

## SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Date / Time of Incident:	October 22, 2019, approximately 4:12 p.m.
Location of Incident:	5530 W. Homer St., Chicago, Illinois
Date / Time of COPA Notification:	October 22, 2019, approximately 7:53 p.m.

On October 22, 2019, at approximately 4:12 p.m., while driving a personal vehicle, off-duty Chicago Police Department (“CPD”) Officer Aladino R. Santiago (“Officer Santiago”) exchanged words with a motorist, ██████████ (“██████”) near the intersection of North Central and West Wabansia Avenues in Chicago. ████████ then threw an object, striking Officer Santiago’s car. In response, Officer Santiago followed ████████ to a parking lot at or near 5530 West Homer Street in Chicago, where ████████ had stopped and was standing next to his car. Officer Santiago then got out of his own car and engaged briefly with ████████, identifying himself as a police officer during that encounter. Both men then left the scene.

██████ went to the CPD’s 025<sup>th</sup> District Station, where he made a complaint about Officer Santiago to the on-duty District Station Supervisor, CPD Sgt. Sandi J. Hawwat (“Sgt. Hawwat”). In his complaint to Sgt. Hawwat, ████████ gave a description of his traffic encounter and subsequent altercation with Officer Santiago, alleging that at the parking lot, Officer Santiago had unholstered a weapon and had pushed him. Officer Santiago called 911 from his car, asking for a CPD supervisor to meet him at the incident scene. CPD Sgt. Edward J. Ranzzoni (“Sgt. Ranzzoni”), CPD Officer Tyler LaFlamme (“Officer LaFlamme”), and CPD Officer James Cervone (“Officer Cervone”) responded, meeting with Officer Santiago at the incident scene, to which Officer Santiago had returned. Officer Santiago then provided Sgt. Ranzzoni with a brief description of the traffic encounter and the subsequent parking lot altercation, informing Sgt. Ranzzoni that he and ████████ both got out of their cars, that ████████ had approached him, and that Officer Santiago had pushed ████████ away.

Sgt. Ranzzoni and Officer Santiago then relocated to the 025<sup>th</sup> District Station. Officers Michael A. Matias and Angel Ortiz (“Officer Matias” and “Officer Ortiz”) responded to the 025<sup>th</sup> District Station and arrested ████████ in the presence of Sgts. Hawwat and Ranzzoni at the direction of one or both of the sergeants. Neither Officer Matias, Officer Ortiz, nor Sgt. Ranzzoni recorded that arrest with their BWCs.

COPA investigated ████████’s complaints regarding his encounter with Officer Santiago and his subsequent arrest, as well as the events occurring at the station not having been recorded on BWC. COPA finds that (1) Officer Santiago committed misconduct by engaging in an unjustified altercation with ████████; (2) Sgt Ranzzoni engaged in misconduct by failing to record the ████████’s arrest with his own BWC and failing to ensure that Officers Matias and Ortiz recorded ████████’s arrest with their BWC, but there was insufficient evidence to find Sgt. Hawwat committed that same violation regarding Officers Matias and Ortiz; and (3) there is insufficient evidence to show that the arrest was improper.

**II. INVOLVED PARTIES**

Involved Officer #1:	Aladino R. Santiago, Star# 5335, Employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: April 26, 2004; Rank: Police Officer Unit of Assignment: 010; DOB: [REDACTED], 1964; M/S
Involved Sergeant #1:	Edward J. Ranzzoni, Star# 1776, Employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: May 26, 1998; Rank: Sergeant Unit of Assignment: 018; DOB: [REDACTED], 1971; M/S
Involved Sergeant #2:	Sandi J. Hawwat, Star# 2116, Employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: June 25, 2001; Rank: Sergeant Unit of Assignment: 025/376; DOB: [REDACTED], 1977; F/WHI
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED], DOB: [REDACTED], 2000; M/B

**III. ALLEGATIONS**

<b>Officer</b>	<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Finding / Recommendation</b>
Officer Aladino Santiago	On October 22, 2019, at approximately 4:12PM, at or near 5530 W. Homer St., Chicago, Illinois, Officer Aladino R. Santiago committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions:  1.) Engaging in an unjustified verbal and/or physical altercation, with [REDACTED].	Sustained / 5-day Suspension and training
Sgt. Edward Ranzzoni	On October 22, 2019, at approximately 5:09PM, at or near 5530 W. Homer St., Chicago, Illinois, and/or at approximately 5:50PM, at or near 5555 W. Grand Ave., Chicago, Illinois, Sgt. Edward J. Ranzzoni committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions:  1. Failing to operate his body-worn camera in accordance with CPD Special Order S03-14, Body Worn Cameras;  2. Failing to direct officers under his command to operate their body-worn cameras in accordance with CPD Special Order S03-14, Body Worn Cameras; and  3. Retaliating against, punishing, intimidating, discouraging, threatening, and/or penalizing [REDACTED] for reporting misconduct and/or making a complaint of misconduct against a CPD member.	Sustained / 10-day Suspension  Sustained / 10-day Suspension  Not Sustained

Sgt. Sandi Hawwat	<p>On October 22, 2019, at approximately 5:50PM, at or near 5555 W. Grand Ave., Chicago, Illinois, Sgt. Sandi J. Hawwat committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions:</p> <p>1. Failing to direct officers under her command to operate their body-worn cameras in accordance with CPD Special Order S03-14, Body Worn Cameras; and</p> <p>2. Retaliating against, punishing, intimidating, discouraging, threatening, and/or penalizing ██████ ██████ for reporting misconduct and/or making a complaint of misconduct against a CPD member.</p>	<p>Not Sustained</p> <p>Not Sustained</p>
-------------------	---	---

#### IV. APPLICABLE RULES AND LAWS

##### Rules

1. Rule 1, CPD Rules of Conduct (prohibiting the violation of any law or ordinance)
2. Rule 6, CPD Rules of Conduct (prohibiting the disobedience of a directive)
3. Rule 9, CPD Rules of Conduct (prohibiting any unjustified verbal or physical altercation with any person, while on or off duty).

##### Special Orders

1. Special Order S03-14 *Body Worn Cameras* (effective April 30, 2018)
2. Special Order S03-03-05 *District Station Supervisors* (effective March 3, 2017)
3. Special Order S03-03-06 *District Field Sergeants* (effective March 3, 2017)

##### City Ordinances

1. Municipal Code of Chicago, §2-78-160.

#### V. INVESTIGATION

##### A. Interviews

██████████

On October 29, 2019, COPA interviewed the Complainant, ██████████.<sup>1</sup> The following is a non-verbatim material summary of that interview.

██████████ stated that he had been driving northbound on North Central Avenue when he observed a car behind him that was “driving like kind of irregular.”<sup>2</sup> He exchanged words with the other

<sup>1</sup> Attachment #16 is an audio recording of that interview.

<sup>2</sup> See *id.*, at 2:47 and immediately following.

driver (now known to be Officer Santiago) and threw a plastic juice container in the direction of the other driver's car. [REDACTED] further stated that he ([REDACTED]) then turned right (eastbound) onto West Homer Street, and that Officer Santiago followed him. [REDACTED] further stated that he then parked his car in a lot adjacent to a theater located at 5530 West Homer Street, and that he then got out of his car. According to [REDACTED], Officer Santiago then arrived at the lot, parked, got of his own car, and approached [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that Officer Santiago then pushed [REDACTED] in the chest using two hands, saying, among other things, "I'm the police mother f[\*]cker."<sup>3</sup> According to [REDACTED], Officer Santiago then unholstered a pistol, holding it at his own side, and not pointing it at [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that they exchanged words and that he ([REDACTED]) then got into his own car and drove to the CPD's 025<sup>th</sup> District Station to report the incident.

When he arrived at the 025<sup>th</sup> District, [REDACTED] spoke to a female CPD supervisor (now known to be Sgt. Sandi J. Hawwat) to make a complaint about Officer Santiago, CPD officers arrested him as he made his complaint, telling him that he was being charged with assault for having thrown something at Officer Santiago's car.

*Officer Michael A. Matias*

Officer Michael A. Matias gave a statement to COPA on February 14, 2020.<sup>4</sup> Officer Matias is listed as the reporting officer in the CPD's Original Incident Case Report relating to the events under review.<sup>5</sup> Officer Matias is also listed as an arresting officer in the CPD's Arrest Report relating to the events, along with Officer Angel Ortiz.<sup>6</sup> In material summary, and non-verbatim, Officer Matias then gave the following account:

On the date in question, Officers Matias and Ortiz received an OEMC radio broadcast message directing them to go into the CPD's 025<sup>th</sup> District Station.<sup>7</sup> Upon arriving at the station as directed, the two officers met with Sgt. Edward J. Ranzzoni, who told them that an off-duty police officer had been involved in an incident and that they were going to prepare a report.<sup>8</sup> Officer Matias then understood that he was expected to prepare an original case report,<sup>9</sup> though he didn't learn that he was going to prepare an arrest report until later, after he had spoken with Sgt. Hawwat, who was the desk sergeant.<sup>10</sup> Officers Matias and Ortiz then spoke with the off-duty officer (Santiago), who was with Sgt. Ranzzoni. Officer Santiago reported that he had been driving when he heard a thump, as if something had hit his car. He then followed [REDACTED]'s car into a parking lot to get a photo of his license plate, where [REDACTED] got out of his car, argued with him and got close to him.<sup>11</sup> Officer Santiago said that when [REDACTED] came up to him, he pushed [REDACTED] away.<sup>12</sup> Sgt. Ranzzoni

<sup>3</sup> See *id.*, at 4:08 and immediately following.

<sup>4</sup> Attachments ## 26 and 27 comprise an audio recording of that statement; Attachment #28 is a transcription.

<sup>5</sup> Attachment #9 is an image of that Original Incident Case Report.

<sup>6</sup> Attachment #10 is an image of that Arrest Report.

<sup>7</sup> Attachment #28, p. 6, line 17, through p. 7, line 5. An audio recording of OEMC broadcasts (Attachment #6), an OEMC Event Query Report (Attachment #12), and an Attendance & Assignment Record (Attachment #1) show that at approximately 5:17 p.m., Sgt. Edward Ranzzoni (using call sign 2550) broadcasted a request for a two-officer unit to come into the 025<sup>th</sup> District Station, and that OEMC then assigned that task to Officers Matias and Ortiz, who were using call sign 2513.

<sup>8</sup> Attachment #28, p. 13, line 24, through p. 14, line 5. GPS records (Attachment #54) show that Officers Matias and Ortiz arrived at the 025<sup>th</sup> District Station at approximately 5:23 p.m.

<sup>9</sup> Attachment #28, p. 19, lines 3 - 12.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*, p. 15, lines 15 - 22.

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*, p. 16, line 13, through p. 18, line 10.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*, p. 39, line 15, through p. 40, line 6.

pointed out █████, who was then meeting with Sgt. Hawwat.<sup>13</sup> Officers Matias and Ortiz then went to speak with █████, not knowing that █████ was going to be arrested.<sup>14</sup> The officers did not then speak directly with █████.<sup>15</sup> Officer Matias heard Sgt. Hawwat say to █████ that █████ was changing his story, and Officer Matias observed Sgt. Hawwat place █████ in handcuffs.<sup>16</sup> It was at that moment that Officer Matias first realized that █████ was going to be arrested.<sup>17</sup> Officer Matias later learned that █████ had come into the station to make a complaint of misconduct against Officer Santiago.<sup>18</sup> Officer Matias did not activate his body-worn camera during the events because he was in a police station and he did not think to turn it on.<sup>19</sup> Officers Matias and Ortiz did not inspect Officer Santiago's car to verify that it had, in fact, been damaged, or to describe any such damage in their reports.<sup>20</sup>

*Officer Angel Ortiz*

Officer Angel Ortiz also gave a statement to COPA on February 14, 2020.<sup>21</sup> Officer Ortiz then gave an account that was substantially similar to the account that Officer Matias gave to COPA earlier that day.

*Officer Aladino R. Santiago*

Officer Aladino R. Santiago gave a statement to COPA on June 18, 2020.<sup>22</sup> In material summary, and not verbatim (except where otherwise indicated) Officer Santiago then gave the following account:

While off-duty, Officer Santiago had been driving northbound on North Central Avenue, just north of its intersection with West Wabansia Avenue.<sup>23</sup> Officer Santiago then heard profane screaming coming from another driver, now known to be █████.<sup>24</sup> █████ pulled into Officer Santiago's lane and opened his car door, "as if to intimidate" Officer Santiago.<sup>25</sup> Officer Santiago ignored █████ and started to drive away.<sup>26</sup> Officer Santiago then heard a "thump," and he then knew that █████ had thrown something at his car.<sup>27</sup> It sounded to Officer Santiago as if that object was a plastic bottle, but Officer Santiago does not know what the object was.<sup>28</sup> Officer Santiago pulled out his phone to take a photograph of █████'s license plates to make a report.<sup>29</sup> █████ then drove northbound and made a right turn on West Homer Street from North Central Avenue.<sup>30</sup> Officer

---

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*, p. 18, lines 11 - 22.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*, p. 22, line 9, through p. 23, line 5.

<sup>15</sup> *Id.*, p. 23, line 8.

<sup>16</sup> *Id.*, p. 25, lines 11 - 21.

<sup>17</sup> *Id.*, p. 25, lines 6 - 10.

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*, p. 27, line 16, through p. 28, line 9.

<sup>19</sup> *Id.*, p. 46, line 19, through p. 47, line 3.

<sup>20</sup> *Id.*, p. 21, line 18, through p. 22, line 8.

<sup>21</sup> Attachments ## 29 and 30 comprise an audio recording of that statement; Attachment #31 is its transcription.

<sup>22</sup> Attachments ## 41 and 42 comprise an audio recording of that statement; Attachment #43 is its transcription.

<sup>23</sup> *Id.*, p. 16, lines 5 - 7.

<sup>24</sup> *Id.*, p. 16, lines 9 - 14.

<sup>25</sup> *Id.*, p. 16, lines 20 - 22.

<sup>26</sup> *Id.*, p. 16, lines 22 - 23.

<sup>27</sup> *Id.*, p. 16, line 24, through p. 17, line 1.

<sup>28</sup> *Id.*, p. 26, line 19, through p. 27, line 21.

<sup>29</sup> *Id.*, p. 17, lines 2 - 4.

<sup>30</sup> *Id.*, p. 17, lines 6 - 8; p. 19, lines 3 - 11.

Santiago knew where [REDACTED] was going, so he followed him.<sup>31</sup> Officer Santiago was then able to see from a distance that [REDACTED] had stopped his own car in a parking lot, and that [REDACTED] was standing next to his own car.<sup>32</sup>

Officer Santiago stopped his own car in that lot about a car length away from [REDACTED]'s car.<sup>33</sup> [REDACTED]'s fists were clenched.<sup>34</sup> Officer Santiago then got out of his car because he was upset and because he wanted to inform [REDACTED] that he had committed a crime.<sup>35</sup> Officer Santiago did not plan to make an arrest.<sup>36</sup> Officer Santiago announced his office.<sup>37</sup> [REDACTED] came towards Officer Santiago, who said, "I told you I'm the police."<sup>38</sup> Officer Santiago pushed [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] pushed back.<sup>39</sup> [REDACTED] said, "Oh, you're the mother f[\*]cking police."<sup>40</sup> Officer Santiago said, "I told you I was the police. I told you."<sup>41</sup> Officer Santiago and [REDACTED] then got back into their cars and they both left the scene, with Officer Santiago headed to the CPD's 025<sup>th</sup> District Station to make a report.<sup>42</sup> Altogether, Officer Santiago and [REDACTED] were together in the lot for approximately fifteen to twenty seconds.<sup>43</sup>

Officer Santiago went directly from the lot to the 025<sup>th</sup> District Station, where he waited inside for approximately five to six minutes.<sup>44</sup> Officer Santiago then realized that he did not know the address for the lot where the events he wished to report had transpired, so he returned to that location in order to ascertain its address.<sup>45</sup> Officer Santiago called 911 from that location.<sup>46</sup> While at the lot, Officer Santiago observed that the object thrown by [REDACTED] had left a "scuff mark" on his car that Officer Santiago was able to rub off with his hand, but that the object caused no other damage.<sup>47</sup>

COPA directed Officer Santiago's attention to BWC footage showing him at the Homer Street Scene with Officer LaFlamme, Officer Cervone, and Sgt. Ranzoni. Due to buffering, none of that footage contains an audio component during its first two minutes.<sup>48</sup> COPA then asked Officer

---

<sup>31</sup> *Id.*, p. 17, lines 7 - 8.

<sup>32</sup> *Id.*, p. 20, lines 2 - 23.

<sup>33</sup> *Id.*, p. 20, line 24, through p. 25, line 9.

<sup>34</sup> *Id.*, p. 17, line 11.

<sup>35</sup> *Id.*, p. 24, line 22, through p. 25, line 3.

<sup>36</sup> *Id.*, p. 25, lines 4 - 5.

<sup>37</sup> *Id.*, p. 17, lines 12 - 13.

<sup>38</sup> *Id.*, p. 17, lines 13 - 14.

<sup>39</sup> *Id.*, p. 17, lines 14 - 15.

<sup>40</sup> *Id.*, p. 17, line 16.

<sup>41</sup> *Id.*, p. 17, lines 17 - 18.

<sup>42</sup> *Id.*, p. 17, lines 19 - 21; p. 25, line 14, through p. 26, line 20.

<sup>43</sup> *Id.*, p. 25, lines 6 - 11.

<sup>44</sup> *Id.*, p. 17, line 22, through p. 18, line 6.

<sup>45</sup> *Id.*, p. 17, line 22, through p. 18, line 6.

<sup>46</sup> *Id.*, p. 31, lines 9 - 14. An OEMC broadcast (Attachment #3) and an associated Event Query Report (Attachment #2) confirms that such a 911 call was made at approximately 4:36 p.m. on the date in question. According to Event Query Report, the call was made by a person who had identified himself as Officer Santiago, who stated that (1) an unknown male had thrown something at Officer Santiago's car, (2) Officer Santiago chased that person into a theater parking lot, (3) the person fled when Officer Santiago identified himself, and (4) Officer Santiago wanted to make a report.

<sup>47</sup> See Attachment #43, p. 22, line 9, through p. 24, line 2.

<sup>48</sup> *Id.*, p. 31, lines 15 - 24. Copies of BWC footage recorded by those CPD members are Attachments ## 4 (Sgt. Ranzoni), 5 (Officer LaFlamme), and 55 (Officer Cervone). That footage is described in more detail at Section V.B below.

Santiago if he was able to disclose what was said at the scene during those two minutes.<sup>49</sup> In response, Officer Santiago stated that he could not hear what the other officers said at the scene during that time frame, but that he remembered that they had asked him what had happened, and that he informed them accordingly.<sup>50</sup> There was no conversation at the scene after those cameras were turned off.<sup>51</sup> From there, Officer Santiago returned to the 025th District Station.<sup>52</sup>

Inside the station, Officer Santiago went to a back room with Sgt. Ranzzoni to do paperwork.<sup>53</sup> While there, Officer Santiago spoke with Sgt. Ranzzoni concerning the preparation of a tactical response report,<sup>54</sup> and with Sgt. Hawwat, who informed Officer Santiago that ██████ was going to be arrested.<sup>55</sup> Officer Santiago did not request that such an arrest should be made.<sup>56</sup> Officer Santiago does not know who made the decision to arrest ██████.<sup>57</sup>

*Sgt. Edward J. Ranzzoni*

Sgt. Edward J. Ranzzoni gave a statement to COPA on June 24, 2020.<sup>58</sup> Immediately before commencing that statement, COPA allowed Sgt. Ranzzoni to view body-worn camera footage that he recorded at the 5530 West Homer Street parking lot scene.<sup>59</sup> In material summary, and not verbatim (except where indicated) Sgt. Ranzzoni gave the following account:

Sgt. Ranzzoni relocated from the Homer Street scene to the 025<sup>th</sup> District Station.<sup>60</sup> Sgt. Ranzzoni then met with Officer Santiago behind the district desk.<sup>61</sup> Officer Santiago had already arrived there by the time that Sgt. Ranzzoni arrived.<sup>62</sup> Within a few minutes of Sgt. Ranzzoni's arrival at 025<sup>th</sup> District Station, Officer Santiago pointed to ██████, who was also there, near the district desk.<sup>63</sup> From the station, Sgt. Ranzzoni then made a radio call for a car to come in and make a case report.<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> See Attachment #43, p. 32, lines 4 - 6.

<sup>50</sup> *Id.*, p. 32, lines 7 - 13. An Event Query Report (Attachment #2) shows that OEMC initially dispatched CPD Beat 2555 to the Homer Street scene. According to an Attendance and Assignment Record (Attachment #1, at p. 20 thereof), Beat 2555 was then occupied by Officers LaFlamme and Cervone. BWC footage recorded by those officers (Attachments ## 5 and 55) shows that they arrived at the Homer Street scene not later than 5:02 p.m. and that they activated their BWCs at approximately 5:04 p.m. See Attachments ## 5 and 55. Sgt. Ranzzoni's BWC footage relating to the event shows that he arrived at the Homer Street scene at about 5:03 p.m. and that he activated his BWC immediately upon arriving there. See Attachment #4.

<sup>51</sup> *Id.*, p. 32, lines 14 - 18.

<sup>52</sup> *Id.*, p. 32, line 19, through p. 33, line 1.

<sup>53</sup> *Id.*, p. 36, lines 7 - 20.

<sup>54</sup> *Id.*, p. 36, line 21, through p. 37, line 4.

<sup>55</sup> *Id.*, p. 33, lines 6 - 21.

<sup>56</sup> *Id.*, p. 39, line 16, through p. 40, line 1.

<sup>57</sup> *Id.*, p. 40, lines 2 - 16.

<sup>58</sup> Attachment #47 is an audio recording of that statement; Attachment #48 is its transcription.

<sup>59</sup> Attachment #48, p. 10, lines 12 - 20.

<sup>60</sup> *Id.*, p. 22, lines 1 - 5. Sgt. Ranzzoni had been dispatched to the scene in response to Officer Santiago's 911 call. See Attachment #2 (an OEMC Event Query Report of that call). GPS records (Attachment #53) show that Sgt. Ranzzoni left the Homer Street scene at approximately 5:09 p.m. and that he arrived at the 025<sup>th</sup> District Station at approximately 5:11 p.m.

<sup>61</sup> *Id.*, p. 23, lines 10 - 18.

<sup>62</sup> *Id.*, p. 23, lines 19 - 21.

<sup>63</sup> *Id.*, p. 22, line, through p. 24, line 24.

<sup>64</sup> *Id.*, p. 25, line 1, through p. 26, line 1. As noted above, an audio recording of OEMC broadcasts (Attachment #6) and an OEMC Event Query Report (Attachment #12) show that Sgt. Ranzzoni made that request at approximately 5:17 p.m.

Sgt. Ranzzoni then approached the district desk, where Sgt. Hawwat was located.<sup>65</sup> Sgt. Ranzzoni then listened to █████ give his account.<sup>66</sup> Sgt. Ranzzoni asked █████ if he threw something and if Officer Santiago had pointed a gun.<sup>67</sup> Sgt. Hawwat asked █████ the same things.<sup>68</sup> █████ gave inconsistent accounts;<sup>69</sup> he contradicted himself.<sup>70</sup> █████ said that Officer Santiago had pointed a gun, but then he recanted that statement.<sup>71</sup> █████ said that he threw an object, that he had missed, that he was littering.<sup>72</sup>

Sgt. Ranzzoni and Sgt. Hawwat then decided to initiate a complaint against Officer Santiago.<sup>73</sup> Sgt. Ranzzoni decided that there was probable cause to arrest █████, and he directed the officers who had come into the station (known by COPA to be Matias and Ortiz) to make a report to place █████ under arrest.<sup>74</sup> Sgt. Ranzzoni did not then know if those officers had their body worn cameras activated; he allowed that he probably should have told them to turn on their cameras, but that didn't occur to him at the time.<sup>75</sup> Sgt. Ranzzoni did not activate his own body-worn camera because body-worn cameras are not normally activated within the confines of a police station.<sup>76</sup>

Sgt. Ranzzoni then met with Officers Santiago, Matias, and Ortiz to make sure that they did their paperwork.<sup>77</sup> Officer Santiago told Sgt. Ranzzoni that the object thrown by █████ had caused scratches to his car.<sup>78</sup>

*Sgt Sandi. J. Hawwat*

Sgt Sandi. J. Hawwat gave a statement to COPA on December 16, 2020.<sup>79</sup> In material summary (non-verbatim except where otherwise indicated), Sgt. Hawwat gave the following account:

Sgt. Hawwat was the 025<sup>th</sup> District Station Supervisor at the time in question.<sup>80</sup> She had not met Officer Santiago previously.<sup>81</sup> While working the desk, she was alerted that █████ wanted to make an allegation of misconduct.<sup>82</sup> Sgt. Hawwat then interviewed █████ at the desk.<sup>83</sup> That interview took “maybe 30 – 45 minutes.”<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> Attachment #48, p. 35, lines 6 - 16.

<sup>66</sup> *Id.*, p. 35, lines 17 - 20.

<sup>67</sup> *Id.*, p. 36, lines 11 - 17.

<sup>68</sup> *Id.*, p. 36, lines 18 - 24.

<sup>69</sup> *Id.*, p. 37, line 13.

<sup>70</sup> *Id.*, p. 38, lines 11 - 22.

<sup>71</sup> *Id.*, p. 38, line 24, through p. 39, line 8.

<sup>72</sup> *Id.*, p. 38, line 24, through p. 39, line 8.

<sup>73</sup> *Id.*, p. 39, lines 11 - 22.

<sup>74</sup> *Id.*, p. 41, lines 12- 24.

<sup>75</sup> *Id.*, p. 44, line 18, through p. 45, line 11.

<sup>76</sup> *Id.*, p. 40, line 20, through p. 41, line 2.

<sup>77</sup> *Id.*, p. 44, lines 8 -11.

<sup>78</sup> *Id.*, p. 48, line 10, through p. 50, line 9.

<sup>79</sup> Attachments ## 50 and 51 comprise an audio recording of that statement; Attachment #52 is its transcription.

<sup>80</sup> Attachment #52, p. 14, lines 10 - 15.

<sup>81</sup> *Id.*, p. 15, lines 1 - 8.

<sup>82</sup> *Id.*, p. 25, line 19, through p. 26, line 4.

<sup>83</sup> *Id.*, p. 26, line 5, through p. 27, line 1.

<sup>84</sup> *Id.*, p. 30, lines 11 - 14.



Sgt. Hawwat spoke with Officer Santiago after he came to the station, and she recalls that Officer Santiago told her that he had encountered someone at the AMC theater, that he was in fear of assault, that “[t]he guy was coming towards him,” and that he threw something at Officer Santiago’s vehicle.<sup>85</sup> Sgt. Hawwat does not recall going outside to examine any of the vehicles involved.<sup>86</sup> She conferred with Sgt. Ranzzoni at the desk area, and both of them determined that ██████ had committed a crime and that he would be arrested.<sup>87</sup> That arrest decision was mutual.<sup>88</sup> Sgt. Hawwat recalls that Officers Matias and Ortiz were present at time of arrest, but she doesn’t recall who placed handcuffs on ██████.<sup>89</sup>

When COPA asked Sgt. Hawwat what, if anything, she had to say in response to the accusation that she did not ensure that Officers Matias and Ortiz had activated their body-worn cameras, Sgt. Hawwat said, “Well, if I’m working a desk, basically, I was just focused on the complaint right here and [█████]. And then the people under my command are the desk people and we don’t wear the body worn cameras. So Ranzzoni and the other officers who were in the station, since it is a self-directed order, I would -- they are supposed to turn on the body worn cameras.”<sup>90</sup> Sgt. Hawwat further said that she “had no knowledge that they were not on according to the order they are supposed to be on. So – but if I had knowledge that they are supposed to be on, of course I would have directed them to be on.”<sup>91</sup> Sgt. Hawwat also said that she had no memory concerning whether the officers’ cameras were signaling that they were activated.<sup>92</sup>

## B. Digital Evidence

COPA reviewed BWC footage recorded at the Homer Street incident scene from approximately 5:03 p.m. - 5:09 p.m. on the incident date.<sup>93</sup> In material summary, that footage depicts a conversation that then took place between Sgt. Ranzzoni and Officer Santiago. During that conversation, Officer Santiago informs Sgt. Ranzzoni that he had been driving northbound on North Central Avenue near Wabansia Avenue, when a person (now known to be ██████) pulled alongside of him and accused Officer Santiago of nearly striking his car. Officer Santiago states that he waved ██████ off and continued to drive. Officer Santiago then heard a thump. Officer Santiago then reports that he followed ██████ into the Homer Street parking lot in order to take a photograph of ██████’s license plate, chasing him. Officer Santiago says that ██████ stopped in the lot and got out of his car. Officer Santiago then stopped his own car about a car length away from ██████ and got out of his own car. ██████ then came out of the car and came up to Officer Santiago and Officer Santiago pushed him. Officer Santiago identified himself as a police officer. ██████ then took a picture of Officer Santiago’s car and left the scene. Sgt. Ranzzoni is then heard saying that ██████ came at Officer Santiago, who was then in fear of receiving a battery, that ██████ then closed the distance, and that ██████ was an assailant. Sgt. Ranzzoni then indicated that a TRR needed to be prepared and that an RD needed to be obtained.

---

<sup>85</sup> *Id.*, p. 15, line 9, through p. 19, line 18.

<sup>86</sup> *Id.*, p. 34, lines 10 - 14.

<sup>87</sup> *Id.*, p. 34, line 15, through p. 36, line 15.

<sup>88</sup> *Id.*, p. 39, line 14, through p. 40, line 4.

<sup>89</sup> *Id.*, p. 40, line 5, through p. 41, line 18.

<sup>90</sup> *See id.*, p. 43, lines 11 - 23.

<sup>91</sup> *See id.*, p. 45, lines 14 - 19.

<sup>92</sup> *See id.*, p. 46, lines 7 - 10.

<sup>93</sup> Attachments ##4, 5, and 55 are copies of that footage, recorded by Sgt. Ranzzoni, Officer LaFlamme, and Officer Cervone, respectively.

COPA reviewed audio recordings of certain OEMC broadcasts made on the incident date.<sup>94</sup> Along with the broadcasts' corresponding event query reports,<sup>95</sup> those recordings show, among other things, that at approximately 4:36 p.m. on October 22, 2019, OEMC's call center received a 911 call from a person who had identified himself as Officer Santiago and who stated (1) that an unknown male had thrown something at Officer Santiago's car, (2) that Officer Santiago had chased that person into a theater parking lot, (3) that the person fled when Officer Santiago identified himself, and (4) that Officer Santiago wanted to make a report. The recordings also show that at approximately 5:17 p.m. that evening, Sgt. Ranzzoni (using call sign 2550) broadcasted a request for a two-officer unit to come into the 025<sup>th</sup> District Station, and that OEMC then assigned that task to Officers Matias and Ortiz, who were using call sign 2513.<sup>96</sup>

On December 3, 2019, COPA investigators interviewed staff of the AMC Galewood Crossings 14 Theater located at 5530 West Homer Street in Chicago and viewed video footage reported to depict the theater's adjacent parking lot at the time of the incident. None of that footage depicted any part of the incident.<sup>97</sup>

### C. Documentary Evidence

#### *CPD Reports*

Sgt. Hawwat submitted the *Initiation Report* that led to the origination of this investigation.<sup>98</sup> In material summary, that report states that █████ claimed to have been pushed by Officer Santiago in a parking lot adjacent to the AMC Galewood Crossings 14 Theater at 5530 West Homer Street in Chicago. The report further states that █████ was arrested at the 025<sup>th</sup> District Station upon Officer Santiago's signed complaints, and that █████ was charged with assault and criminal damage to property.<sup>99</sup>

Officer Matias prepared the CPD's *Original Case Incident Report* relating to the incident.<sup>100</sup> That report contains a narrative describing an account which Officer Matias ascribed to Officer Santiago, which is substantially similar to the account that Officer Santiago provided in his statement to COPA.

Officer Matias is also listed as the attesting officer in the CPD's *Arrest Report* relating to the incident,<sup>101</sup> which also contains a narrative substantially similar to the account that Officer Santiago provided in his statement to COPA, and which indicates that █████ was charged with the offenses of assault and criminal damage to property.

Officer Santiago submitted a *Tactical Response Report* in connection with the events under review.<sup>102</sup> In that report, Officer Santiago stated, in material summary, that at 4:12 pm on the

---

<sup>94</sup> Attachments ## 3 and 6 comprise those recordings.

<sup>95</sup> Attachments ## 2 and 12 are images of those Event Query Reports.

<sup>96</sup> See Attachments ## 2 and 3.

<sup>97</sup> See Attachment #22, which is a COPA Investigative Report describing those events.

<sup>98</sup> Attachment #8 is an image of that report.

<sup>99</sup> See *id.*

<sup>100</sup> Attachment #9 is an image of that report.

<sup>101</sup> Attachment #10 is an image of that report.

<sup>102</sup> Attachment #11 is an image of that report.

incident date he employed an open-handed stun to ██████'s chest area after Officer Santiago perceived ██████ taking action "consistent with an assailant –actions [sic] aggressive without weapons ..." According to Officer Santiago's narrative portion of that report, ██████ "approached in-close [sic] proximity and placed [Officer Santiago] in fear of receiving a battery. In response, [Officer Santiago] utilized open-hand stun to chest area. ... [Officer Santiago] utilized the following force mitigation: presence, verbal direction, and movement. De-escalation techniques utilized were advise, warn, persuade, and instruction. ..."

## 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 is proved by a preponderance of the evidence when it has found to be more probably true than not). If the evidence gathered in an investigation establishes that it is more likely that the 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.

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

## VII. ANALYSIS

### 1. The allegation against Officer Santiago

According to Officer Santiago, (1) he could see ██████, from a distance, standing next to his car in a parking lot, (2) he approached ██████'s car and stopped his car about a car length away, (3) ██████ was then standing there with his fists clenched, and (4) Officer Santiago then got out of his own car to engage with ██████, "because he was upset," but not to make an arrest. According to the officer's account, as well as ██████'s, both a verbal and physical altercation then ensued. Based on Officer Santiago's own account, COPA finds that Officer Santiago's act in getting out of his car to engage and the resulting altercation he had with ██████ were both not justified, because Officer Santiago admittedly did not do so for law enforcement purposes. COPA accordingly finds that Officer Santiago's actions violated Rule 9 of the CPD Rules of Conduct, which prohibits unjustified verbal and physical altercations, including those occurring off-duty. The sole allegation against Officer Santiago is therefore **SUSTAINED**.

## 2. The body-worn camera allegations against Sgts. Ranzzoni and Hawwat

The CPD's body-worn camera directive required Sgt. Ranzzoni to activate his body-worn camera system to event mode at the beginning of an incident and to record the entirety of that incident for "all law-enforcement-related activities."<sup>103</sup> According to that directive, "law-enforcement-related activities" include, but are not limited to, arrests, "statements made by individuals in the course of an investigation," and "any other instance when enforcing the law."<sup>104</sup> Sgt. Ranzzoni was therefore required by the directive to activate his body-worn camera system to event mode at the 025<sup>th</sup> District Station when he began to participate in a conversation with [REDACTED] and Sgt. Hawwat, as that conversation included statements made by [REDACTED] in the course of an investigation. The directive also requires CPD supervisors assigned to oversee officers using BWCs to ensure that other CPD members are utilizing their own BWC systems as required.<sup>105</sup> Sgt. Ranzzoni, a field sergeant, was therefore required to direct Officers Matias and Ortiz to activate their systems to record [REDACTED]'s arrest.<sup>106</sup> Sgt. Ranzzoni acknowledged this responsibility during his statement, stating that he probably should have directed Officers Matias and Ortiz to activate their cameras.<sup>107</sup> For the above reasons, COPA finds that Sgt. Ranzzoni's omissions constituted violations of Rule 6 of the CPD Rules of Conduct, which prohibits the disobedience of any CPD directive. Allegations #1 and #2 against Sgt. Ranzzoni are accordingly **SUSTAINED**. Sgt. Hawwat, on the other hand, worked inside the 025<sup>th</sup> District Station and was overseeing officers who do not utilize body-worn cameras. While she was a superior member to Officers Matias and Ortiz, she was not their immediate supervisor. COPA finds in this instance that the evidence is insufficient to sustain the allegation against her. As such, Allegation #1 against her is **NOT SUSTAINED**.

## 3. The remaining allegations against Sgts. Ranzzoni and Hawwat.

There is insufficient evidence to prove the allegations by a preponderance of the evidence.

[REDACTED] has not presented COPA with any direct evidence (such as a statement or a threat) indicating that Sgt. Ranzzoni or Sgt. Hawwat retaliated against him for reporting misconduct or showing that either took action to punish, intimidate, threaten, or penalize him for doing so.<sup>108</sup> Nor has COPA uncovered any such direct evidence or any other evidence suggesting that the sergeants' stated reasons for arresting [REDACTED] were pretextual. [REDACTED] may well surmise that Sgts. Ranzzoni and

---

<sup>103</sup> See Special Order S03-14 *Body Worn Cameras* (effective date: April 30, 2018), Section III.A.2.

<sup>104</sup> See *id.*

<sup>105</sup> See *id.*, Section VI.A.1.a. A separate directive requires district station supervisors to "monitor behavior and performance of subordinates and their adherence to Department policies and procedures and take appropriate action when deficiencies in performance, uniform, and/or equipment are observed." This subsection notes that the supervisor will "report any findings and deficiencies to the watch operations lieutenant." See Special Order S03-03-05 *District Station Supervisors* (effective date: March 3, 2017), Section II.U.

<sup>106</sup> See Special Order S03-03-06(III)(F) and (G), which requires District Field Sergeants to both utilize an assigned body-worn camera and ensure that subordinates are properly using their body-worn cameras.

<sup>107</sup> COPA credits Sgt. Ranzzoni for acknowledging, during his statement, that he probably should have directed Officers Matias and Ortiz to activate their body-worn camera systems. The operative directive does not prohibit BWC activation within a district station, and COPA finds that nothing within the directive can be fairly or reasonably understood to suggest that arrests made within a district station are not to be recorded. By contrast, the directive does list certain other places where BWC-recording should not ordinarily occur; among those are hospitals, private residences, and courtrooms. See *id.*, Section IV.

<sup>108</sup> Such conduct is prohibited by Section 2-78-160 of the Municipal Code of Chicago. Accordingly, such conduct is also prohibited by Rule 1 of the CPD Rules of Conduct, which mandates compliance with all laws.

Hawwat would not have directed his arrest but for the fact that the person he complained of was a Chicago Police Officer. Indeed, COPA's investigation of the events giving rise to ██████'s complaints certainly raises suspicion and doubt concerning whether Sgts. Ranzzoni and Hawwat truly had probable cause to direct ██████'s arrest, whether for the offense of assault<sup>109</sup> or for the offense of damaging property.<sup>110</sup> COPA's investigation shows that Officer Santiago never claimed that ██████ threw or attempting a punch. Instead, Officer Santiago claimed throughout simply that ██████ had approached him. In his statement to COPA, Officer Santiago denied that his car was permanently damaged as a result of ██████'s conduct. That denial raises doubt concerning the truth of Sgt. Ranzzoni's claim, made during his own statement to COPA, that Officer Santiago had informed him that the object thrown by Allen had caused scratches to his car. However, suspicion and doubt are not evidence. Allegation #3 against Sgt. Ranzzoni and Allegation #2 against Sgt. Hawwat must accordingly be **NOT SUSTAINED**.

## **VIII. RECOMMENDED DISCIPLINE FOR SUSTAINED ALLEGATIONS**

### **a. Officer Santiago**

#### **i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History**

Officer Santiago has been a member of the Chicago Police Department since April 26, 2004. Since that time, he has received Two Department Commendation; 19 Honorable Mentions; Seven Complimentary Letters; Three Crime Reduction Awards and Ribbons (2004, 2009 and 2019); One NATO Summit Service Award; One Presidential Election Deployment Award; and 6 Emblem of Recognition – Physical Fitness. Officer Santiago does not have any history of sustained complaints or SPARs.

#### **ii. Recommended Penalty**

COPA recommends that Officer Santiago receive a 5-day Suspension and training in Anger Management. COPA has considered his complimentary and lack of disciplinary history in mitigation. COPA has also taken into account this incident involved some provocation on the part of Mr. ██████, although not rising to the level of justifying Officer Santiago's actions. Officer Santiago acknowledged that he was upset at the time he acted and could benefit from anger management training. For the foregoing reasons, COPA recommends a 5-day Suspension and training.

### **b. Sergeant Ranzzoni**

#### **i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History**

Sergeant Ranzzoni has been a member of the Chicago Police Department since May 25, 1998. Since that time, he has received One Life Saving Award; 13 Honorable Mentions; Seven Complimentary Letters; Three Crime Reduction Awards and Ribbons (2004, 2009 and 2019); One NATO Summit Service Award; One Presidential Election Deployment Award; and 15

---

<sup>109</sup> "A person commits an assault when, without lawful authority, he or she knowingly engages in conduct which places another in reasonable apprehension of receiving a battery." 720 ILCS 5/12-1(a).

<sup>110</sup> "A person commits criminal damage to property when he or she ... knowingly damages any property of another". 720 ILCS 5/21-1(a)(1).

Emblem of Recognition – Physical Fitness. Sergeant Ranzzoni does not have any history of sustained complaints or SPARs.

**ii. Recommended Penalty**

COPA recommends that Sergeant Ranzzoni receive a 10-day Suspension. COPA has considered his complimentary history and lack disciplinary history in mitigation. COPA also has considered his supervisory rank, and the need for him to lead by example. For the foregoing reasons, COPA recommends a 10-day Suspension.

**IX. CONCLUSION**

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

<b>Officer</b>	<b>Allegation</b>	<b>Finding / Recommendation</b>
Officer Aladino Santiago	<p>On October 22, 2019, at approximately 4:12PM, at or near 5530 W. Homer St., Chicago, Illinois, Officer Aladino R. Santiago committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions:</p> <p>1.) Engaging in an unjustified verbal and/or physical altercation with ██████████.</p>	Sustained / 5-day Suspension and training
Sgt. Edward Ranzzoni	<p>On October 22, 2019, at approximately 5:09PM, at or near 5530 W. Homer St., Chicago, Illinois, and/or at approximately 5:50PM, at or near 5555 W. Grand Ave., Chicago, Illinois, Sgt. Edward J. Ranzzoni committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions:</p> <p>1. Failing to operate his body-worn camera in accordance with CPD Special Order S03-14, Body Worn Cameras;</p> <p>2. Failing to direct officers under his command to operate their body-worn cameras in accordance with CPD Special Order S03-14, Body Worn Cameras; and</p> <p>3. Retaliating against, punishing, intimidating, discouraging, threatening, and/or penalizing ██████████ ██████████ for reporting misconduct against a CPD member.</p>	<p>Sustained / 10-day Suspension</p> <p>Sustained / 10-day Suspension</p> <p>Not Sustained</p>
Sgt. Sandi Hawwat	<p>On October 22, 2019, at approximately 5:50PM, at or near 5555 W. Grand Ave., Chicago, Illinois, Sgt. Sandi J. Hawwat committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions:</p>	

	<p>1. Failing to direct officers under her command to operate their body-worn cameras in accordance with CPD Special Order S03-14, Body Worn Cameras; and/or</p> <p>2. Retaliating against, punishing, intimidating, discouraging, threatening, and/or penalizing [REDACTED] [REDACTED] for reporting misconduct and/or making a complaint of misconduct against a CPD member.</p>	<p>Not Sustained</p> <p>Not Sustained</p>
--	--	---

Approved:

[REDACTED]

4-22-2021

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Appendix A

Assigned Investigative Staff

---

<b>Squad #:</b>	5
<b>Investigator:</b>	Francis Tighe
<b>Supervising Investigator:</b>	Loren Seidner
<b>Deputy Chief Investigator:</b>	Angela Hearts-Glass