also unwarranted. A cursory internet search revealing that a CPD member has previously been accused of misconduct or been named as a defendant in a civil lawsuit is not evidence that the member has committed misconduct. And while a school official admitted that school personnel gave ██████ personal information to the police without authorization, this does not mean that the police committed misconduct in asking for the information. ██████ allegations regarding irregularities in photographic lineup procedures are also unwarranted, as ██████ photograph was not used in a lineup; rather, Detective ██████ showed the photograph to ██████ who had apparently known ██████ for years, simply to verify that they were referring to the same person. As to the questions that arresting officers asked ██████ regarding drugs and weapons, these are standard questions that police officers ask individuals who are being arrested, often for the purpose of averting felony charges being lodged against the arrestee for bringing contraband into a police detention area.²³

VIII. CONCLUSION

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

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Detective ██████ ██████	It is alleged by ██████ that on or about February 22, 2019, at approximately 3:40 pm, at or near ██████ South Wentworth Avenue, that Detective ██████ # ██████ committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions, by: 1. Arresting ██████ without justification, and;	Unfounded

²³ See 720 ILCS 5/31A-1.1 (Bringing Contraband into a Penal Institution). The definition of “penal institution” includes any police detention area. 720 ILCS 5/31A-0.1.

	2. Creating false reports regarding [REDACTED] involvement in an alleged robbery that occurred on December 14, 2018.	Unfounded
Detective [REDACTED]	1. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that on or about February 4, 2019, at approximately 6:30 pm, at or near [REDACTED] South Cottage Grove, that Detective [REDACTED] # [REDACTED] committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions, by creating false reports regarding [REDACTED] involvement in an alleged robbery that occurred on December 14, 2018.	Unfounded
Sergeant [REDACTED]	1. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that on or about January 21, 2019, at approximately 3:19 pm, at or near [REDACTED] South Wentworth Avenue, that Sergeant [REDACTED] # [REDACTED] committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions, by creating false reports regarding [REDACTED] involvement in an alleged robbery that occurred on December 14, 2018.	Unfounded
Sergeant [REDACTED]	1. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that on or about December 17, 2018, at approximately 7:33 pm, at or near [REDACTED] South Cottage Grove, that Sergeant [REDACTED] # [REDACTED] committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions, by creating false reports regarding [REDACTED] involvement in an alleged robbery that occurred on December 14, 2018.	Unfounded
Detective [REDACTED]	1. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that on or about December 18, 2018, at approximately 8:28 am, at or near [REDACTED] South Wentworth Avenue, that Detective [REDACTED] # [REDACTED] committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions, by creating false reports regarding [REDACTED] involvement in an alleged robbery that occurred on December 14, 2018.	Unfounded

Approved:

[REDACTED]


January 29, 2020

 Andrea Kersten
 Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator

 Date

Appendix A

Assigned Investigative Staff

Squad#:	
Investigator:	
Supervising Investigator:	
Deputy Chief Administrator:	
	Andrea Kersten