

**SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION**

**I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Date of Incident:	13 April 2018
Time of Incident:	2:47am
Location of Incident:	732 S. Kostner Avenue
Date of COPA Notification:	April 13, 2018
Time of COPA Notification:	3:44am

On April 13, 2018 at approximately 2:40 am, [REDACTED] was on the train returning home from work. Upon exiting at the blue line stop at Cicero, Mr. [REDACTED] began to walk home when he observed a red Mercedes, being driven by a black male, following him. Despite Mr. [REDACTED] attempts to take evasive action to lose the red Mercedes, the vehicle kept moving within his path of travel. Fearing for his safety, Mr. [REDACTED] called 911 to report the suspicious vehicle, providing a description of the vehicle and its location. Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] responded to the call and spoke with Mr. [REDACTED] in the area of Kostner and Roosevelt. Mr. [REDACTED] related to Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] that a red Mercedes with a glowing hood emblem was following him, and that he feared for his safety. With this information, the officers drove off in the last known direction of the red Mercedes.

Shortly after, Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] curbed a red Mercedes matching the description provided by Mr. [REDACTED] and discovered Mr. [REDACTED]. Mr. [REDACTED] was the driver. Upon approaching the driver’s side door to speak with the Mr. [REDACTED] Officer [REDACTED] noticed what appeared to be a small amount of cannabis on the front passenger’s floorboard area of the vehicle. After making this observation, Officer [REDACTED] asked Mr. [REDACTED] to exit the vehicle. Upon Mr. [REDACTED] exit, Officer [REDACTED] conducted a protective pat down of Mr. [REDACTED] and asked him to step to the back of his vehicle and lean against the bumper. Officer [REDACTED] and Officer [REDACTED] arrived at the scene to assist. After Mr. [REDACTED] exited his vehicle, Officer [REDACTED] conducted a search of the driver’s side of the vehicle and Officer [REDACTED] searched the passenger’s side. No contraband was recovered from the vehicle. After the name check of Mr. [REDACTED] on the portable data terminal in the squad car returned clear, the officers allowed Mr. [REDACTED] to leave.

**II. INVOLVED PARTIES**

Involved Officer #1:	[REDACTED] Star# [REDACTED] Employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: [REDACTED] 2016 Rank: Officer Unit of Assignment: [REDACTED]
----------------------	--

---

	DOB: [REDACTED] 1986 Gender: Male Race: White
Involved Officer #2:	[REDACTED] Star# [REDACTED] Employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: [REDACTED] 2015 Rank: Officer Unit of Assignment: [REDACTED] DOB: [REDACTED] 1988 Gender: Male Race: White
Involved Officer #3:	[REDACTED] Star# [REDACTED] Employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: [REDACTED] 2017 Rank: Officer Unit of Assignment: [REDACTED] DOB: [REDACTED] 1994 Gender: Male Race: Hispanic
Involved Officer #4:	[REDACTED] Star# [REDACTED] Employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: [REDACTED] 2015 Rank: Officer Unit of Assignment: [REDACTED] DOB: [REDACTED] 1991 Gender: Male Race: Hispanic
Subject #1:	[REDACTED] DOB: [REDACTED] 1984 Gender: Male Race: Black

**III. ALLEGATIONS**

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Officer [REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unlawfully stopped [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 1.</li> <li>2. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 1.</li> <li>3. Unlawfully searched [REDACTED] [REDACTED] vehicle in violation of Rule 1.</li> <li>4. Failed to accurately complete the investigatory stop report in violation of Rule 5 and Rule 10.</li> </ol>	<p>Exonerated</p> <p>Exonerated</p> <p>Exonerated</p> <p>Sustained</p>
Officer [REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unlawfully stopped [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 1.</li> <li>2. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 1.</li> <li>3. Failed to accurately complete the investigatory stop report in violation of Rule 5 and Rule 10.</li> </ol>	<p>Exonerated</p> <p>Exonerated</p> <p>Sustained</p>
Officer [REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 1.</li> <li>2. Conducted an unlawful search of [REDACTED] vehicle in violation of Rule 1.</li> </ol>	<p>Exonerated</p> <p>Exonerated</p>
Officer [REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 1.</li> </ol>	<p>Exonerated</p>

**IV. APPLICABLE RULES AND LAWS**

Rules

1. Rule 1: Violation of any law or ordinance.

1. Rule 5: Failure to perform any duty.

3. Rule 8: Disrespect to or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty.
4. Rule 10: Inattention to duty.

---

#### Special Orders

---

1. Special Order S04-13-09: Investigatory Stop System

---

#### Federal Laws

---

1. Fourth Amendment, United States Constitution.

---

#### State Laws

---

1. 725 ILCS 5/107-14: Temporary questioning without arrest.

## V. INVESTIGATION<sup>1</sup>

### a. Interviews

COPA interviewed ██████████ on February 2, 2018, at approximately 10:00am at COPA Headquarters, located at ██████████, Chicago, Illinois.<sup>2</sup> Mr. ██████████ stated in the early morning hours of April 13, 2018, at approximately 3:00am, he was driving home eastbound on Roosevelt, and took a left at the Kostner. Mr. ██████████ stated he observed a police car sitting on Kostner facing northbound. When Mr. ██████████ vehicle made the left turn onto Kostner, the police vehicle started following him. Mr. ██████████ stated once he and the police vehicle drove under the viaduct, the police vehicle activated its flashing lights and Mr. ██████████ pulled over.

Mr. ██████████ stated that by the time the police officer approached his car window, he already had his license and insurance information out. Mr. ██████████ stated he rolled the window down, at which time the officer informed him he was being recorded by the officer's body worn camera. The officer told Mr. ██████████ he was pulled over because there were calls of someone driving around with a weapon threatening people in the neighborhood. Mr. ██████████ stated he began to ask questions related to the officer's statement, including whether the person matched his description. However, before the officer answered, Mr. ██████████ explained the officer directed his flashlight on the passenger's side floorboard. Mr. ██████████ related the officer told him it was not important because he observed marijuana on the floor of the car. Mr. ██████████ stated he told the officer, "Sir, I don't smoke marijuana and no one who gets in my car smokes marijuana." Mr. ██████████ stated the officer responded by informing him of the fact that marijuana is not legal in the City of Chicago nor is it legal within the State of Illinois. Mr. ██████████ explained that at this point, two additional police trucks pulled up. A total of six officers surrounded his car. Mr. ██████████

---

<sup>1</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>2</sup> ██████████ Mr. ██████████ audio recorded interview is incorporated as Attachment # 5.

stated he did not understand what was going on and the officer then asked him when he had last smoked. Mr. ██████ stated he again told the officer that he does not smoke marijuana. Mr. ██████ explained that the officer then asked him to step out of the car. He walked Mr. ██████ to the back of the car and asked him to put his hands on the trunk. Mr. ██████ then asked the officer if he was being arrested and the officer responded, “No – just put your hands on the trunk.”

Mr. ██████ stated he believed the officer then walked back to the police car and started to run his name when two other officers hopped out of a vehicle and started to search the back of his car. Mr. ██████ stated the officers only searched the back area of his vehicle. Mr. ██████ stated he wondered why the officers were only conducting a search of the back of the car when they reported finding marijuana in the front. Mr. ██████ stated the officers did not open the consoles or other compartments. He stated while the search was conducted, he was still standing with his hands on the back of the car.

Next, Mr. ██████ explained that the officer’s partner came over and asked Mr. ██████ for his social security number. Mr. ██████ asked the officer why the officer needed his social security number. Mr. ██████ explained the officer then started to walk towards him aggressively and said, “Because I asked you for it.”<sup>3</sup> Mr. ██████ stated he told the officer he was not refusing to provide the number, but as a civilian he had a right to ask the reason for it. Mr. ██████ stated he had already provided them his driver’s license and insurance information, so he wondered why the officers needed his social security number. At this point, Mr. ██████ explained, the officer’s partner, who was the officer who initially approached his vehicle and took his license and insurance, stuck his head out of the police car and said, “No, no - that’s alright, that’s alright.”<sup>4</sup> Mr. ██████ stated, he again, asked why the officers needed the social security number and was told by the officer, “Just stand there and shut up.”<sup>5</sup>

Mr. ██████ stated there were six officers surrounding him at this point. He explained he was, “freaked out and afraid for his life.”<sup>6</sup> However, Mr. ██████ told the officers said, “I just want you all to know that I didn’t give you permission to search my car.”<sup>7</sup> Mr. ██████ stated at this point the officer told him to shut up so he just stood there and shut up. Mr. ██████ stated that the officer who searched him, came over and said, “We’re going to let you off easy today.”<sup>8</sup> Mr. ██████ stated he replied, “Let me off easy, for what? If I’ve done something wrong, hold me to the letter of the law.”<sup>9</sup> Mr. ██████ said the officer told him, “You’ve been drinking, too.”<sup>10</sup> Mr. ██████ stated he told the officer, “This is the third time you’ve criminalized me. First, you accuse me of toting a weapon and threatening people, the second time you accuse me of smoking marijuana and having it in my car and the third time you accuse me of being drunk.”<sup>11</sup> Mr. ██████ stated all of this is unfounded. Mr. ██████ explained at that point, one of the police cars pulled off. Mr. ██████ stated he took down the other license plates numbers of the remaining police

---

<sup>3</sup> Attachment # 5, timestamp 06:26.

<sup>4</sup> Attachment # 5, timestamp 06:53.

<sup>5</sup> Attachment # 5, timestamp 06:58.

<sup>6</sup> Attachment # 5, timestamp 07:04.

<sup>7</sup> Attachment # 5, timestamp 07:11.

<sup>8</sup> Attachment # 5, timestamp 07:30.

<sup>9</sup> Attachment # 5, timestamp 07:32.

<sup>10</sup> Attachment # 5, timestamp 07:38.

<sup>11</sup> Attachment # 5, timestamp 07:40

vehicles. Mr. ██████ explained that if someone had seen the piece of shrubbery, it was clear it was a piece of grass or something which had come off somebody's shoe.<sup>12</sup> After this Mr. ██████ got into his car and went home.

Mr. ██████ stated the first car which pulled Mr. ██████ over was a Chicago Police Department blue and white vehicle and that the officers were in full uniform. Mr. ██████ explained the officer who approached the vehicle was the driver of the police car and was also the one who flashed the light on the piece of grass on the floor and stated it was marijuana. Mr. ██████ stated it was still there when he pulled off. Mr. ██████ explained it even had him second guessing.<sup>13</sup>

Mr. ██████ stated he was driving a 4-door, red Mercedes Benz CLA 250 on the night of the incident. Mr. ██████ explained that initially the passenger officer approached his passenger side and was looking into the vehicle. Mr. ██████ stated that the officers did not help him out of the vehicle and did not put their hands on him to get out of the vehicle. Mr. ██████ stated they told him to stand at the back of his car and to put his hands on the hood. Mr. ██████ related that the officers conducted a pat down search but did not empty his pockets.

Mr. ██████ stated the two additional police cars which arrived were also blue and white SUVs. Mr. ██████ stated that there were five males and one female on scene.<sup>14</sup> Mr. ██████ believed all the officers were white but explained he did not look at all their faces because he was scared. He added, from the glimpse he took, they all looked to be white. Mr. ██████ stated the two officers looked in the back seat, but not the trunk of his vehicle. Mr. ██████ did not believe the two male officers who searched his car were the officers who made the initial stop.<sup>15</sup> Mr. ██████ explained that the SUV who pulled him over parked immediately behind him. He stated another police vehicle was parked in front of him and another parked behind the officers that had initially stopped him. Mr. ██████ stated he cannot recall where the searching officers came from. Mr. ██████ explained he had a coat in his back seat along with a box containing business fliers. Mr. ██████ described the searching officers' actions as "shuffling stuff around" the back seat and looking in the side door panels.<sup>16</sup> Mr. ██████ stated they came out and gave a thumbs-up. Mr. ██████ explained it was after this that the officer asked Mr. ██████ for his social security number. Mr. ██████ stated the driver officer, who initially stopped him, was in the police car and his partner was standing right by police car's driver's door. Mr. ██████ stated the partner asked him for his social security number and he asked the officer why he needed the information. Mr. ██████ stated the officer replied, "Because I asked you for it."<sup>17</sup> At that moment, the officer's partner stuck his head out and said he didn't need it. It appeared to Mr. ██████ that the driver

---

<sup>12</sup> COPA took this to be a reference by Mr. ██████ was to the plant material on the passenger's side floorboard area observed by the officers.

<sup>13</sup> COPA took this statement to be a reference to Mr. ██████ second guessing whether what was on the floorboard was marijuana.

<sup>14</sup> COPA determined through its investigation there were 4 male officers and 2 female officers on scene at the incident.

<sup>15</sup> COPA determined through its investigation that Officer ██████ and Officer ██████ were the officers who conducted the search of Mr. ██████ vehicle.

<sup>16</sup> Attachment # 5, timestamp 14:40.

<sup>17</sup> Attachment # 5, timestamp 15:24.

officer was on the computer and might have found something at which time he told his partner not to worry about it.

Mr. ██████ related that the officer driver stated, “We’re going to let you off easy today,” and he replied, “What are you letting me off for?”<sup>18</sup> Mr. ██████ stated the officer then said, “You’ve been drinking also,” at which time Mr. ██████ replied, “Sir, I’ve not been drinking. You think I’ve been smoking marijuana. And If I am visibly drunk, why are you going to let me operate a motor vehicle?”<sup>19</sup> Mr. ██████ stated the officer then said, “We’re going to let you off, so I suggest you just go.”<sup>20</sup> Mr. ██████ explained at that point, he had a million things running through his mind and he decided he was just going to go and file a formal complaint. Mr. ██████ stated every time he asked the officers something, they became aggressive and he didn’t want to agitate them anymore.

Mr. ██████ stated he got his vehicle a year ago. He stated it is a 2016, 4-door, with the license plate number ██████.<sup>21</sup> Mr. ██████ explained that when the officer first came over, he asked him if there were any concealed weapons in the car. Mr. ██████ stated he said, “No.” Mr. ██████ stated that is when the officer informed him, they received a call of someone riding around with a weapon and threatening individuals. Mr. ██████ stated the officer did not tell him if it was a red car, instead the officer deflected to the “supposed marijuana.”<sup>22</sup>

Mr. ██████ stated he was not asked to take a sobriety test or submit to a breathalyzer. Mr. ██████ stated the police asked where he lived, and he informed them he lived right around the corner at ██████. Mr. ██████ explained he was on the way home on Kostner and typically he turns left on Harrison and then takes Harrison to Cicero. Mr. ██████ stated as soon as he made a left turn, the officers were already at the corner, perpendicular to where he was turning. Mr. ██████ stated he was on Roosevelt and the officer was on Kostner. Mr. ██████ stated the officers did not immediately activate the emergency lights, though he saw their headlights were on. Mr. ██████ explained the officer’s car was not parked and he estimated it was less than 10 seconds before they stopped his vehicle under the viaduct.

Mr. ██████ stated he has never seen a body worn camera before and related one of the officers told him he was being recorded. Mr. ██████ clarified he placed his hands on the trunk of the car, not the hood. Mr. ██████ stated he didn’t take a photo of the grass in the car, adding he thought about it, but did not. Mr. ██████ explained the officers did not issue him a ticket or issue him a warning. He stated nothing was given to him, including an investigative stop report. Mr. ██████ stated the night of the traffic stop he was wearing a short sleeve white t-shirt, grey jogging pants and a jean jacket. He added he was not wearing anything on his head. Mr. ██████ stated the officers did not provide him with a description of what the offender looked like. Mr. ██████ wondered, “Who would do something like that then ride around in a red Mercedes?”<sup>23</sup> Mr. ██████

---

<sup>18</sup> Attachment # 5, timestamp 16:50.

<sup>19</sup> Attachment # 5, timestamp 17:00.

<sup>20</sup> Attachment # 5, timestamp 17:15.

<sup>21</sup> At this point in the interview, Mr. ██████ showed the interviewing investigators a photograph of a license plate number on what appears to be a red Mercedes Benz reading ██████.

<sup>22</sup> Attachment # 5, timestamp 19:39.

<sup>23</sup> Attachment # 5, timestamp 25:00.

stated he has the flashiest car, explaining his emblem lights up at night. He added none of what occurred made sense. Mr. ██████ explained that he was humiliated. Mr. ██████ stated the officers were criminalizing his actions but declared, all of it was unfounded.<sup>24</sup> Mr. ██████ added if he did something wrong then the officers should have held him to the letter of the law. Mr. ██████ explained the officers did nothing to investigate it and did not check the front seat or console. Mr. ██████ again, expressed that the incident was humiliating.

**COPA interviewed Officer ██████ on June 1, 2018 at approximately 6:45am**, at the COPA Headquarters located at ██████<sup>25</sup> Officer ██████ affirmed he was given the opportunity to review his body worn camera video and the investigatory stop report prior to giving his statement. He stated he was on duty the early morning hours of April 13, 2018 and that his shift was 22:00-05:00. His assignment that day was to work a rapid response car. Officer ██████ explained his duties included patrol and responding to calls in progress. Officer ██████ stated he was in civilian dress that day.

Officer ██████ stated that he was working with a partner, Officer ██████ on April 13, 2018. Officer ██████ stated Officer ██████ is not his regular partner but explained the two have worked 10-15 times together previously. Officer ██████ stated he would consider Officer ██████ a good friend. Officer ██████ stated that during the early morning hours of April 13, 2018, he and Officer ██████ conducted a traffic stop at 732 S. Kostner. Officer ██████ stated he was the driver. He explained they were monitoring the radio traffic and heard a call issued from the ██████ District about a suspicious vehicle with an occupant. The caller described the vehicle as a red Mercedes or BMW. The caller said the car was following him and he was worried the car would rob him. Officer ██████ stated they were on the border of the district near Kostner and Roosevelt and were headed south to look for the caller when they were waved down. Officer ██████ stated they approached the individual and asked if he called the police. The man confirmed he called 911 and provided Officer ██████ and Officer ██████ with a description of the vehicle. The caller further elaborated on the description of the vehicle, stating it had an illuminated symbol/emblem on the front. Officer ██████ stated they informed him that a ██████ District vehicle has been assigned to take his report and he and Officer ██████ then continued down Kostner to look for the vehicle described by the caller. Officer ██████ believed they made contact with the caller between 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> Streets and that it occurred somewhere right along the border of the two police districts. Officer ██████ estimated it was less than 5 minutes from the time they monitored the 911 call to the time they contacted the caller. Officer ██████ stated when they spoke to the caller, he and his partner were still in their squad car and the caller was walking on the sidewalk. He characterized the caller's demeanor as, "a little scared" – adding the caller was looking around. Officer ██████ stated it was late at night and it looked as though he was coming from work, as he was dressed in a work outfit. Officer ██████ stated the caller informed them of the area where the vehicle had travelled. Officer ██████ estimated that the conversation with caller took less than two minutes. Officer ██████ told the caller a unit would be coming to take his report.

Officer ██████ the officers turned northbound to head back towards their district. He explained that when they reached the border, he and his partner saw the vehicle matching the

---

<sup>24</sup> Attachment # 5, timestamp 25:44.

<sup>25</sup> Officer ██████ Officer ██████ appeared and was represented by counsel ██████ at the time of his interview. Officer ██████ audio recorded interview of June 1, 2018 is incorporated as Attachment #26.

description just provided by the 911 caller somewhere around Roosevelt and Taylor. Officer [REDACTED] stated they conducted an investigatory stop of the vehicle. Officer [REDACTED] clarified they curbed the vehicle based on reasonable suspicion, not for a traffic violation. Officer [REDACTED] stated he asked the driver for his license and insurance and informed him the nature of why they had stopped his vehicle. Officer [REDACTED] stated he observed what looked like marijuana on the passenger front floorboard. Officer [REDACTED] stated the driver's name was [REDACTED] and noted he was the only person in the car. Officer [REDACTED] stated he believed the car had an illuminated emblem but was not sure. Officer [REDACTED] described Mr. [REDACTED] demeanor that evening as irritated and dismissive.

Officer [REDACTED] was asked why he believed what he saw on the floorboard that evening was cannabis. Officer [REDACTED] stated it was due to his training and experience in the [REDACTED] District. Officer [REDACTED] stated he has made hundreds of narcotics arrests. Additionally, he stated he sees marijuana daily. Officer [REDACTED] characterized the amount he observed as, "shake residue."<sup>26</sup> Officer [REDACTED] explained that when individuals roll cannabis cigarettes or cigars, some of the cannabis falls out. Officer [REDACTED] stated he did not recover the "shake residue" because it was such a small amount. Officer [REDACTED] explained it was not a criminal violation, but a civil violation at that point, so he exercised officer discretion and decided a ticket really wasn't warranted. Officer [REDACTED] stated he did not conduct the search of the vehicle. He saw his partner conduct the search of the vehicle and mentioned other officers were also on scene, including Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and two female officers from the [REDACTED] District. Officer [REDACTED] estimated the search of Mr. [REDACTED] vehicle took a couple of minutes and stated no additional contraband was observed.

After his initial interaction with Mr. [REDACTED] Officer [REDACTED] stated he asked Mr. [REDACTED] to step out of the vehicle. Officer [REDACTED] stated he conducted a protective pat-down of Mr. [REDACTED] and then directed him to go to the rear of his vehicle to lean up against the bumper. Officer [REDACTED] stated at no time was Mr. [REDACTED] handcuffed and explained he asked Officer [REDACTED] to wait with Mr. [REDACTED]. While at the back of the vehicle, Officer [REDACTED] stated, he again provided Mr. [REDACTED] with an explanation as to why this was happening and why they were out there. Officer [REDACTED] recalled he informed Mr. [REDACTED] that a call was made, and he asked Mr. [REDACTED] if he was nearby anyone for too long, and if there was possibly anybody who might have called the police on him. Officer [REDACTED] stated he explained they were there for a reason. Officer [REDACTED] stated he told Mr. [REDACTED] that he saw the marijuana and while it will be legal, it is not legal yet. Officer [REDACTED] stated he then asked Officer [REDACTED] to watch Mr. [REDACTED] and he went back to the car to run Mr. [REDACTED] name. Officer [REDACTED] explained everyone was working as a team. Officer [REDACTED] was searching the car and Officer [REDACTED] was watching the subject. Officer [REDACTED] clarified the search was conducted because he observed marijuana in plain view.

Officer [REDACTED] ran a name check on Mr. [REDACTED] in his vehicle, which came back clear. Officer [REDACTED] believed that when he ran the name, there might have been a Soundex,<sup>27</sup> which happens when you run certain names and it pops certain things, which may or may not be related to that person. Officer [REDACTED] explained he asked for Mr. [REDACTED] social security number in order to verify that Mr. [REDACTED] was not who was showing on his screen. Officer [REDACTED] stated he rattled off a few numbers and those numbers came back and then he realized that it was a duplicate and

<sup>26</sup> Attachment #26, timestamp 11:39.

<sup>27</sup> Soundex is a phonetic coding system intended to suppress spelling variations, used especially to encode surnames for the linkage of records.

that the individual he was looking at shared some demographics with the driver but was not Mr. [REDACTED]. Once he determined it was not the same individual, he did not need the information any further. After performing the name check, Officer [REDACTED] stated Mr. [REDACTED] was good and gave Mr. [REDACTED] his driver's license and insurance. Officer [REDACTED] stated an investigative stop report was written up by Officer [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] does not believe Mr. [REDACTED] was given a copy of the investigative stop report but cannot recall why.

Officer [REDACTED] stated he did not have concerns that Mr. [REDACTED] was under the influence of cannabis or alcohol. Officer [REDACTED] did not recall saying anything to Mr. [REDACTED] regarding the fact the officers were, "giving him a pass," because they were not issuing him a ticket. Officer [REDACTED] estimated the stop took approximately 4 minutes. Officer [REDACTED] stated after the body worn camera footage ended, Mr. [REDACTED] quickly left. Officer [REDACTED] stated that at no point in time did he or any other officer on scene tell Mr. [REDACTED] to shut up.

Officer [REDACTED] stated that when vehicle was curbed it was dark but there was artificial light. Officer [REDACTED] explained there was streetlight and he was using his flashlight when he saw what he believed was "shake residue" in the vehicle. When asked to explain what the shake residue looked like, Officer [REDACTED] stated it looked like cannabis, it was green and leafy, plant like. Officer [REDACTED] then clarified, it was not really a leaf, rather it looked more like a bud. Officer [REDACTED] explained what individuals use to smoke marijuana is cylinder shaped. Officer [REDACTED] affirmed it could not have been just a leaf. Officer [REDACTED] did not recall if the route Mr. [REDACTED] took matched with the route taken by the 911 caller.

**COPA Interviewed Officer [REDACTED] as an accused officer on June 19, 2018 at approximately 7:10am,** at the COPA Headquarters located at [REDACTED].<sup>28</sup> Officer [REDACTED] affirmed he previously provided COPA with a statement on June 1, 2018, relative to the stop of [REDACTED] Mr. [REDACTED] which occurred on April 13, 2018. Officer [REDACTED] stated he stood by the answers he previously provided as truthful and accurate to the best of his recollection and confirmed that if he were asked the same questions today, he would provide the same or substantially the same answers.

Officer [REDACTED] stated his partner, [REDACTED] wrote the Investigatory Stop Report. He added that after Officer [REDACTED] wrote the Investigatory Stop Report, he did not review it. When asked if he was aware that his partner marked the box "NO" which asks if the name was verified by identification Officer [REDACTED] replied, it was a mistake. Officer [REDACTED] stated, "It was at the end of the day, I should have looked it over but didn't. I was writing other investigatory stops at the time."<sup>29</sup> Additionally, Officer [REDACTED] stated the reports were written at the end of their tour, approximately 1 -2 hours after the stop, though he is not exactly sure. When Officer [REDACTED] was asked if he was aware that his partner checked the box which stated that a protective pat down was not conducted, he replied, "I am aware now, but was not aware at the time of the report. I conducted a protective pat down."<sup>30</sup> Officer [REDACTED] described the circumstances of what led to the protective pat down. He stated, "The call came out and we spoke with the caller who provided the description

---

<sup>28</sup> Officer [REDACTED] was interviewed as an Accused Officer on June 19, 2018. He appeared with and was represented by Attorney [REDACTED]. His second interview is incorporated as Attachment #41.

<sup>29</sup> Attachment #41, timestamp 04:48.

<sup>30</sup> Attachment #41, timestamp 05:30.

of the vehicle. Further information indicated the victim thought that he was afraid he might be robbed. When we stopped the vehicle, we noticed marijuana in it. The correlation between narcotics and guns is legendary.”<sup>31</sup> Officer █████ added, “Most robberies are done with firearms or other associated weapons and we were being precautions.”<sup>32</sup>

**COPA interviewed Officer █████ on June 1, 2018 at approximately 7:10am,** at the COPA Offices located at █████<sup>33</sup> Officer █████ affirmed he was given the opportunity to review his body worn camera video and the investigatory stop report prior to giving his statement. He stated he was on duty in the early morning hours of April 13, 2018 and that his shift was 8:00pm to 4:00am. His assignment that day was to work a mission team. Officer █████ stated his duties included responding to in-progress calls, narcotics calls, and weapons calls. Officer █████ was in plain clothes, meaning civilian dress, and was using a marked Chicago Police Department car that evening. Officer █████ described himself as a male white, 6’3” and approx. 240 pounds. Officer █████ stated he worked with Officer █████ that evening. Officer █████ explained the Officer █████ was not his regular partner but he has worked with him often. Officer █████ stated he has worked with Officer █████ since January of 2018. Officer █████ described Officer █████ as a friend, explaining the two speak outside of work.

Officer █████ stated that on evening of incident, he was involved in traffic stop at the location of 720 S. Kostner Avenue. He was seated in the front passenger seat that evening. He explained they monitored radio traffic that evening. Officer █████ stated the █████ District shares a dispatch band with the █████ District of the Chicago Police Department and explained Roosevelt Road acts as the dividing line between the two districts.

While monitoring the 911 radio traffic, Officer █████ stated there was a caller who stated there was a suspicious automobile with occupants following him. The caller described the vehicle as a red Mercedes or BMW. The caller was concerned that the occupant or occupants were going to rob him. After monitoring this call, Officers █████ and █████ responded by relocating to the area of Kostner and Roosevelt to tour the area. Officer █████ stated they travelled southbound on Kostner from Roosevelt where they saw an individual walking who waved them over. Officer █████ described the individual as a male, black who was in his late 20s or early 30s who was wearing a uniform of some sort. Officer █████ stated they asked him if he called the police. The man told them he was the one who called and said a red BMW or Mercedes had followed him and had been following him for quite some time. The man described the car as having no tint on the windows and mentioned the grill of the vehicle had some type of light on it which was lit up. Officer █████ stated they told the man to, “hang tight” because it was a █████ District call and explained █████ District officers would most likely come and meet with him.

After speaking with the 911 caller, Officer █████ stated he and Officer █████ toured the area for red vehicle. He stated they travelled northbound on Kostner towards Roosevelt as they came to an intersection, they saw, “a red Mercedes with no tints on it with a lit-up grill.”<sup>34</sup> Officer

---

<sup>31</sup> Attachment #41, timestamp 05:52.

<sup>32</sup> Attachment #41, timestamp 06:15.

<sup>33</sup> Officer █████ appeared and was represented by counsel █████ at the time of his interview. Officer █████ audio recorded interview of June 1, 2018 is incorporated as Attachment #27.

<sup>34</sup> Attachment #27, timestamp 06:02.

█████ explained the car they observed was travelling eastbound on Roosevelt and made northbound turn onto Kostner. Officer █████ stated they followed the vehicle, ran the plate, and conducted an investigatory stop on the vehicle. Officer █████ stated the 911 caller provided information that there was one person in the car. He estimated that after concluding their conversation with 911 caller, they observed the red Mercedes less than a minute later. Officer █████ stated they made contact with the caller on the 1300 block, made a turn and saw the red vehicle almost immediately. Officer █████ estimated the conversation with 911 caller was, “a minute – less than two minutes.”

After viewing the red Mercedes, Officer █████ activated the emergency lights. Officer █████ explained the red Mercedes immediately pulled over. Officer █████ explained he approached the passenger side and Officer █████ the contact officer, approached to speak with the driver. Officer █████ described the area where vehicle was curbed as dark but illuminated by artificial lights. Additionally, Officer █████ stated he had his flashlight out and was shining it into the vehicle looking for contraband or weapons, based on the type of call received.

Officer █████ stated the vehicle they curbed matched the description which was given to them by the caller. The car they curbed was, “a red Mercedes, occupied by one male occupant, and had a light behind the Mercedes symbol which illuminated the grill.”<sup>35</sup> Officer █████ explained when they curbed the car they were the first officers there but other █████ District officers, Officers █████ and █████ arrived to assist. Additionally, two female officers from the █████ District also responded to the traffic stop.

When asked what observations he made upon his approach of the vehicle, Officer █████ stated he saw a green leafy substance in small chunks on the passenger side floorboard. Officer █████ stated he walked to driver’s side door and heard his partner ask the driver if he had smoked marijuana in the car recently. Officer █████ stated Officer █████ then asked the driver to exit the vehicle and brought him to the rear of the vehicle. Officer █████ stated, he performed a brief search of the vehicle. Officer █████ explained he searched under the seat and the arm rest area. He then opened the glove box and went into the back seat. Officer █████ recalled opening a box to see if there was any contraband in it but did not locate anything. Officer █████ stated he then asked Officer █████ if he could check the passenger side of the vehicle. Upon questioning, Officer █████ stated to the best of his knowledge the search conducted by Officer █████ did not reveal anything. When asked why he believed what he saw on the floorboard was cannabis, Officer █████ stated, “I’ve been a police officer for 10 years, I see cannabis on a daily basis. It is a distinct item. It was a very small chunks or kernel; it had a kernel-type shape.”<sup>36</sup> Officer █████ explained the cannabis was not recovered and inventoried. He stated anything under 10 grams would have to be citation. He further explained, that in order to issue the citation, “we would have had to recover the cannabis, place him under arrest, drive him to the station and give him a citation, because we don’t normally carry that type of citation.”<sup>37</sup> Officer █████ stated, “We used officer discretion based on the amount was observed.”<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Attachment #27, timestamp 09:06.

<sup>36</sup> Attachment #27, timestamp 11:35.

<sup>37</sup> Attachment #27, timestamp 12:20.

<sup>38</sup> Attachment #27, timestamp 12:35.

Officer ██████ estimated the search of the Mercedes took approximately a minute or less. Officer ██████ described the demeanor of driver as annoyed. Officer ██████ stated after the driver was asked to step to the back of the vehicle, Officer ██████ went to the squad to run the driver's name on the computer and while doing so, Officer ██████ asked Officer ██████ to ask the driver for his social security number. Officer ██████ explained he asked the driver his social security number and he responded with the first 3-5 numbers when Officer ██████ called out that he no longer needed the number. Officer ██████ stated he believed there was a possible hit on a registered sex offender, but when Officer ██████ no longer needed it, he told the driver never mind. Officer ██████ explained after the name check on the driver came back clear we pretty much ended the stop and the driver left immediately. Officer ██████ stated the driver was given his ID back and he was free to go. Officer ██████ stated he drafted the investigatory stop report but cannot recall why the driver was not presented with a receipt, whether, "[Mr. ██████ walked away or if he refused one."<sup>39</sup>

Upon questioning, Officer ██████ stated he had no concerns the driver was smoking cannabis or that he had been drinking. The vehicle smelled like he just smoked a cigarette. Officer ██████ stated none of the officers told the driver he was being, "given you a pass," nor did any of the officers tell the driver to, "shut up." Officer ██████ estimated the total interaction with the driver lasted approximately 5 minutes.

Officer ██████ stated the red Mercedes was curbed based on the call and the area where the vehicle was recovered, which was consistent with the information provided by the caller. Upon questioning, Officer ██████ stated the basis of the search was the visual of the cannabis on the floorboard in the vehicle. Officer ██████ stated no body worn camera was activated when the officers spoke with the 911 caller. He explained he and Officer ██████ were in the squad car speaking through the window. The officers activated their equipment when they pulled over the vehicle.

**COPA Interviewed Officer ██████ as an accused officer on June 19, 2018 at approximately 7:00am,** at the COPA Headquarters located at ██████  
█████<sup>40</sup> Officer ██████ affirmed he previously provided COPA with a statement on June 21, 2018, regarding the traffic stop of Mr. ██████ which occurred on April 13, 2018. Officer ██████ stated he stood by the answers he previously provided and confirmed that if he were asked the same questions today, he would provide the same or substantially the same answers.

Officer ██████ stated he wrote the Investigatory Stop Report<sup>41</sup> at the end of his shift between 4:00-5:00am. When asked why the box in the investigatory stop report which asks if the name was verified by identification was checked "NO", Officer ██████ explained, "It was something I overlooked and a clerical error. It was the end of the shift and we were writing numerous reports."<sup>42</sup> Officer ██████ stated after viewing the body worn camera video, he saw his partner was holding the driver's license in his hand. Officer ██████ was also asked why the box regarding whether a protective pat down conducted was checked no. Officer ██████ explained, "After reviewing the body cam, it does indicate that my partner conducted a protective pat down

---

<sup>39</sup> Attachment #27, timestamp 14:40.

<sup>40</sup> Officer ██████ Officer ██████ was interviewed as an Accused Officer on June 19, 2018. He appeared with and was represented by Attorney ██████ His second interview is incorporated as Attachment #40.

<sup>41</sup> Investigatory Stop Report is incorporated as Attachment #21.

<sup>42</sup> Attachment #40, timestamp 06:00.

of the driver.”<sup>43</sup> Officer ██████ explained it was a clerical error, the pat down was recorded, and he was not trying to hide anything. Upon questioning regarding the circumstances which led to the protective pat down, Officer ██████ explained, “It was the circumstances of the call...The call came out that the caller thought that he was afraid he might be robbed...The protective pat down was for officer safety...”<sup>44</sup> Officer ██████ further explained that in his experience as an officer with the Chicago Police Department, when a robbery is committed - a weapon is usually involved.

**COPA interviewed Officer ██████ on June 1, 2018** at the COPA Headquarters located at ██████<sup>45</sup> Officer ██████ affirmed he was given the opportunity to review his BWC video and the investigatory stop report prior to beginning his interview. Officer ██████ stated he was on duty on April 13, 2018 and worked the first watch. Officer ██████ stated his hours were either 21:00-06:00 or 22:30 – 07:30, and he was assigned to a beat car that evening. Officer ██████ stated he was in uniform and in a marked Chicago Police squad car that evening. Officer ██████ stated he was the driver of that vehicle that evening.

Officer ██████ stated he was working with Officer ██████. Officer ██████ explained Officer ██████ was his, “on and off regular partner” and estimated the two have worked together more than 10 times. Officer ██████ stated that aside from texts here and there, he and Officer ██████ are not social outside of work.

Officer ██████ stated that on that date, he and his partner were at location of 700 S. Kostner Avenue in Chicago. He stated that they received a call of a suspicious vehicle in the vicinity of 700 S. Kostner, after which they relocated to the area where the call originated. Officer ██████ stated, before they arrived, another unit came over the air to say they had stopped the vehicle. He and his partner proceeded to the location to assist them. Officer ██████ was unable to recall the amount of time that passed between the time they received information, regarding the suspicious vehicle, to the time they relocated to the area, but estimated it to be around 15 minutes. Officer ██████ believed the substance of call was a suspicious vehicle, which was described as a red sedan, a Mercedes but could not recall any information regarding the occupants of the red Mercedes. Officer ██████ believed the call came from area of Kostner and Roosevelt and that Officers ██████ and ██████ were the initial responding unit.

When Officer ██████ arrived, he observed Officer ██████ and ██████ had already curbed the vehicle, which was a red Mercedes. Officer ██████ could not recall if the ██████ District officers were on scene before or after he and Officer ██████ arrived, but they were there at some point during the stop. Officer ██████ stated when he arrived, he acted as a guard officer with the driver of the vehicle. When Officer ██████ and Officer ██████ arrived, Officer ██████ was on the driver’s side of the vehicle and Officer ██████ was standing with the driver on the roadside, away from the sidewalk. Officer ██████ believed Officer ██████ was searching the driver’s side of the vehicle at the time they arrived and estimated it took approximately 2 minutes or less for Officer ██████ to conduct the search of the vehicle. Officer ██████ stood with the driver for approximately 2 minutes at the back of the vehicle and did not recall having any conversation with the driver of the vehicle.

---

<sup>43</sup> Attachment #40, timestamp 06:40.

<sup>44</sup> Attachment #40, timestamp 07:05.

<sup>45</sup> Officer ██████. Officer ██████ appeared with and was represented by counsel ██████ at the time of his interview. Officer ██████ audio recorded interview of June 1, 2018 is incorporated as Attachments #33-34.

Officer ██████ did recall discussing the weather with Officer ██████ and making small talk with the other officers on scene.

Officer ██████ stated he was not alerted to the reason for the search of the red Mercedes. He described the driver's demeanor as, "stand-offish," adding, the driver, "became irate when he was asked information."<sup>46</sup> Officer ██████ could not recall if any contraband was recovered as the result of the search of the vehicle. Officer ██████ stated he no concern that the driver had been drinking or smoking cannabis that evening, nor did he or the other officers tell him he was, "getting a pass," with regards to not receiving a ticket. Officer ██████ estimated the name check of the driver took approximately 60 seconds and he does not know the results. Officer ██████ explained after the name check, the cameras were turned off due to the scene being secure, and the driver was let go at that time. Officer ██████ estimated the time from the clear name check to time the driver was free to leave was less than 5 minutes.

Officer ██████ stated he does not know if the driver was given an Investigative Stop Receipt. At no point did he or the other officers on scene tell the driver to shut up. Officer ██████ observed Officer ██████ search the passenger side of the vehicle but cannot recall if he searched the front and the back. He estimated the search by Officer ██████ took less than a minute. Officer ██████ stated neither Officer ██████ nor Officer ██████ said they recovered anything from the vehicle and did not tell him why they had searched the vehicle. Officer ██████ then clarified, Officer ██████ related cannabis crumbs were observed. Officer ██████ partner didn't say whether he observed cannabis crumbs.

**COPA interviewed Officer ██████ as an accused officer on July 5, 2018, at approximately 5:45pm** at the COPA Offices located at ██████. <sup>47</sup> Officer ██████ affirmed he previously provided a statement to COPA on June 5, 2018.<sup>48</sup> He stated he stands by the answers he previously provided during his first interview and said that if were asked the same questions, he would provide the same or substantially the same answers. He had nothing further to add.

**COPA interviewed Officer ██████ on June 22, 2018 at approximately 7:20am,** at the COPA Offices located at ██████.<sup>49</sup> Officer ██████ affirmed he was given the opportunity to review his partner's body worn camera video and the investigative stop report prior to giving his statement. He stated he was on duty the early morning hours of April 13, 2018 and that his shift was either 21:00-05:00 or 22:30 -06:30. His assignment that day was to work a beat car and his duties included: patrolling the assigned area, responding to calls, providing back up, and conducting traffic stops. Officer ██████ was in uniform that evening, in a marked blue and white car. He described himself as approximately 5'8" and Hispanic. Officer

---

<sup>46</sup> Attachment #33, timestamp 10:40.

<sup>47</sup> Officer ██████ Officer ██████ appeared and was represented by counsel ██████ at the time of his interview. Officer ██████ second audio recorded interview is incorporated as Attachment #56.

<sup>48</sup> Officer ██████ initial interview date was mistakenly noted as June 5, 2018 when it occurred June 1, 2018.

<sup>49</sup> Officer ██████ Officer ██████ appeared and was represented by counsel ██████ at the time of his interview. Officer ██████ audio recorded interview is incorporated as Attachment #50.

████████ stated he worked with Officer ██████████ on April 13, 2018 and has worked with Officer ██████████ on and off since February. Officer ██████████ stated he and Officer ██████████ are friends and social outside of work. Officer ██████████ stated he was the passenger of that squad car officer that night.

Officer ██████████ stated he and his partner assisted with a traffic stop at 700 S. Kostner Avenue on April 13, 2018. Officer ██████████ stated an individual waved down ██████████ and stated that someone in a red Mercedes vehicle was following him. ██████████ found the vehicle on 736 Kostner and subsequently curbed the vehicle. Officer ██████████ stated they came to assist because they were near that location. When they arrived, the red Mercedes had already been curbed. Officer ██████████ could not recall the exact time from when he heard ██████████ was waved down to the time, he and Officer ██████████ relocated to the area of 732 S. Kostner but he estimated the time to be approximately 10 minutes.

Upon their arrival, Officer ██████████ stated they observed a red Mercedes curbed at the location of 732 S. Kostner. He stated he and Officer ██████████ approached the back of the red Mercedes and the officers asked if they could watch the driver at the back of the vehicle. Officer ██████████ stated he and his partner, Officer ██████████ watched the driver, who was at the back of his vehicle. Officer ██████████ explained that Officer ██████████ then asked him if he could search the passenger side of the vehicle. Officer ██████████ stated he conducted the search and explained he knew the basis of the search was the fact Officer ██████████ noticed weed residue and a smell of cannabis.

Officer ██████████ stated he searched both the front and back area of the passenger side. Officer ██████████ stated that there was nothing else he could observe and cannot recall if he searched the front floorboard area of the car. Additionally, Officer ██████████ stated, he could not recall seeing any contraband. Officer ██████████ stated that his search took a minute, in total, and as he was searching, his partner was with the driver at the rear of the red Mercedes. Officer ██████████ stated he was wearing a body worn camera at the time of the incident but cannot recall if it was activated at the time. Mr. ██████████ was at the area for approximately 5 minutes.

Officer ██████████ described Mr. ██████████ demeanor as, “very irritated.”<sup>50</sup> He explained Mr. ██████████ tone and body language led him to that conclusion. Officer ██████████ could not recall the description of the car and could not recall whether the individual who placed the 911 call was in the immediate area. Officers ██████████ and ██████████ saw the cannabis residue which led to the search of the car. Officer ██████████ could not recall a smell of cannabis in the vehicle.

## **b. Digital Evidence**

**Officer ██████████ Body Worn Camera Video 2018-04-13 ██████████**: Video depicts Officer ██████████ exiting the squad car and approaching the driver’s side door of a red Mercedes. The driver’s window lowers and Mr. ██████████ hands over driver’s license and insurance papers. Audio starts at

---

<sup>50</sup> Attachment #50, timestamp 09:50.

30 second mark and Officer [REDACTED] informs Mr. [REDACTED] that he is being audio and visually recorded. Officer [REDACTED] points his flashlight into the rear of vehicle and asks Mr. [REDACTED] “When is the last time you smoked in the car?” Mr. [REDACTED] replies, “Smoked what?” Officer [REDACTED] states, “Marijuana.”<sup>51</sup> Mr. [REDACTED] informs Officer [REDACTED] he has not smoked marijuana. Officer [REDACTED] directs Mr. [REDACTED] to the area where the officer’s flashlight is pointed – front passenger side floorboard area. Officer [REDACTED] states, “It looks like marijuana on the floor.”<sup>52</sup> Mr. [REDACTED] states he doesn’t smoke marijuana. Officer [REDACTED] asks Mr. [REDACTED] to step out of the vehicle and asks where Mr. [REDACTED] is heading. Mr. [REDACTED] provides his address. Officer [REDACTED] conducts a protective pat down of Mr. [REDACTED] as he stands outside his driver’s side door. Officer [REDACTED] addresses Mr. [REDACTED] as, “Sir.” Officer [REDACTED] asks Mr. [REDACTED] to walk to back of car requests that Mr. [REDACTED] lean up against the bumper of his car. Officer [REDACTED] asks Mr. [REDACTED] if there is anything in the car the officers should know about. Mr. [REDACTED] replies, “No.” Officer [REDACTED] asks Mr. [REDACTED] if he was close to anyone, anyone who might have, “called on him.” Mr. [REDACTED] replies, “No.” Officer [REDACTED] informs Mr. [REDACTED] he would not have stopped him without a reason. Officer [REDACTED] informs Mr. [REDACTED] “We got a call about a suspicious auto with occupants, said it was following someone, and the person thought they were going to get robbed.” Officer [REDACTED] further explains that is why they are out there with Mr. [REDACTED] Officer [REDACTED] states he saw the marijuana and tells Mr. [REDACTED] “It is not a big deal – it will be legal someday – just not yet.”<sup>53</sup>

Officer [REDACTED] returns to his squad parked behind red Mercedes with Mr. [REDACTED] license. At the same time, a female officer approaches Officer [REDACTED] and he asks if she made contact with the victim. She responds she did not, and Officer [REDACTED] tells her they saw and spoke to him. Officer [REDACTED] states, “It all jives,” and that he will tell her about it after he is green.<sup>54</sup> Officer [REDACTED] informs the officer there is weed in plain view – so they will search the car. Officer [REDACTED] states they verified there is only one person in the car, and he said as much. Officer [REDACTED] asks another officer to get his partner. Officer [REDACTED] asks Officer [REDACTED] to get Mr. [REDACTED] social security number. Officer [REDACTED] is heard asking for Mr. [REDACTED] social security number. Shortly afterwards Officer [REDACTED] says, “Because I asked you for it...for the computer.”<sup>55</sup> Mr. [REDACTED] provides the first few numbers and then Officer [REDACTED] says, “Tell him never mind.”<sup>56</sup> Officer [REDACTED] exits the squad car and someone asks, “Everything good?”<sup>57</sup> Video ends.

**Officer [REDACTED] Body Worn Camera Video 2018-04-1 [REDACTED]:** Video depicts Officer [REDACTED] approaching the curbed red Mercedes from the passenger side. He and Officer [REDACTED] point their flashlights into the red Mercedes, into both the front and back seat areas. Mr. [REDACTED] appears to be speaking with [REDACTED] Officer [REDACTED] says, “That looks like marijuana. Right there on the floorboard.”<sup>58</sup> Officer [REDACTED] asks the driver when he last smoked. Mr. [REDACTED] tells Officer [REDACTED] he does not smoke marijuana. Officer [REDACTED] searches the front of the vehicle, including the console and glovebox from the front driver’s side area. Officer [REDACTED] searches the back seat, opening a box on the driver’s side rear seat which contains papers. Officer [REDACTED] asks another

<sup>51</sup> Officer [REDACTED] BWC video, timestamp 00:41.

<sup>52</sup> Officer [REDACTED] BWC video, timestamp 00:47.

<sup>53</sup> Officer [REDACTED] BWC video, timestamp 01:30.

<sup>54</sup> Officer [REDACTED] BWC video, timestamp 02:10.

<sup>55</sup> Officer [REDACTED] BWC video, timestamp 03:13.

<sup>56</sup> Officer [REDACTED] BWC video, timestamp 03:23.

<sup>57</sup> Officer [REDACTED] BWC video, timestamp 03:40.

<sup>58</sup> Officer [REDACTED] BWC video, timestamp 00:43.

officer on scene to check the other side of the vehicle. Officer [REDACTED] bends down near passenger side of vehicle out of view. He stands a short time later and gives thumbs up. Officer [REDACTED] continues to stand near the back of red Mercedes. Officers talk about the pace of work and the weather. Officer [REDACTED] asks Officer [REDACTED] to get Mr. [REDACTED] social security number. Officer [REDACTED] asks for Mr. [REDACTED] social security number. Shortly afterwards, Officer [REDACTED] states, "Because I'm asking you for it...for the computer."<sup>59</sup> Mr. [REDACTED] provides a few numbers and then a voice is heard saying, "Never mind."<sup>60</sup> Officer [REDACTED] walks over to the driver side of his squad where Officer [REDACTED] is seated. A voice says, "Everything is good."<sup>61</sup> Video ends<sup>62</sup>.

**Officer [REDACTED] Body Worn Camera Video 2018-04-13 [REDACTED]:** Video depicts Officer [REDACTED] exiting his vehicle and approaching the curbed red Mercedes from the driver's side. A police SUV with its emergency lights activated is already on scene. Mr. [REDACTED] is standing at the back of his vehicle with Officer [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] asks Officer [REDACTED] to stand at the back of red vehicle with Mr. [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] can be seen standing on the passenger side of vehicle and on the other side of Mr. [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] searches the driver's side of the red Mercedes. Officer [REDACTED] asks Officer [REDACTED] on scene to check the other side of the vehicle. Officer [REDACTED] bends down near passenger side of vehicle out of view. Officer is heard saying, "We were on our way when we heard you guys."<sup>63</sup> Officers talk about the pace of work and the weather. Officer [REDACTED] asks Officer [REDACTED] to get Mr. [REDACTED] social security number. Officer [REDACTED] asks for Mr. [REDACTED] social security number. Mr. [REDACTED] asks, "Why do you need my social security number?"<sup>64</sup> Mr. [REDACTED] provides a few numbers and then a voice is heard saying, "Never mind."<sup>65</sup> Mr. [REDACTED] and officers stand at back of vehicle a few seconds more, and a voice is heard saying, "Green, green, green."<sup>66</sup> Video ends.

**Officer [REDACTED] Body Worn Camera Video 2018-04-13 [REDACTED]:** Video depicts passenger Officer [REDACTED] in the squad which is moving. Officers arrive on scene a minute and 41 seconds into the recording. Officer [REDACTED] approaches the red Mercedes which is parked. Mr. [REDACTED] is standing at back of trunk area facing vehicle, his hands are hanging at his side. Two officers are standing to the left of Mr. [REDACTED] and one officer is standing in the rear door passenger area of the Red Mercedes. Officer appears to be searching back car and side door areas. Exits and stands at back of car with other officers. Officers can be faintly heard in background speaking with Mr. [REDACTED]. Mr. [REDACTED] then begins to recite a few numbers and stops. A voice says, "never mind".<sup>67</sup> Someone at scene heard saying, "Green, green green." Video ends.<sup>68</sup>

**Officer [REDACTED] Body Worn Camera Video: 2018-04-13 [REDACTED]:** Video depicts Officer [REDACTED] in the driver's seat of a moving squad car. At timestamp 07:49, [REDACTED] and her partner arrive on

---

<sup>59</sup> Officer [REDACTED] BWC video, timestamp 03:06.

<sup>60</sup> Officer [REDACTED] BWC video, timestamp 03:19.

<sup>61</sup> Officer [REDACTED] BWC video, timestamp 03:37.

<sup>62</sup> It should be noted that Officer [REDACTED] deactivated his BWC prior to Mr. [REDACTED] being told that he was free to leave.

<sup>63</sup> Officer [REDACTED] BWC video, timestamp 01:10.

<sup>64</sup> Officer [REDACTED] BWC video, timestamp 02:06.

<sup>65</sup> Officer [REDACTED] BWC video, timestamp 02:18.

<sup>66</sup> Officer [REDACTED] BWC video, timestamp 02:42.

<sup>67</sup> Officer [REDACTED] BWC video, timestamp 03:23.

<sup>68</sup> Officer [REDACTED] BWC video, timestamp 03:48.

scene. Officer ██████ observed exiting the vehicle and approaching SUV squad which is parked behind the red Mercedes. Officer ██████ is heard asking Officer ██████ if she made contact with the victim. Officer ██████ responds that they couldn't find anybody out there. Officer ██████ states he saw him and adds, "it all kind of jives."<sup>69</sup> ██████ walks towards the parked red Mercedes and stands next to the other officers situated around the car. Another officer is heard asking Mr. ██████ for his social security number. Mr. ██████ begins to say numbers and then stops. Another officer outside camera view is heard saying "Green – green – green."<sup>70</sup> Video ends.

### OEMC transmissions:

**41:38-** Dispatch - ██████ – Suspicious car with occupants over on Kostner and Roosevelt. Actually disregard. ██████ – that suspicious auto is travelling southbound on Kostner from Roosevelt. A red BMW or Mercedes that is following the complainant. He is wearing a black or brown uniform. I guess he is walking on foot, ok?

**46:47-** Beat (inaudible). We will be out with that suspicious auto with occupants at Kostner and Lexington. That red Mercedes. Dispatch – OK 10-4.

**47:14-** This is ██████ – we are with that suspicious auto with occupants.

**53:47-** ██████ – You can CLEAR us on that.

#### c. Physical Evidence

No physical evidence recovered during this incident.

#### d. Documentary Evidence

**Investigatory Report:**<sup>71</sup> The COPA Investigative Report details a phone conversation which took place between Investigator Weber and Mr. ██████ on May 11, 2018. Mr. ██████ affirmed he placed a call to 911 in mid-April regarding a red Mercedes. He stated he placed the call during the early morning hours as he was returning home from work. Mr. ██████ stated shortly after he exited the elevated train stop at Cicero, he observed a red Mercedes following him. He described taking evasive action in an effort to lose the red Mercedes and believed the red Mercedes took action to stay within his path of travel. Mr. ██████ stated he was concerned for his safety and jogged to a viaduct, but the red Mercedes followed. Mr. ██████ described the driver of the vehicle as a black male, in his late 30s and approximately 6 feet tall. Mr. ██████ stated he tried to reach a well-illuminated area to place a 911 call. Shortly after placing the phone to his ear, Mr. ██████ stated the red Mercedes drove away shortly thereafter. Mr. ██████ stated he provided the 911 operator his name, location, a description of the red Mercedes and a description of its driver and shortly afterwards, two white male officers in civilian clothes who drove a blue and white SUV from the Chicago Police Department met him on Kostner Avenue. Mr. ██████ stated he related what had

---

<sup>69</sup> Officer ██████ BWC video, timestamp 02:45.

<sup>70</sup> Officer ██████ BWC video, timestamp 04:24.

<sup>71</sup> COPA Investigative Report is incorporated as Attachment #60.

occurred and provided the officers a description of the vehicle which was following him. He specifically recalled telling the officers the front Mercedes sign on the vehicle glowed. Mr. ██████ estimated the conversation with the officers took approximately 5-6 minutes and afterwards, he observed the officers drive off in the direction he had last seen the red Mercedes.

**Investigatory Stop Report:**<sup>72</sup> The Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) was drafted by Officer ██████ Officer ██████ Star. No. ██████. The report indicates in summary, on April 13, 2018 at approximately 02:47, the responding officers were monitoring radio traffic of a suspicious vehicle. The officers subsequently made contact with the caller who related he was being followed by a red Mercedes with one occupant and that the vehicle was in the area of Kostner and Roosevelt. The officers observed the vehicle and conducted a traffic stop of a red Mercedes, license plate number ██████, at the location of 732 S. Kostner Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60624. The responding officers observed marijuana residue on the passenger side floorboard and conducted a search of the vehicle, during which no additional contraband was located. The report also indicated that the driver denied following the vehicle.<sup>73</sup> Additionally, the report indicated no ISR receipt was given to him due to the fact he left before the officers were able to give him one.

## VI. ANALYSIS

The Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution protects individuals against unreasonable searches and seizures. The facts surrounding the stop, detention and search of ██████ Mr. ██████ and his vehicle establish that the officers' actions were within the bounds of the law and Chicago Police Department policy.

### **Allegation #1: Unlawfully stopped ██████ in violation of Rule 1**

During the early morning hours of April 13, 2018, Officer ██████ and Officer ██████ conducted an investigatory stop of Mr. ██████ vehicle. This was done after the officers monitored radio traffic about a suspicious vehicle with occupants in the area of 4400 W. Roosevelt Road and 1199 S. Kostner Road.<sup>74</sup> With this information, Officer ██████ and Officer ██████ went to the area and located the 911 caller, Mr. ██████ who waved the officers down. While speaking with Mr. ██████ the officers learned that Mr. ██████ was concerned for his safety and thought he might be robbed by a red Mercedes or BMW which was following him. Additionally, the officers ascertained a description of the vehicle: a red BMW or Mercedes, with no window tint, and a glowing Mercedes sign. Additionally, Mr. ██████ provided the officers with the vehicles' direction of travel and a description of its driver. Shortly after obtaining this information, Officer ██████ and Officer ██████ observed a vehicle matching the description previously provided by Mr. ██████. Specifically, they observed a red Mercedes, without any window tint, with a glowing front Mercedes emblem, travelling near the vicinity of Mr. ██████ and conducted an investigatory stop of the vehicle. Upon curbing of the vehicle, they discovered its driver was a male, black in his 30s.

---

<sup>72</sup> Investigatory Stop Report is incorporated as Attachment #21.

<sup>73</sup> The 911 caller stated he was on foot. COPA believes this is a mistake and should read, the driver denied following the person, not the vehicle.

<sup>74</sup> See OEMC Event Query Report incorporated as Attachment #23.

In order to conduct an investigatory stop, an officer must have reasonable, articulable suspicion that a crime has been, is being, or is about to be committed.<sup>75</sup> “While ‘reasonable suspicion’ is a less demanding standard than probable cause and requires a showing considerably less than preponderance of the evidence, the Fourth Amendment requires at least a minimal level of objective justification for making the stop.”<sup>76</sup> In evaluating the reasonableness of an investigative stop, it is necessary to determine whether the officer's action was justified at its inception, and whether it was reasonably related in scope to circumstances which justified the interference in the first place.”<sup>77</sup>

In establishing reasonable suspicion, the officer must be able to articulate more than an “inchoate and unparticularized suspicion or ‘hunch’” of criminal activity.<sup>78</sup> The “reasonable suspicion” necessary to justify such a stop “is dependent upon both the content of information possessed by police and its degree of reliability.”<sup>79</sup> The standard takes into account “the totality of the circumstances—the whole picture.”<sup>80</sup> Additionally, the permissibility of a particular law enforcement practice is judged by “balancing its intrusion on the individual's Fourth Amendment interests against its promotion of legitimate governmental interests.”<sup>81</sup>

Illinois law allows an officer, after having identified himself as a peace officer to, “stop any person in a public place for a reasonable period of time when the officer reasonable infers from circumstances that the person is committing, is about to commit or has committed an offense...and may demand the name and address of the person and an explanation of their actions. Such detention and temporary questioning will be conducted in the vicinity of where the person was stopped.”<sup>82</sup> Rule 1 of the Chicago Police Department’s Rules of Conduct, prohibits the violation of any law or ordinance.

In this instance, the evidence is clear that it was after the officers spoke to Mr. ██████ in person, providing the officers the opportunity to assess Mr. ██████ credibility first-hand. It was this conversation during which Mr. ██████ related the numerous aforementioned facts, which led to the officers’ decision to stop the red Mercedes.<sup>83</sup> This information, specifically the actions of the red Mercedes taken in light of Mr. ██████ attempts to evade the vehicle, coupled with the time of day of the stop,<sup>84</sup> provided reasonable suspicion that the driver of the red Mercedes was contemplating or engaged in criminal activity.<sup>85</sup> In weighing the intrusion upon Mr. ██████ liberty against the governmental interests in determining if an individual is driving around stalking or potentially preparing to commit another crime at the hour of 3:00am, the stop of Mr. ██████

---

<sup>75</sup> See *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1, 30 (1968)

<sup>76</sup> See *Illinois v. Wardlaw*, 528 U.S. 119, 123 (2000) (citing *United States v. Sokolow*, 490 U.S. 1, 7 (1989)).

<sup>77</sup> See *United States v. Sharpe*, 470 U.S. 675 (1982) (citing *Terry v. Ohio*, 392, U.S. at 20)).

<sup>78</sup> See *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. at 27.

<sup>79</sup> See *Navarette v. California*, 134 S. Ct. 1683, 1689 (1981) (quoting *Alabama v. White*, 496 U.S. 325, 330 (1990)).

<sup>80</sup> See *Navarette v. California* at 1689 (quoting *United States v. Cortez*, 449 U.S. 411, 417 (1981)).

<sup>81</sup> See *United States v. Villamonte-Marquez*, 462 U.S. 579, 588 (1983); *Delaware v. Prouse*, 440 U.S. 648, 654 (1979); *Camara v. Municipal Court*, 387 U.S. 523 (1967).

<sup>82</sup> 725 ILCS 5/107-14.

<sup>83</sup> See Investigative Report incorporated as Attachment #60.

<sup>84</sup> The investigatory stop took place at approximately 3:00am.

<sup>85</sup> COPA noted the definition of stalking in 720 ILCS 5/12-7.3 when an individual, “knowing engages in a course of conduct directed at a specific person, and he or she knows or should know that this course of conduct would cause a reasonable person to fear for his or her safety...”

was needed to assuage not only the fear of Mr. [REDACTED] but the concern of the police officers that criminal activity might be afoot. As such, COPA finds the investigatory stop of [REDACTED] Mr. [REDACTED] vehicle by Officer [REDACTED] and Officer [REDACTED] was within the parameters of the laws and within Chicago Police Department Rules and the officers are EXONERATED from allegations of wrongdoing relative to the stop of the vehicle.

### **Allegation #2: Unlawfully detained [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 1**

In conducting an investigatory stop, officers may “briefly detain” an individual to confirm or dispel their suspicions which justified the stop. In assessing whether a detention is too long in duration to be justified as an investigative stop, it is appropriate to examine whether the police diligently pursued a means of investigation that was likely to confirm or dispel their suspicions quickly, during which time it was necessary to detain the defendant.<sup>86</sup> The interviews of the officers, as well as the body worn camera video, have established that the entirety of the interaction between the officers and Mr. [REDACTED] inclusive of the detention of Mr. [REDACTED] took approximately 5 minutes. During that time, the officers conducted a name check on the Mr. [REDACTED] as protective down of Mr. [REDACTED] and a search of Mr. [REDACTED] vehicle. The evidence demonstrates the officers proficiently and diligently pursued their investigation, and Mr. [REDACTED] was detained for only as long as the officers needed to dispel the notion that Mr. [REDACTED] had committed or was about to commit a crime.

In this instance, the evidence is clear that the officers briefly detained [REDACTED] Mr. [REDACTED] to dispel their suspicions which justified the stop. At no time did was the stop unreasonably delayed by the officers’ actions. After observing what they reasonably believed to be cannabis on the floorboard area of the vehicle, the officers conducted a quick and cursory search of the vehicle which is permitted under the law.<sup>87</sup> Because the officers’ actions were within the bounds of the law, they did not violate Rule 1 of the Chicago Police Department’s Rules of Conduct, which prohibits the violation of any law or ordinance. As such, COPA finds the detention of [REDACTED] Mr. [REDACTED] by Officer [REDACTED] Officer [REDACTED] Officer [REDACTED] and Officer [REDACTED] was within the parameters of the law and within Chicago Police Department Rules and the officers are EXONERATED from allegations of wrongdoing relative to the detention of [REDACTED] Mr. [REDACTED]

### **Allegation #3: Unlawfully searched [REDACTED] vehicle in violation of Rule 1**

The evidence has established that Officer [REDACTED] and Officer [REDACTED] conducted a search of Mr. [REDACTED] vehicle. This search was made after Officer [REDACTED] and Officer [REDACTED] observed what they believed to be cannabis on the passenger side floorboard of Mr. [REDACTED] vehicle. The Supreme Court has held that because there is a lesser expectation of privacy of one’s vehicle as opposed to one’s person, a warrantless search may be conducted if there is probable

---

<sup>86</sup> See *United States v. Sharpe*, at 686-688.

<sup>87</sup> See Allegation #3 below.

cause to believe that the vehicle may contain contraband.<sup>88</sup> Despite Illinois lessening the penalties and fines associated with the possession of small amounts of cannabis, it is still considered illegal to be in possession of it without a medical prescription.<sup>89</sup>

Both Officer [REDACTED] and Officer [REDACTED] explained the basis for their belief that what they observed on the floorboard was cannabis. Officer [REDACTED] stated he came to this conclusion due to his training and experience in [REDACTED] District, which included, “hundreds of narcotics arrests.” Officer [REDACTED] further explained he, “sees marijuana daily.” Officer [REDACTED] further described the suspect cannabis he observed as, “shake residue.” Officer [REDACTED] explained that when individuals roll cannabis cigarettes or cigars some of the items fall out. He stated you see the items alongside the door, by the center counsel, if they don’t get it all in the joint paper or cigar paper. When asked why he believed what he saw on the floorboard was cannabis, Officer [REDACTED] stated, “I’ve been a police officer for 10 years, I see cannabis on a daily basis. It is a distinct item. It was a very small chunks or kernel; it had a kernel-type shape.” Officer [REDACTED] and Officer [REDACTED] accounts were supported by their body worn camera footage and COPA finds the officers account credible. Mr. [REDACTED] admitted that there was a green substance by the front driver’s seat of the vehicle that had him second guessing whether it was marijuana after the incident.<sup>90</sup>

Because the facts in this instance clearly establish that the search conducted by Officer [REDACTED] and Officer [REDACTED] was valid and justified, COPA finds that the search of Mr. [REDACTED] vehicle was within the parameters of the law and within Chicago Police Department Rules and the officers are EXONERATED from allegations of wrongdoing with regards to the search of Mr. [REDACTED] vehicle.

#### **Allegation #4: Failure to perform any duty in violation of Rule 5**

A review of the Investigatory Stop Report in this case reveals two inaccuracies in its completion. The first error in the report indicates the individual’s identity was not verified by ID, when in fact the officers were in possession of Mr. [REDACTED] driver’s license at some point during the traffic stop. The second error in the report indicates a protective pat down was not conducted, when the evidence is clear Officer [REDACTED] conducted a protective pat down of Mr. [REDACTED] Officer [REDACTED] authored the Investigatory Stop Report and appears in the box for the First Officer. Officer [REDACTED] was listed in the report as the Second Officer. Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] admitted they possessed Mr. [REDACTED] license and conducted a protective down of Mr. [REDACTED]

When questioned as to why the Investigatory Stop Report was inaccurate, Officer [REDACTED] stated, “It was something I overlooked and a clerical error. It was the end of the shift and we were writing numerous reports.”<sup>91</sup> Officer [REDACTED] stated after viewing the body worn camera video, he saw his partner was holding the driver’s license in his hand. Additionally, Officer [REDACTED] explained, “After reviewing the body cam, it does indicate that my partner conducted a protective

---

<sup>88</sup> See *United States v. Ross*, at 799.

<sup>89</sup> Mr. [REDACTED] did not indicate he had a prescription and the officers had no reason to suspect he had a license when Mr. [REDACTED] denied smoking marijuana.

<sup>90</sup> Mr. [REDACTED] ultimately asserted it was a piece of grass or something similarly innocuous.

<sup>91</sup> Attachment #40, timestamp 06:00.

pat down of the driver.”<sup>92</sup> Officer ██████ stated his recording otherwise was a clerical error. He added, the pat down was recorded, and he was not trying to hide anything. When Officer ██████ was questioned as to why the Investigatory Stop Report contained inaccuracies, Officer ██████ stated the report was written by Officer ██████. He also stated he did not review the report. Officer ██████ stated that it was simply a mistake. Officer ██████ added, “It was at the end of the day, I should have looked it over, but didn’t. I was writing other investigatory stops at the time.”<sup>93</sup> Officer ██████ stated at the time the report was written he was not aware of the fact it indicated no protective pat down was conducted. He confirmed he conducted a protective pat down of Mr. ██████.

Chicago Police Department Rule 10 prohibits an inattention to duty and Rule 5 prohibits the failure to perform any duty. It is clear Officer ██████ and Officer ██████ demonstrated an inattention to duty by failing to accurately complete the Investigatory Stop Report for this incident<sup>94</sup>. Though the two mistakes were “clerical oversights” or “mistakes” in the words of Officer ██████ and Officer ██████<sup>95</sup> the Investigatory Stop Report functions to, “protect the public, preserve the rights of all members of the community, and enforce the law impartially.”<sup>96</sup> The necessity of accurate report writing cannot be understated, especially in the realm of law enforcement, where officers deal with a high volume of citizen interactions and may be called upon to make a complete and accurate recounting of what occurred during a specific incident months or years later. It is for these reasons; COPA finds the allegations of failing to accurately complete the investigatory stop report against Officers ██████ and ██████ are SUSTAINED.<sup>97</sup>

## VII. RECOMMENDED DISCIPLINE FOR SUSTAINED ALLEGATIONS

- a. Officer ██████ # ██████
  - i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History
    1. Complimentary:
    2. Disciplinary:
  - ii. Recommended Penalty
    1. COPA recommends a penalty of Violation Noted.
    2. Mitigating factor: The violation was administrative in nature.
    3. Aggravating factor:
- b. Officer ██████ # ██████
  - i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History
    1. Complimentary: 32 Honorable Mentions
    2. Disciplinary:

---

<sup>92</sup> Attachment #40, timestamp 06:40.

<sup>93</sup> Attachment #41, timestamp 04:48.

<sup>94</sup> COPA noted that while Mr. ██████ stated he was not given any receipt or anything after the traffic stop, the Investigatory Stop Report indicates no investigatory stop receipt was given “due to subject leaving before officers were able to give him one.”

<sup>95</sup> However, there is no evidence that Officers ██████ and ██████ purposefully filled out the report inaccurately.

<sup>96</sup> See Chicago Police Department Special Order S04-13-09 – Investigatory Stop System, Section III (A).

<sup>97</sup> Officer ██████ admitted he should have looked over the report and his name is on the report as the second officer.

**ii. Recommended Penalty**

1. COPA recommends a penalty of Violation Noted.
2. Mitigating factor: The violation was administrative in nature. There are no sustained allegations of misconduct within the last 7 years.
3. Aggravating factor:

**VIII. CONCLUSION**

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

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Officer [REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unlawfully stopped [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 1</li> <li>2. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 1.</li> <li>3. Unlawfully searched [REDACTED] vehicle in violation of Rule 1.</li> <li>4. Failed to accurately complete the investigatory stop report in violation of Rules 5 and 10.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Exonerated</li> <li>2. Exonerated</li> <li>3. Exonerated</li> <li>4. Sustained / Violation Noted</li> </ol>
Officer [REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unlawfully stopped [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 1</li> <li>2. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED] Mr. [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 1.</li> <li>3. Failed to accurately complete the investigatory stop report in violation of Rules 5 and 10.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Exonerated</li> <li>2. Exonerated</li> <li>3. Sustained / Violation Noted</li> </ol>
Officer [REDACTED]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 1.</li> <li>2. Conducted an unlawful search of [REDACTED] vehicle in violation of Rule 1.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Exonerated</li> <li>2. Exonerated</li> </ol>

---

Officer [REDACTED]	1. Unlawfully detained [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 1.	1. Exonerated
--------------------	---	---------------

Approved:



7-15-2020

---

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>	Angela Hearts-Glass