

## SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

### I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

|                            |                                |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Date of Incident:          | July 4, 2020                   |
| Time of Incident:          | At or about 8:00pm             |
| Location of Incident:      | At or near 101 N. Michigan Ave |
| Date of COPA Notification: | On or about July 5, 2020       |
| Time of COPA Notification: | At or about 10:00am            |

On or about July 4, 2020, at approximately 8:00 pm, [REDACTED] (Ms. [REDACTED]) several of her family members, and hundreds of other people were celebrating the Fourth of July by shooting fireworks at or near 101 N. Michigan Avenue. Ms. [REDACTED] was observed holding a Roman candle firework which appeared to be lit and pointed in the direction of several pedestrians and uniformed officers. Ms. [REDACTED] was allegedly ordered by an officer to drop the lit fireworks, however, before releasing the firework she turned and ran away from where the officers were standing. Officer Christopher Innis ran along the side of Ms. [REDACTED] and tackled her onto the grass. Ms. [REDACTED] landed on the grass with Officer Innis lying on top of her. Ms. [REDACTED] was arrested for not obeying the orders of the officer to drop the lit firework. She was taken into custody and later released into the custody of her parents.

Ms. [REDACTED] and her mother, [REDACTED] (now Ms. [REDACTED]) filed a complaint with COPA stating that Officer Innis forcefully took MS. [REDACTED] to the ground without justification. There was no Body Worn Camera (BWC) footage that captured the incident.<sup>1</sup>

### II. INVOLVED PARTIES

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| Involved Officer #1: | Christopher Innis, Star #3871, Employee ID# [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: December 14, 2012, Rank: PO, Unit of Assignment: 715, DOB: [REDACTED], 1982, Male, Black. |
|----------------------|--|

<sup>1</sup> The incident occurred during a mass protest. Special Order S06-06- Mass Arrest Procedures, provides authority for ranking members of the Office of Operations (formerly the Bureau of Patrol) or identified Incident Commanders to declare a Mass Arrest Incident (MAI). When such a declaration is made, certain aspects of some Department Orders are relaxed or suspended. For COPA purposes, a MAI declaration impacts the need to document force in a Tactical Response Report (TRR) and booking processes. However, once a MAI is declared TRRs are not required for Cooperative Subjects, and all Resisters (both Passive and Active regardless of the resistance) unless injury is alleged or occurs.

### III. ALLEGATIONS

| Officer                    | Allegation  | Finding / Recommendation |
|----------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Officer Christopher Inniss | Forcefully took ██████████ to the ground without justification. | Exonerated               |

### IV. APPLICABLE RULES AND LAWS

#### General Orders<sup>2</sup>

1. General Order 03-02: Use of Force Guidelines (effective October 1, 2002).
2. General Order 03-02-01: Force Options (effective February 29, 2020).

#### Special Orders

1. Special Order S06-06: Mass Arrest Procedures (effective September 27, 2018).

### V. INVESTIGATION<sup>3</sup>

#### a. Interviews

In her statement to COPA on July 30, 2020, ██████████ (the complainant/minor, Ms. ██████████ and ██████████ (the complainant's mother, Ms. ██████████ stated that on or about July 4, 2020, Ms. ██████████ went downtown with her family to celebrate the Fourth of July holiday. Ms. ██████████ explained that some of her family members and other people were shooting fireworks. She continued to explain that she was holding a Roman candle firework pointed up toward the sky. An officer ordered her to put the lit firework down. However, before she could comply with the order, she noticed a crowd of people running toward her group. Ms. ██████████ turned around and started running away from the crowd. Officer Innis observed her running with the fireworks. Officer Innis approached the side of Ms. ██████████ tackled her, and pinned her to the ground. Ms. ██████████ stated she fell in the grass on her chest. Officer Innis explained to her that she was going to jail because she was running with the fireworks. She was placed in handcuffs, arrested, and taken to jail.

<sup>2</sup> All references in this report to Department Directives are to the orders that were in effect at the time of this incident, unless otherwise noted.

<sup>3</sup> COPA 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. This section is a concise summary of the facts surrounding this incident as uncovered by COPA during the investigation.

<sup>4</sup> Attachment 3: Audio Interview of ██████████

In his statement to COPA on February 25, 2021, **Accused Police Officer Christopher Inniss**<sup>5</sup> explained that he was on active duty during the July 4, 2020, occurrence. His partner was Police Officer David Lemmon (Officer Lemmon) and their Sergeant was Daniel Goosherst assigned to Unit 715, the Critical Incident Response Team (CIRT).

Officer Inniss advised several officers were assigned to Millennium Park during the Fourth of July celebration. It was reported that teenagers were throwing fireworks at each other and at police officers. More specifically, Ms. ██████ was seen by Officer Lemmon and Sergeant Goosherst pointing a Roman candle firework toward the crowd and in the direction of a group of officers. Ms. ██████ was commanded to drop the fireworks by either Officer Lemmon or Sergeant Goosherst. Officer Inniss stated he and other officers were approximately 10 feet away from Ms. ██████. He did not observe anyone else within the group with fireworks.

As Officer Lemmon and Sergeant Goosherst approached Ms. ██████ they gave her a verbal command to come to them. However, Ms. ██████ ran in the opposite direction of the approaching officers. Officer Inniss continued to explain that he witnessed fireballs coming from the Roman candle that Ms. ██████ was holding and flying over the heads of the crowd, Officer Lemmon, and Sergeant Goosherst. This incident occurred as Ms. ██████ turned away from the officers to flee the scene. Officer Inniss advised he did not give Ms. ██████ any commands prior to taking her down. Ms. ██████ landed on her stomach in a patch of grass. After they landed on the grass, Officer Inniss placed Ms. ██████ under arrest. Officer Inniss believed the takedown was reasonable and that he would have performed the tactic on anyone who was fleeing regardless of their physical description. Officer Inniss described himself as a 6'3" in height and weighed 270 - 275 pounds. Officer Inniss stated Ms. ██████ did not complain of any injuries or asked to be taken to the hospital.

In their statements to COPA, Witness Officer Lemmon advised that he and Officer Inniss were partners assigned on the date of the incident. Witness Sergeant Goosherst stated that he was the sergeant assigned to CIRT. Sergeant Goosherst and Officer Lemmon both stated Officer Inniss followed policy because Ms. ██████ was holding, running, and pointing a Roman candle firework into a crowd and in the direction of other police officers. Officer Lemmon and Sergeant Goosherst both believed that Officer Inniss applied the adequate amount of force to ensure the safety of the complainant, officers, and the other civilians gathered in the area.<sup>6</sup>

## **b. Documentary Evidence**

The **Arrest Report**<sup>7</sup> of Ms. ██████ documented she was arrested for Disorderly Conduct – Breach of Peace. Ms. ██████ was observed by officers running with a lit Roman candle firework. Ms. ██████ was observed firing the lit firework into a crowd of people and police officers. The Arresting Officers gave an order to put the lit firework down and the offender turned and shot

---

<sup>5</sup> Attachment 13: Audio interview of Christopher Inniss

<sup>6</sup> Attachment 11: Audio interview of Sergeant Daniel Goosherst; Attachment 12: Audio Interview of Police Officer David Lemmon

<sup>7</sup> Attachment 4: Arrest Report of ██████

toward the Arresting Officers. Ms. [REDACTED] was placed into custody. The report added that Ms. [REDACTED] was 4'10" in height and weighed 100 pounds.

A **Tactical Response Report (TRR)**<sup>8</sup> submitted by Officer Inniss documented Ms. [REDACTED] did not follow verbal direction and fled. Officer Inniss responded with member's presence, verbal direction/control techniques, a takedown, escort holds, and emergency handcuffing.

## 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

COPA finds that the allegation against Officer Inniss is **Exonerated**. Ms. [REDACTED] alleged that Officer Innis forcefully took her to the ground without justification. Ms. [REDACTED] admitted she ran and did not comply with an officer's command to put down the firework. Ms. [REDACTED] stated that she ran because a crowd of people was running towards her, so she ran away from the crowd.

---

<sup>8</sup> Attachment 21: TRR Inniss

Officer Inniss performed a tackle takedown to stop Ms. [REDACTED] from fleeing the scene. General Order G03-02-01, Force Options, (IV)(B)(2) reads in part, “An Active Resister: a person who attempts to create distance between himself or herself and the member’s reach with the intent to avoid physical control and/or defeat the arrest.” General Order G03-02-01 also states that a takedown is authorized as a force option when dealing with an active resister. Ms. [REDACTED] was an active resister who attempted to flee the scene, regardless of her rationale. Ms. [REDACTED] did not sustain any injuries from the takedown and Officer Innis completed a TRR documenting his use of force with her. Therefore, COPA finds a finding of Exonerated.

Approved:

[REDACTED]

3-22-2022

---

Angela Hearts-Glass  
*Deputy Chief Administrator*

---

Date