

SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	August 25, 2018/ 1:16 a.m., 1014 N. Halsted St., Chicago, IL
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	August 29, 2018/ 11:06 a.m.
Involved Officer #1:	Robert Rose , Star #982, Employee ID # [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: February 28, 2000, Sergeant, Unit 630 Area North, DOB: [REDACTED], 1976, M, Caucasian.
Involved Officer #2:	Kristophe Rigan , Star #1279, Employee ID # [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: March 25, 2002, Sergeant, 18 th District, DOB: [REDACTED], 1979, M, Caucasian.
Involved Officer #3:	Ziad Mansour , Star #11202, Employee ID # [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: May 16, 2017, Police Officer, 18 th District, DOB: [REDACTED], 1991, M, Middle Eastern.
Involved Officer #4:	Joel Gonzalez , Star #16282, Employee ID # [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: December 12, 2016 Police Officer, 18 th District, DOB: [REDACTED], 1984, M, Hispanic.
Involved Officer #5:	Victor Goetz , Star #15976, Employee ID # [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: October 31, 2016, Police Officer, 18 th District, DOB: [REDACTED], 1998, M, Caucasian.
Involved Officer #6:	Michael Mickey , Star #8608, Employee ID # [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: October 16, 2017, Police Officer, 18 th District, DOB: [REDACTED], 1995, M, Caucasian.
Involved Officer #7:	Anthony Accardo , Star #10627, Employee ID # [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: February 29, 2016, Police Officer, 18 th District, DOB: [REDACTED], 1993, M, Caucasian.
Involved Officer #8:	Vanessa Barajas , Star #10608, Employee ID # [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: May 16, 2017, Police Officer, 14 th District, DOB: [REDACTED], 1990, F, Hispanic.

Involved Officer #9: **Anthony Regalado**, Star #15071, Employee ID # [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: December 12, 2016, Police Officer, 18th District, DOB: [REDACTED], 1981, M, Hispanic.

Involved Officer #10: **Julio Perez**, Star #17150, Employee ID # [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: December 12, 2016, Police Officer, 18th District, DOB: [REDACTED], 2986, M, Hispanic.

Involved Individual #1: **Complainant (3rd Party)**, [REDACTED] 35, F, Black, [REDACTED].

Involved Individual #2: **Victim**, [REDACTED] 41, M, Black, Chicago, [REDACTED].

Involved Individual #3: **Victim**, [REDACTED] 38, M, Black, [REDACTED].

Case Type: Unjustified vehicle-related stop, search, seizure, and arrest(s).

I. ALLEGATIONS

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Sergeant Robert Rose	1. On or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, Sergeant Rose searched the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] without justification.	Exonerated.
Sergeant Kristophe Rigan	2. On or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, Sergeant Rigan searched the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] without justification.	Exonerated.
Police Officer Ziad Mansour	3. On or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N.	Exonerated.

<p>Police Officer Joel Gonzalez</p> <p>Police Officer Victor Goetz</p> <p>Police Officer Michael Mickey</p> <p>Police Officer Anthony Accardo</p>	<p>Halsted Chicago, IL, Officer Mansour detained [REDACTED] without justification.</p> <p>4. On or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, Officer Mansour searched the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] without justification.</p> <p>5. On or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, Officer Gonzalez searched the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] without justification.</p> <p>6. On or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, Officer Gonzalez failed to activate his body-worn camera when responding to an incident involving [REDACTED]</p> <p>7. On or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, Officer Goetz arrested [REDACTED] without justification.</p> <p>8. On or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, Officer Mickey arrested [REDACTED] without justification.</p> <p>9. On or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, Officer Accardo searched the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] without justification.</p>	<p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Sustained.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p> <p>Exonerated.</p>
---	---	--

Police Officer Vanessa Barajas	10. On or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, Officer Barajas arrested [REDACTED] without justification.	Exonerated.
Police Officer Anthony Regalado	11. On or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, Officer Regalado searched the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] without justification.	Exonerated.
Police Officer Julio Perez	12. On or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, Officer Perez detained [REDACTED] without justification.	Exonerated.
	13. On or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, Officer Perez searched the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] without justification.	Exonerated.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE¹

On August 25, 2018, at or about 12:45 a.m., multiple CPD units responded to calls for service for shots-fired at or near [REDACTED], Chicago, IL. 18th District SDSC² Officer Ascencio and her PPO partner were also on-duty at the time and heard the shots-fired dispatch over their SDSC post radio(s). Officer Ascencio then scanned relevant POD camera footage on her display monitor, and purportedly observed a green, “late-model SUV driving away from that address at a high rate of speed.”³ The SUV drove down Evergreen St. and onto Sedgwick Ave.⁴ The SUV was tracked on POD cameras by the SDSC personnel for approximately 19 minutes

¹COPA conducted a full and complete investigation of this matter, including the interview of all pertinent civilian and officer witnesses, and the collection and review of digital, documentary, and forensic evidence. As part of COPA’s ongoing efforts to increase case closure capacity, certain cases are summarized more succinctly in a Modified Summary Report of Investigation, pursuant to COPA Guideline Modified Summary Report of Investigation Template and Approvals, effective February 13, 2019.

² Strategic Decision Support Center (“SDSC”). Chicago SDSCs are specialized CPD subunits sited in district stations throughout the city and staffed by CPD officers and civilian data analysts from the University of Chicago Crime Lab. SDSC personnel monitor city-wide, networked CPD POD cameras and “shot-spotter” units, in real-time, and use the information received to direct CPD field officers to suspected crime scenes or subjects’ locations.

³ Attachment 19 at 8:38.

⁴ Id. at 10:19.

before it stopped, near 1014 S. Halsted St.⁵ Officer Ascensio contemporaneously relayed her observations over CPD radio for responding units to pursue the SUV.⁶

Multiple on-duty 18th District officers, including Ziad Mansour and his partner Julio Perez, and Anthony Accardo and his partner Michael Mickey, responded to the radio calls and drove towards 1014 S. Halsted St., in their respective squad vehicles.⁷ The officers arrived at the address, outside an auto mechanic shop, and observed a green SUV parked on Halsted St., outside the garage, and two black, male individuals standing outside the vehicle. Officers Mansour and Perez were the first to arrive on-scene, and immediately exited, activated their BWCs, and approached two black males standing next to the parked SUV. Officer Mansour made first contact with Mr. ██████████ who was then detained and handcuffed by another assist officer, while Officer Perez stopped and detained the other man standing outside the SUV, now known to be ██████████. Officers Mansour and Perez then approached the SUV and looked through the windows. They and other assist officers then opened the SUV's front and rear doors and began searching the interior. Almost the entirety of the foregoing was simultaneously recorded on officers' BWCs.

While the vehicle was searched, Messrs. ██████████ and ██████████ were questioned by officers (and subsequently, Sergeant Rigan), and the two vociferously protested that they had been shot at but had not themselves shot anyone. Mr. ██████████ was recorded on BWC telling officers that he and his friend, Mr. ██████████ were outside his mother's house near ██████████, and/or also at a location near W. Blackhawk St. and N. Cleveland Ave., and that before the shooting, his cousin had been hit in the face by an attacker wielding a golf club. Subsequently, shooting erupted and he and Mr. ██████████ drove away in Mr. ██████████ SUV, their left rear window and right rear tire having been shot out. Mr. ██████████ repeatedly protested his innocence to officers and asked that his hands be tested for ballistics residue. Mr. ██████████ and Mr. ██████████ were then subsequently handcuffed and told that they were being detained while the officers continued their investigation. The two men were then escorted into the rear seats of two separate squad vehicles.

Officers Mansour and multiple other officers continued searching the SUV interior and at one point, BWC(s) depicted a white, male officer – since identified as Sergeant Rigan – search the driver's seat area, and peer into an open cavity in the driver's door panel.⁸ Sergeant Rigan then stated he saw something in the door and requested gloves. BWC then depicted Sergeant Rigan donning gloves, reach into the driver's door panel and extract a black, Beretta 380 cal. semi-automatic pistol and remove and unload it, and then remove a large plastic bag containing suspect narcotics. An unloaded 357 cal. Ruger revolver was reportedly then recovered from inside the front passenger-door trim panel.

Officers thereafter arrested Messrs. ██████████ and ██████████ for unlawful use of a weapon without a FOID card and narcotics possession (cocaine 15-100 gms.) and transported them to the district for processing. The vehicle was then impounded. Officers inventoried both handguns, 18.9 grams of powdered cocaine, 22 tablets of codeine, and 58.5 grams of crack cocaine. Both men were subsequently captured on BWC inside the district processing area(s), being Mirandized and questioned about the shooting, and while both denied shooting anyone, Mr. ██████████ related he knew the culprit(s), but neither he nor Mr. ██████████ would identify those they alleged shot at them and the SUV. Mr. ██████████ reiterated the shooting was related to a prior attack with a golf club against one

⁵ Id. at 16:46.

⁶ Id. at 13:20.

⁷ Attachment 22 at 5:11.

⁸ The electric window switchgear on the front door panel(s) had visibly been pried up and out of their opening(s).

of his cousins.

On August 29, 2018, Mr. ██████ girlfriend, Ms. ██████ filed a third-party complaint with COPA alleging Mr. ██████ was wrongfully stopped and arrested and that the pills found by officers were prescribed to him. Mr. ██████ and Mr. ██████ subsequently presented to COPA and provided sworn statements alleging they had not shot at anyone on the night at issue, and that CPD wrongfully stopped and arrested them. Both men also denied knowing the origin of the weapons or narcotics found in the SUV.⁹

Body-worn camera (“BWC”) footage of the initial arrest was recovered by CPD and produced to COPA.

COPA obtained and reviewed all relevant reports, including original case incident reports, case supplementary reports, CFD records, and relevant criminal court records.

III. ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

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

1. Sustained - where it is determined the allegation is supported by a preponderance of the evidence;
2. Not Sustained - where it is determined there is insufficient evidence to prove the allegations by a preponderance of the evidence;
3. Unfounded - where it is determined by clear and convincing evidence that an allegation is false or not factual; or
4. Exonerated - where it is determined by clear and convincing evidence that the conduct described in the allegation occurred, but it is lawful and proper.

A **preponderance of evidence** can be described as evidence indicating that it is **more likely than not** that the conduct occurred and violated Department policy. *See Avery v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co.*, 216 Ill. 2d 100, 191 (2005), (a proposition is proved by a preponderance of the evidence when it has found to be more probably true than not). If the evidence gathered in an investigation establishes that it is more likely that the misconduct occurred, even if by a narrow margin, then the preponderance of the evidence standard is met.

The majority of relevant facts presented in this case are either undisputed, or proven beyond a preponderance, primarily via the extensive video footage recovered depicting all or part of the incident(s), and the parties’ subsequent statements. To wit: The objective evidence recovered, and parties’ statements show that on the evening and time in question, one or more individuals telephoned 911 reporting hearing gunshots near ██████, Chicago. A boxy, green

⁹ Mr. ██████ additionally related to COPA that that a bottle of narcotic tablets in his backpack in the vehicle trunk was his and was prescribed, but that he didn’t have the prescription and that the vial was unlabeled.

SUV was then remotely observed by CPD-SDSC personnel fleeing the vicinity via nearby POD video cameras. A nearby CPD patrol unit also reported briefly stopping a green SUV and inquiring about a *second reported* shots-fired complaint, but the SUV driver and passenger – now known to be Messrs. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] – denied hearing any shots and the officers left. Other units and/or SDSC personnel then reported observing a green SUV, license plate # [REDACTED] driving at a high speed, towards W. Evergreen Avenue, with two black males in the front seats, one with facial hair and a passenger wearing a light-colored shirt. The vehicle was then tracked on POD video by CPD, and pursued by multiple responding officers and supervisors to a repair garage at 1014 N. Halsted St. Both the driver of the vehicle, [REDACTED] and the garage employees later interviewed by COPA, related that in the moments before officers arrived, Mr. [REDACTED] exhorted the garage mechanics to fix his shot-out tire as quickly as possible, even offering extra money for them to end their break period. Moments later, multiple squad cars arrived and detained, searched, and ultimately arrested Mr. [REDACTED] and his passenger [REDACTED] and impounded Mr. [REDACTED] green SUV, plate # [REDACTED].

In addition to the foregoing, Mr. [REDACTED] admitted both to COPA and to the arresting officer(s) that he was on parole at the time of the arrest. Likewise, he admitted he was the driver of, and had lawful possession of the vehicle before the incident. He did not claim anyone else had driven the vehicle before it was impounded or stored anything within it. Both he and Mr. [REDACTED] further admitted that gunshots *were* fired against them and struck their SUV, and that they then fled the vicinity and drove to the garage to patch their shot-out tire. The two also refused to identify the individual(s) who shot at them, although Mr. [REDACTED] intimated in his statements to officers and COPA that he knew the assailant(s) and that the shooting was related to a prior attack against his cousin. In addition, Mr. [REDACTED] admitted in his COPA statement that he (and Mr. [REDACTED]) drank significant amounts of hard liquor and beer before driving from the shooting scene in his SUV and stated that he was wrong for doing so.

All 4th Amendment-related allegations against the accused members in the instant case fail, warranting Exonerated or non-sustainable findings, because of specific, relevant issues of law. To Wit:

- a. [REDACTED]’s parolee status diminished his reasonable expectations of, and rights to privacy in his person, his vehicle, or its contents.**

Both U.S. Constitution, Amd. IV, and the Illinois Constitution guarantee the right of individuals to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures. Ill. Const. art I Sec. 6. The Fourth Amendment generally requires a warrant supported by probable cause for a search to be deemed reasonable, absent few exceptions. One such exception involves probationers or parolees. People v. Wilson, 228 Ill.2d 35, 41, 885 N.E. 2d 1033, 319 Ill.Dec 353 (2008). Both the US and Illinois Supreme Courts have held that probationers and parolees enjoy a greatly diminished expectation of privacy. Id. at 41. *See also* United States v. Knights, 534 U.S. 112, 119-20, 122 S. Ct. 587, 151 L. Ed. 2d 497 (2001). Parolees remain “on the ‘continuum’ of state-imposed punishments,” and thus have “fewer expectations of privacy in general.” United States v. White, 781 F.3d 858, 862-863 (7th Cir. 2015). (quoting Samson v. California, 547 U.S. 843, 847, 850, 126 S. Ct. 2193, 165 L. Ed. 2d 250 (2006)). When a search is therefore deemed reasonable, a warrant is not required in

cases involving probationers or parolees. People v. Wilson, 228 Ill.2d at 40. Illinois law mandates parolees or those on mandatory supervised release shall consent to a search of his or her person, property, or residence under his or her control, 730 ILCS 5/3-3-7(10) (2010) (“the Act”) – although the courts have equally held that such a mandate does not constitute prospective consent to suspicionless searches, for those cases where an officer does *not* first know a subject is on parole before conducting a search. People v. Lampitok, 207 Ill. 2d 231, 260-61, N.E.2d 91, 278 Ill.Dec.244 (2003). Applied here, Mr. ██████ admittedly was on parole at the time of the incident, and would have, at minimum, signed an MSR agreement consenting to searches per the Act as a condition of his release. While this would not prospectively have constituted a blanket consent to suspicionless searches of him or his SUV by the accused officer(s), the evidence showed that at least one sergeant at the scene, Sergeant Rigan, related to COPA he researched Mr. ██████ criminal background prior to the incident. He thus knew or should have known of Mr. ██████ arrest and parolee status.

b. The stop and detention of ██████ and his passenger were duly justified as matters of law.

In addition to the foregoing, Illinois and US courts hold that warrantless investigatory vehicle stops and detentions of individuals by law enforcement must be reasonable, and require police first have a reasonable and articulable suspicion that a motorist has broken the law. US v. Watson, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 148888, 2018 WL 4181505 (N.D. Ill. 2018), citing US v. Rodriguez-Escalara, 884 F3d 661, 667-68 (7th Cir. 2018). In determining whether reasonable suspicion is justified, the totality of circumstances must be considered – a mere hunch will not suffice, but the level of suspicion the standard requires is ‘considerably less’ than is necessary for probable cause. (Id., citing US v. Sokolow, 490 U.S. 1, 7 (1989). *See also* Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S.1, 21 (1968) and Navarette v. California, 134 S. Ct. 1683, 1687 (2014).

Applied here, the objective records and party statements show callers to 911 reported gunfire near ██████ on the date and time(s) at issue.¹⁰ These 911-calls then triggered CPD-SDSC personnel to locate and track Mr. ██████ green SUV over POD cameras, fleeing the vicinity at a purportedly high rate of speed, and eventually stopping on Halsted St. That data was contemporaneously relayed to the responding officers who in turn pursued the SUV. The totality of the foregoing, coupled with bullet holes observed in the SUV by the responding officers, the evasive statements given at the scene by Messrs. ██████ and ██████ and the garage staff’s reporting that Mr. ██████ exhorted them to fix his tire as rapidly as possible, all provided officers with more than the minimum reasonable, articulable suspicion that “criminal activity may [have been] afoot” (*See Terry*, 392 U.S. at 30) and/or the men had committed the criminal act(s) necessary to detain them and investigate.

¹⁰ Courts have presumed the reliability of eyewitness 911-callers reporting emergency situations for purposes of establishing reasonable suspicion. US v. Drake, 456 F. 3d 771, 775 (7th Cir. 2006).

c. The search of ██████████ SUV was justified under the “Automobile Exception” to the 4th Amendment or as a Search Incident to Arrest.

Another relevant warrantless search exception(s) recognized by US and Illinois courts are the search incident to a lawful arrest, and “automobile exception” which “derives from interests in officer safety and evidence preservation that are typically implicated in arrest situations.” Arizona v. Gant, 556 U.S. 332, 338 (2009) (quoting Katz v. United States, 389 U.S. 347, 357 (1967)). Based on these two justifications, “Police may search a vehicle incident to a recent occupant’s arrest only if the arrestee is within reaching distance of the passenger compartment at the time of the search or it is reasonable to believe the vehicle contains evidence of the offense of arrest.” Id. at 351.

Here, contra the facts in Gant, Messrs. ██████████ and ██████████ were detained and questioned standing outside the SUV during at least part of the time the vehicle was searched, and the officer safety rationale would justify the search pursuant to the search-incident-to-arrest exemption. Moreover, there was more than a reasonable basis to believe that evidence of the offenses for which the two men were arrested — unlawful possession or use of firearms — would be found in their bullet-marked vehicle.

The second reason, which can stand alone as an independent basis for finding the search to be proper, the search of the vehicle was justified under the so-called “automobile exception.” Under the automobile exception, police officers may search a vehicle without a warrant where *probable cause* exists to believe the automobile contains evidence of criminal activity subject to seizure. People v. Contreras, 2014 IL App (1st) 131889, P28. This case presents more than sufficient probable cause to believe such evidence would be found in the vehicle. The admitted 1 a.m. fleeing of a shooting scene, the matching description and license of the SUV and the two occupants, the fact the vehicle was visibly struck by bullets, the attempt to have the garage mechanics repair the SUV as hurriedly as possible – ostensibly to permit a rapid escape -- the evasive, confrontational answers by the two men on BWC to responding officers, coupled with Mr. ██████████ documented, prior criminal/gang-membership history, all provided more than sufficient probable cause for responding officers to detain and search the men and the SUV interior for evidence of gun-related crimes. After finding the pistols (without FOID cards) and suspected narcotics secreted inside the vehicle door panels, officers then had due justification to arrest the two men and impound the SUV.

For each of the foregoing reasons, COPA finds that each Fourth Amendment-Related Allegation made in this case did not show, by a necessary preponderance, a violation of Department policy or unreasonableness under Seventh Circuit or Illinois, or U.S. Supreme Court precedent, sufficient to sustain an allegation(s).

d. A review of the records and the COPA statement of Officer Gonzalez showed he failed to activate his BWC.

Pursuant to S04-13, Department members shall activate their department-issued Axon BWC units to record starting at the beginning of all law-enforcement-related activities, absent narrow exceptions -- including but not limited to recording calls for service, investigatory stops, searches and arrests. As such, Officer Gonzalez should have activated his BWC unit upon his arrival at the scene of the incident at issue, but the records recovered by COPA, and Officer Gonzales's statement indicated he did not. "I thought I turned it on, but when I got the notification, it said I hadn't."¹¹

IV. RECOMMENDED DISCIPLINE FOR SUSTAINED ALLEGATIONS

e. Officer Joel Gonzalez

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History

Officer Gonzalez has received a total of 32 awards. He has an award for attendance, 2 for physical fitness, 28 honorable mentions and a crime reduction award.

ii. Recommended Penalty, by Allegation

1. **Allegation No. 1** – COPA recommends a Violation Noted. Officer Gonzalez failed to activate his body worn camera. COPA considers Officer Gonzalez' complimentary and lack of disciplinary history in mitigation.

V. CONCLUSION

For each of the foregoing reasons:

1. COPA finds that for **Allegation #1**, that on or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, **Sergeant Rose** searched the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] without justification, should be EXONERATED.
2. COPA finds that for **Allegation #2**, that on or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, **Sergeant Rigan** searched the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] without justification, should be EXONERATED.
3. COPA finds that for **Allegation #3**, that on or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, **Officer Mansour** detained [REDACTED] without justification, should be EXONERATED.

¹¹ Attachment 29 at 26:45 and 37:16.

4. COPA finds that for **Allegation #4**, that on or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, **Officer Mansour** searched the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] without justification, should be EXONERATED.
5. COPA finds that for **Allegation #5**, that on or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, **Officer Gonzalez** searched the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] without justification, should be EXONERATED.
6. COPA finds that for **Allegation #6**, that on or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, **Officer Gonzalez** failed to activate his body-worn camera when responding to an incident involving [REDACTED] should be SUSTAINED. A penalty of Violation Noted is recommended.
7. COPA finds that for **Allegation #7**, that on or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, **Officer Goetz** arrested [REDACTED] without justification, should be EXONERATED.
8. COPA finds that for **Allegation #8**, that on or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, **Officer Mickey** arrested [REDACTED] without justification, should be EXONERATED.
9. COPA finds that for **Allegation #9**, that on or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, **Officer Accardo** searched the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] without justification, should be EXONERATED.
10. COPA finds that for **Allegation #10**, that on or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, **Officer Barajas** arrested [REDACTED] without justification, should be EXONERATED.
11. COPA finds that for **Allegation #11**, that on or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, **Officer Regalado** searched the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] without justification, should be EXONERATED.
12. COPA finds that for **Allegation #12**, that on or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, **Officer Perez** detained [REDACTED] without justification, should be EXONERATED.
13. COPA finds that for **Allegation #13**, that on or about August 25, 2018 at approximately 1:15 AM at or near 1014 N. Halsted Chicago, IL, **Officer Perez** searched the vehicle belonging to [REDACTED] without justification, should be EXONERATED.

Approved:



6-7-2021

Andrea Kersten
Deputy Chief Investigator

Date

Appendix A

Assigned Investigative Staff

Squad#:	2
Investigator:	Paul Fine
Supervising Investigator:	Robert Coleman/Gregory Little
Deputy Chief Administrator:	Andrea Kersten