

## SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

Date of Incident:	September 11, 2018
Time of Incident:	12:45 p.m.
Location of Incident:	2200 N. Oakley Ave., Chicago, IL
Date of COPA Notification:	September 11, 2018
Time of COPA Notification:	2:49 p.m.

On September 11, 2018, at or about 12:45 p.m., Officers Curtisteen Thompson, #12857, Wayne Patnett, #9508, and Anita Sullins, #13574, responded to a call for service about a white female in a bathing suit threatening a worker at Holstein Park, at or about 2200 N. Oakley Ave., Chicago, IL. Officer Thompson arrived first, and then stopped, detained and verbally warned the woman, ██████████ that she could not threaten park staff, that she should leave the property, and should she return, she would be arrested. During the encounter, Officer Thompson allegedly pushed Ms. ██████████ in the chest with her fingers, pushing her backwards. The incident was captured by Body Worn Camera (BWC).<sup>1</sup> No arrests were made.

Ms. ██████████ filed a phone complaint to COPA on September 11, 2018, alleging a female officer improperly pushed her. She subsequently provided a sworn COPA statement relating the foregoing and alleged the officer pushed her backwards – however, she was not bruised or injured, and did not seek medical care.

Ms. ██████████ related she had a history of being unduly harassed by Park District swimming pool staff for various petty rules infractions (such as using a kickboard), and subjected to arbitrary, capricious, or retributive enforcement of rules to an extent and severity not enforced against other swimmers. She believed the decision to call police was part of such a campaign of harassment against her for her making prior complaints against staff members for rudeness.

---

<sup>1</sup> Attachment 14 –Officer Thompson BWC footage.

**II. INVOLVED PARTIES**

Involved Officer #1:	Curtisteen J. Thompson, Star #12851, Employee ID # [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: January 3, 1995, Police Officer, 14 <sup>th</sup> District, DOB: [REDACTED], 1967, F, Black.
Involved Individual #1:	Complainant-Victim, [REDACTED] 50, F, Caucasian, [REDACTED]

**III. ALLEGATIONS**

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Police Officer Curtisteen J. Thompson	1. Made unnecessary physical contact with [REDACTED] during a September 11, 2018 stop, by pushing or poking her in the chest.	<b>Exonerated</b>
	2. Failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report incident to the September 11, 2018 encounter with [REDACTED]	<b>Sustained</b>

**IV. APPLICABLE RULES AND LAWS**

Rules

1. **Rule 6:** Prohibits disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.
2. **Rule 8:** Prohibits disrespect to or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty.

General Orders

1. **G03-02-01 “Force Options”<sup>2</sup>**  
“[...]II. Policy

<sup>2</sup> Attachment 15- Department Directive or General Order..

---

“A. **Sanctity of Human Life.** All incidents will be resolved with the foremost regard for the preservation of human life and the safety of all persons involved. A member's decision to use force will be made in accordance with G03-02, "Use of Force."

“B. **De-Escalation.** Department members will use de-escalation techniques to prevent or reduce the need for force when it is safe and feasible to do so based on the totality of the circumstances. This includes continually assessing the situation and modifying the use of force as circumstances change and in ways that are consistent with officer safety.

[...]

**“III. (B) Tactical Positioning**

“1. When it is safe and reasonable to do so, members should make advantageous use of positioning, distance, and cover by isolating and containing a subject and continuously evaluating the member's positioning, subject's actions, and available force options.

“2. Members should attempt to establish a zone of safety for the security of the responding members and the public.

[...]

“Zone of Safety

“The distance to be maintained between the subject and the responding member(s). This distance should be greater than the effective range of the weapon (other than a firearm) and it may vary with each situation (e.g., type of weapon possessed, condition of the subject, surrounding area)[...]”

---

Special Orders

---

**1. S04-13-09 “Investigatory Stop System”<sup>3</sup>**

“[...]Investigatory Stop—The temporary detention and questioning of a person in the vicinity where the person was stopped based on Reasonable Articulate Suspicion that the person is committing, is about to commit, or has committed a criminal offense. The suspect may be detained only for the length of time necessary to confirm or dispel the suspicion of criminal activity. The temporary detention and questioning of a person for the purpose of enforcement of the Gang and Narcotics-Related Loitering Ordinances is an Investigatory Stop.

“An Investigatory Stop is not a voluntary contact. A voluntary contact is a consensual encounter between an officer and a person during which the person must feel free to leave the officer's

---

<sup>3</sup> Attachment 21 – Department Directive or General Order.

---

presence. An officer may approach any person at any time for any reason on any basis. However, absent reasonable suspicion or probable cause, that person must be free to walk away at any time. An officer's ability to articulate that no factors existed that would make a reasonable person perceive they were not free to leave is important. The following are some factors the court may consider to determine whether or not a consensual encounter has elevated to an Investigatory Stop or an arrest:

- “1. Threatening presence of several officers;
  - “2. Display of a weapon by an officer;
  - “3. Use of language or tone of voice indicating that compliance with the officer's request might be compelled;
  - “4. Officer blocks a person's path; or
  - “5. Choice to end the encounter is not available to the person[....]”
- 

## V. INVESTIGATION<sup>4</sup>

### a. Interviews

#### 1. Complainant-Victim ██████████

In an interview with COPA on September 11, 2018,<sup>5</sup> Complainant-Victim ██████████ related that on or about September 6<sup>th</sup>, she was at Holstein Park for her regular, lap swimming exercise.<sup>6</sup>

Ms. ██████████ said while using the pool she was told by a teenage lifeguard she had to stop using her kickboard. She related arguing to staff that doing so was ridiculous because there were so few people swimming at the time – to no avail. There was no physical altercation, but she related she demanded to know the name of the staff person who was impudent to her, and when the girl refused to provide her name, she called the staffer a bitch on a power trip. She then left the pool.

The next day, on Friday, she returned to the pool and a staff manager presented her with an “incident report” holding that she violated the park’s “code of conduct.” Ms. ██████████ dismissed the report and walked away. She then phoned an area manager and discussed the various incident(s) and the ongoing “bullying” she felt subjected to by the park staff.

When she next returned to the pool, on September 11<sup>th</sup>, the same staff person she encountered on the 6<sup>th</sup> was working and the two had another verbal confrontation during which Ms. ██████████ admittedly stated: “We could go to town on this,”<sup>7</sup> – which Ms. ██████████ alleged meant that she would file a Park District complaint against the staffer. Five-minutes after Ms.

---

<sup>4</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>5</sup> Attachment 5.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*, at 2:20.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*, at 7:07.

█████ began swimming, she observed the facility manager walk out to the pool deck and call the police.

Approximately one-half hour later, a black, female police officer [now believed to be Officer Thompson] arrived in an SUV.<sup>8</sup> Ms. █████ then realized the situation was serious and decided to leave the pool.<sup>9</sup> While making her way out, the officer approached her and asked to speak with her, near the life-guard station.<sup>10</sup> Ms. █████ told the officer she did nothing wrong, did not have to be detained, and that she wanted to leave. The officer said no, she needed to talk with her.<sup>11</sup> The officer told Ms. █████ that she could not speak abusively to the park staff and that if she returned, she would be arrested.<sup>12</sup> Ms. █████ related that when she then asked under what grounds she would be arrested -- because she had done nothing wrong -- the officer then “punched” or poked her in the breastbone with two extended fingers.<sup>13</sup> The force of the poking caused Ms. █████ to stumble backwards, but she did not fall or sustain any apparent injury. The officer told her to “back up” and that she was being recorded on video.

No arrest was made or ANOV citation issued, and Ms. █████ thereafter left the facility. No Tactical Response Report (“TRR”) was filed in this case.<sup>14</sup>

Ms. █████ related she subsequently called the Park District and spoke with managers about what she felt was her improper treatment by staff. She related receiving a formal Chicago Park District incident report against her for her allegedly abusive behavior toward staff, and that she disputed it.

No hospitalization or medical care was obtained incident to this matter.

## 2. Police Officer Curtisteen J. Thompson

In an interview with COPA on November 30, 2018, Officer Thompson reiterated the basic underlying facts of the instant matter, and related that she did confront and, at minimum, raised her arm towards Ms. █████ during the encounter.<sup>15</sup>

Officer Thompson admitted failing to complete or provide an investigatory stop report/receipt because she forgot to do so -- in part because she was distracted by multiple,

---

<sup>8</sup> Id. at 7:40.

<sup>9</sup> Id. at 7:45.

<sup>10</sup> Id. at 8:10.

<sup>11</sup> Id. at 8:40.

<sup>12</sup> Id. at 9:05.

<sup>13</sup> Id. at 9:10.

<sup>14</sup> No TRR was required in this case, per G03-02-02 because: “the member's actions did not extend beyond verbal commands and/or physical actions [which were no more serious or traumatic than] control holds utilized in conjunction with handcuffing and searching techniques which do not result in injury or allegation of injury.” Ms. █████ likewise never complained of injury at the scene and did not appear visibly injured on BWC.

<sup>15</sup> See Attachment 18 at 15:34. “I’m sticking my arm out so I can create distance and space from this lady, ’cause she was literally so close to me that I felt threatened. [...] So, I put my arm out and told her to step back. I didn’t push her or poke her. I put my hand out to create distance so I could feel safe.”

simultaneous events during the incident.<sup>16</sup> She also related that she didn't believe an ISR was needed because the incident was originally called in to 911 and dispatched.<sup>17</sup> Officer Thompson related that at one point, Ms. ██████ moved to within about one foot in front of her [Officer Thompson], before Officer Thompson pushed her back, in the abdomen.<sup>18</sup>

### b. Digital Evidence

In-car camera ("ICC") and Body-worn camera ("BWC") video was requested and reviewed.<sup>19</sup>

Noteworthy details from the BWC video and their approximate times of occurrence are listed below:

<b>Time</b>	<b>BWC Video Description of Events (From Officer Thompson's BWC #X81015284)</b>
00:04	The CPD vehicle driven by Officer Thompson stopped and she exited.
00:50	She walked towards the outdoor field house fence surrounding the outdoor pool and was approached by a white female in a red shirt, presumably a staff person. [The staff person later identified herself in the video as "█████".]
01:10	The staff person identified Ms. ██████ and said that the prior Friday, she had "basically assaulted all the [life]guards by saying they were thugs, uneducated, told them all to fuck off, called them every name[...]"
01:16	Officer Thompson asked why she didn't ban her from the pool and the staffer replied they reported her to supervisors and legal affairs, and that they spoke to her [Ms. ██████ on the phone.

<sup>16</sup> See Attachment 18 at 12:23. "[...] [A]t the moment when I, they, wanted her to leave, she left, there was a lot of people, there was music playing, and it just slipped my mind. 'Cause now I'm dealing with the regional manager, and then I think another P.O. pulled up, and then an off-duty P.O. who works for the Park District pulls up and they all explained to me about what can be done legally. They 'gotta contact the legal department to keep this lady from coming to the park because her behavior is getting more aggressive towards the staff each times she comes, and it just slipped my mind[....] I wanted her to keep the peace and walk away [...] I was by myself. So it didn't get more aggressive or more out of control. And I got kids in the pool, I got family members in the pool. And this lady is just, let her leave. And then it [providing an ISR] just slipped my mind."

<sup>17</sup> Attachment 18 at 20:57, and 22:50.

<sup>18</sup> Attachment 18 at 14:24. "She was in my face, like literally in my face. She's in my space there's no distance, and it's just me and her and she's literally in my face [...] maybe a foot. She was moving towards me."

<sup>19</sup> No ICC depicting the incident was recovered or produced by CPD.

01:45	“Today she told my head [life]guard [REDACTED] (sp?): ‘You and I, we can go to town’ when she [REDACTED] told her [Ms. [REDACTED]] to go shower. And that’s a state-mandated law, you have to take a shower before you enter the pool.”
02:12	Officer Thompson asked: “Is she mental?” The staff person replied: “I’m thinking so. [But she also does not outwardly appear to be mentally ill].” [...] “But I’m getting more nervous now that it’s a repeated issue now. And I just don’t trust her behavior.”
02:41	Officer Thompson stated: “She’s a racist, unfortunately, is what she is. But it’s not against the law to be a racist unless you take it to another level.”
02:57	Officer Thompson asked the staffer what she wanted done and she and a black, male, pool manager who approached, stated that they were uncomfortable and wanted her to leave.
03:23	Officer Thompson approached Ms. [REDACTED] and Ms. [REDACTED] said she didn’t want to speak with her -- but then said she would, but only if done so closer towards the building [away from onlookers]. She continued walking away from Officer Thompson.
03:24	Officer Thompson replied she needed to speak with her then and there. Ms. [REDACTED] said she hadn’t done anything wrong and Officer Thompson replied the staff wanted her to leave.
03:36	Ms. [REDACTED] said she would talk to the manager of the park and proceeded to walk away from Officer Thompson.
03:37	Officer Thompson stated: “Don’t walk away from me ma’am,” and Ms. [REDACTED] stopped and turned back.
03:47	Officer Thompson told Ms. [REDACTED] she could not disrespect the staff and Ms. [REDACTED] stated the staff had bullied her and that she would be filing a complaint.
04:00	Ms. [REDACTED] was standing in front of Officer Thompson, face-to-face, and again stated that she did nothing wrong.
04:02	Officer Thompson replied: “You have,” and Ms. [REDACTED] responded: “I havent [...] and I’ve responded to some heavy-duty bullying that is unacceptable.”

04:09	Ms. ██████ began gesticulating with her hands and stated: "I'm gonna go unless you want to arrest me for something, I've done nothing wrong."
04:11	Officer Thompson pushed Ms. ██████ near the center of her chest, under her bosom, and stated: "First of all step back from me. [...] Why are you being so irate?"
04:17	Ms. ██████ appeared mortified, and responded: "Right now I have a meeting to get to and I've heard you, I'm leaving, I've done nothing wrong, I'm walking out."
04:20	Officer Thompson stated: "Do you understand that you cannot come back to the park? And if you come back you're going to be arrested for trespass? And you are being recorded." Ms. ██████ replied she understood what Officer Thompson was saying, "But I don't believe that that's lawful."
04:47	Officer Thompson then told Ms. ██████ she was free to go and she left.
04:53	Officer Thompson walked back to the area where the park staff were standing and told them if Ms. ██████ returned, to call 911 and that she would be arrested. During the remainder of the video, Officer Thompson and the staff spent several minutes discussing the interaction and the staff's past history of problems with Ms. ██████
17:55	Video concluded.

### c. Documentary Evidence

The OEMC Event Query and Unit Query (#1825407126) showed that on September 11, 2018, vehicle 1432 responded to a call for service at Holstein Park, 2200 N. West Drive of Oakley Ave., at 12:29 p.m. The report documented the 911-caller reported a white female wearing a white swim cap, and black swim suit had threatened a worker.<sup>20</sup>

### 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.

<sup>20</sup> Attachment 11.

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. Police Officer Curtisteen J. Thompson

COPA finds **EXONERATED** for **Allegation #1** that on the date and time alleged, **Police Officer Curtisteen J. Thompson**, while on duty, engaged in unnecessary physical contact with ██████████ by intentionally pushing or poking her in the chest and causing her to stumble backwards, during a verbal confrontation at the Holstein Park swimming pool field house. BWC footage was clear: While said physical contact undoubtedly and admittedly occurred,<sup>21</sup> what remains outstanding is its appropriateness under the circumstances, Department policy and Illinois law.

At the time of the incident Ms. ██████████ was already out of the pool and clothed. She was not standing near the pool edge, nor on tile. During her interaction with Officer Thompson, Ms. ██████████ stood in close proximity to Officer Thompson, nearly face-to-face, outside the field house, and the two argued over Ms. ██████████ reported improper behavior at the pool. At one point, Ms. ██████████ appeared on BWC to move slightly closer towards Officer Thompson.<sup>22</sup> Ms. ██████████ simultaneously began raising her voice and waving her arms, arguing that she had done

---

<sup>21</sup> See also Attachment 18 at 16:27. "I wasn't trying to cause her any harm. I didn't push her to cause her any harm. I put my hand out to push her away from me so I can have distance, 'cause I don't know if she's going to go for my weapon – this lady was very aggressive towards me for some reason [...] I didn't push her to cause her to fall down, I didn't use enough force to cause her to fall down."

<sup>22</sup> Attachment 14, at 4:00.

nothing unlawful.<sup>23</sup> The video then depicted Officer Thompson push Ms. [REDACTED] just under her breasts towards the center of her chest, and with a moderate amount of force.<sup>24</sup> Ms. [REDACTED] appeared flabbergasted, but, contra her COPA statement (and thus diminishing her credibility), she did not appear to stumble backward, or suffer injury.

While pushing Ms. [REDACTED] Officer Thompson stated on BWC: “[...]First of all, step back from me. Why are you being so irate?” Later in the video, Officer Thompson told pool staff that she felt Ms. [REDACTED] was getting too close for safety: “She was all in my space. I thought she was too close, so if she got ready to swing on me I need to have some arm movement so I can punch her back.”<sup>25</sup> During her sworn statement to COPA, Officer Thompson related that Ms. [REDACTED] moved to within approximately a foot of Officer Thompson before the chest poke/push.

Current Department “Force Options” guidelines hold, in part, that officers shall use de-escalation techniques to prevent or lessen the use of force whenever safe and feasible under the circumstances.<sup>26</sup> Any use of force shall be objectively reasonable, necessary under the circumstances, and proportional to the threat, actions, and level of resistance offered by a subject. Officers shall also work to maintain a “zone of safety” around a suspect. Applied here, the preponderance of evidence showed that Officer Thompson’s actions, including pushing or poking Ms. [REDACTED] were reasonable, necessary, and proportional to the threat posed, and maintained such a zone of safety.

When considering the officer’s knowledge of the underlying reason behind the dispatch, the fact she was the only officer initially present, the fact the confrontation occurred – as requested by Ms. [REDACTED] -- in a more secluded, vacant area outside the fieldhouse, the fact that Holstein staff warned Ms. [REDACTED] previously threatened staff and/or showed signs suggesting mental illness, coupled with Ms. [REDACTED] erratic actions observed by Officer Thompson, it was reasonable for Officer Thompson to have heightened safety concerns, and act to maintain a reasonable distance between herself and Ms. [REDACTED] BWC footage showed Ms. [REDACTED] -- who was also taller than Officer Thompson -- standing close to the officer. At one point, during the height of the argument, Ms. [REDACTED] inched closer to Officer Thompson and waved her arms about. Officer Thompson’s then pushing back or poking Ms. [REDACTED] and warning her to move back, was an objectively reasonable, justifiable, and non-injurious means of maintaining a safe distance, and de-escalate the situation. Pushing or poking Ms. [REDACTED] to separate the two, likewise maintained a zone of safety between the officer and Ms. [REDACTED] Doing so was consistent with Department Directive(s) and policy, and lessened the risk of an escalation requiring potentially even more stringent measures.

---

<sup>23</sup> Id. at 4:08.

<sup>24</sup> Id. at 4:12.

<sup>25</sup> Id. at 6:18.

<sup>26</sup> See Attachment 15, G03-02-01 “Force Options”.

Ms. ██████ claim Officer Thompson's actions caused her to stumble, begin to fall back, and be injured, is belied by the BWC footage and the parties' statements – and thus materially diminishes Ms. ██████ credibility for COPA's purposes of review. Her instant allegation, and the totality of objective evidence recovered, therefore, are unpersuasive, and insufficient to prove and sustain the allegation by the requisite preponderance.

For each of the foregoing reasons, a finding of **EXONERATED** is warranted.

COPA finds **SUSTAINED** for **Allegation #2** that on the date and time alleged, **Police Officer Curtisteen J. Thompson**, while on duty, unjustifiably failed to draft and provide a copy of an Investigatory Stop Report or Receipt, after detaining Ms. ██████ To wit: BWC footage showed Officer Thompson at one point order Ms. ██████ not to walk away while Officer Thompson spoke to her. Per S04-13-09, officer use of language or tone of voice indicating that compliance with an officer's request might be compelled is one indication an otherwise consensual encounter between an officer and civilian has escalated to an investigatory stop. Applied here, the BWC footage depicted sufficient evidence showing that Ms. ██████ – as would most reasonable civilians facing a like situation – would reasonably not believe she was free to depart after the officer warned her to remain. Ms. ██████ turning around and returning to Officer Thompson's location when so ordered supports the premise Ms. ██████ reasonably believed she had no lawful choice but to return towards the office, at least for that moment.

No recovered evidence showed an ISR receipt was ever drafted and/or provided to Ms. ██████ following the encounter, and Officer Thompson also admitted not providing an ISR during her COPA statement.

Officer Thompson further admitted in her statement that she should have drafted an ISR incident to the encounter. She later recanted, however, and posited that an ISR may not have been required because OEMC's dispatch records of the call and creation of an event number were sufficient to forego drafting an ISR.<sup>27</sup> That rationale for eschewing an ISR, however, is error, in part, and not exculpatory of the instant matter. To wit:

S04-13-09 specifically mandates, in part:

“[...] Sec. III

“C. **Sworn members who conduct an Investigatory Stop are required to complete an Investigatory Stop Report.** [Emphasis added].

“D. The reasons for completing the Investigatory Stop Report is to ensure:

- “1. sworn members document the facts and circumstances of:
  - “a. an Investigatory Stop, including a statement of the facts establishing Reasonable Articulate Suspicion to stop an individual;
  - “b. a Probable Cause stop when no other document captures the reason for the detention;

---

<sup>27</sup> Attachment 18, *supra*, at 20:57, and 22:50.

- “c. a Protective Pat Down or other search, including a statement of the facts establishing Reasonable Articulate Suspicion to pat down an individual for potential weapons;
- “2. appropriate Investigatory Stop, Probable Cause to stop when no other document captures the reason for detention, Protective Pat Down, or other search information is entered and retained within the Investigatory Stop Database; and
- “3. supervisors review the facts and circumstances of Investigatory Stop, Probable Cause stops, Protective Pat Downs, or other searches[....]”

Officer Thompson’s actions here constituted an “Investigatory Stop,” not a “Probable Cause” stop. Officer Thompson responded to a call for service about an unknown female of a certain description, and Officer Thompson stopped and questioned a female at Holstein Park roughly matching that description. The investigatory questioning of Ms. ██████ did not uncover facts showing probable cause to arrest and she was thereafter allowed to depart. Contra S04-13-09, therefore, had the incident instead amounted to a stop with probable cause to arrest, plus another document (an arrest report) was then generated that “captured the reason for the detention,” providing an ISR could have been omitted. Here, however, the incident did *not* rise to a probable cause stop, no related document(s) was drafted capturing the reason for the initial detention, and, therefore, an ISR *was* required.<sup>28</sup>

For each of the foregoing reason(s), a finding of **SUSTAINED** is warranted.

## VIII. RECOMMENDED DISCIPLINE FOR SUSTAINED ALLEGATIONS

### a. Officer Curtisteen J. Thompson

#### i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History

Officer Thompson’s complimentary history consists of the following: (1) 2004 Crime Reduction Ribbon; (1) 2009 Crime Reduction Award; (1) 2019 Crime Reduction Award; (1) Attendance Recognition Award; (4) Complimentary Letter; (1) Democratic National Convention Award; (2) Department Commendation; (18) Honorable Mention; (1) Joint Operations Award; (1) NATO Summit Service Award, (1) Presidential Election Deployment Award, 2008. Total of (32) Awards.

---

<sup>28</sup> Specifically, ISR form “CPD-11.912,” box 3 marked: “Fits Description Of An Offender As Described By Victim Or Witness.”

