

SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Date of Incident:	September 7, 2019
Time of Incident:	3:42 A.M.
Location of Incident:	7904 South Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, IL 60620
Date of COPA Notification:	September 10, 2019
Time of COPA Notification:	9:14 A.M.

On September 7, 2019, at approximately 3:42 a.m., in the vicinity of 7904 South Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, **Accused Police Officers; Officer Angel Martinez (“Officer Martinez”), Star #5152, Richard Lane (“Officer Lane”), Star#16704, Anthony Carozza (“Officer Carozza”), Star#16555, and Antonio Brand Jr. (“Officer Brand Jr.”), Star#19253,** were responding to a call of a person with a knife at the above location, a restaurant. Upon arrival, the responding Officers encountered [REDACTED], who advised them that he was in possession of a gun, and that he had a valid Concealed Carry license. [REDACTED] was subsequently detained and searched. A loaded handgun was recovered.¹ [REDACTED] was arrested for violation of 430 ILCS 66.0/65-A-10.² Allegedly, a sign was conspicuously posted at the entrance of the premises, indicating that the possession of firearms was prohibited at the establishment. This incident was recorded under Event #02385 and is a Body Worn Camera (BWC) event. Subsequently, [REDACTED] complained to COPA that he had been illegally searched and arrested.

[REDACTED] alleges he was arrested without justification and the Accused Officers failed to understand the Illinois statue regarding Concealed Carry Act of firearms.

II. INVOLVED PARTIES

Involved Officer #1:	Angel A. Martinez, Star #5124, Employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: November 16, 2017, Rank: Police Officer, Unit of Assignment: 006, DOB: [REDACTED] 1993, Male, Hispanic.
Involved Officer #2:	Richard N. Lane, Star #16704, Employee ID# [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: April 16, 2018, Rank: Police Officer, Unit of Assignment: 006, DOB: [REDACTED], 1991, Male, White.
Involved Officer #3:	Antonio Brand, Jr., Star #19253, Employee ID# [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: February 19, 2013, Rank: Police

¹ See Attachment #11; Inventory #14539673.

² Carry Conceal / Public Event, Class B, Type M.

Officer, Unit of Assignment: 006, DOB: [REDACTED],
 1978, Male, White.

Involved Individual #1: [REDACTED], Male, Black.

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer	Allegation	Finding / Recommendation
Officer Angel A. Martinez	1. That on or about September 7, 2019, at or near 7904 South Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, you placed [REDACTED] under arrest, without lawful justification. 2. That on or about September 7, 2019, at or near 7904 South Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, you unlawfully placed [REDACTED] under arrest, as a result of your improperly enforcing 430 ILCS 66/65.	Sustained/Additional Training Sustained/Additional Training
Officer Richard N. Lane	1. That on or about September 7, 2019, at or near 7904 South Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, you placed [REDACTED] under arrest, without lawful justification. 2. That on or about September 7, 2019, at or near 7904 South Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, you unlawfully placed [REDACTED] under arrest, as a result of your improperly enforcing 430 ILCS 66/65.	Sustained/Additional Training Sustained/Additional Training
Officer Antonio Brand, Jr.	1. That on or about September 7, 2019, at or near 7904 South Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, you placed [REDACTED] under arrest, without lawful justification. 2. That on or about September 7, 2019, at or near 7904 South Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, you unlawfully placed [REDACTED] under arrest, as a result of your improperly enforcing 430 IL CS 66/65.	Sustained/Additional Training Sustained/Additional Training

<p>Officer Anthony Carozza</p>	<p>1. That on or about September 7, 2019, at or near 7904 South Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, you placed [REDACTED] under arrest, without lawful justification.</p> <p>2. That on or about September 7, 2019, at or near 7904 South Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, you unlawfully placed [REDACTED] under arrest, as a result of your improperly enforcing 430 ILCS 66/65. rcing 430 ILCS 66/65.</p>	<p>Sustained/Additional Training</p> <p>Sustained/Additional Training</p>
--------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------

IV. APPLICABLE RULES AND LAWS

Rules

1. Rule 1: Violation of any law or ordinance.
2. Rule 2: Any action or conduct which impedes the Department’s efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department.
3. Rule 3: Any failure to promote the Department’s efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals.

Special Orders

1. S06-05-02³

Federal Laws

1. 4th Amendment to the United States Constitution

State Laws

1. Constitution of the State of Illinois, Article I, Section 6
2. 430 ILCS 66/65⁴

³ CPD- Firearm Concealed Carry Act.
⁴ Illinois Firearm Concealed Carry Act.

V. INVESTIGATION

a. Interviews

In his video-recorded interview with COPA on September 10, 2019,⁵ **Complainant** ██████████, stated that on September 7, 2019, at approximately 3:42 a.m., in the vicinity of 7904 South Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, he was arrested by officers from the Chicago Police Department. He was in a restaurant, waiting for his food that he had ordered. Also, in the restaurant, at that time, were two men and a woman. The woman had complained that the tires on her vehicle, which was parked in front of the restaurant, were slashed.. She accused one of the males of doing it, and the police were called by the restaurant proprietor. Several Officers arrived to investigate. One of the officers began questioning ██████████ who told the officer that he had a firearm on his person, and that he had a valid Concealed Carry license. He lifted his shirt and displayed the firearm to the Officer, which was on his right side. He identified that officer as Officer Martinez. Officer Martinez subsequently handcuffed ██████████ His firearm was removed by a second officer, whom he identified as Officer Lane. Officer Lane inventoried his property. A third officer, described as having FTO imprinted on his shirt, searched him. All of the officers were in full CPD uniforms.

When asked why he was being arrested, Officer Martinez told him that he had a Concealed weapon in a public place. ██████████ was subsequently transported to Cook County Jail, where he received an I-Bond about 9:30 p.m., and was released from custody. He returned to the restaurant to retrieve his car, which had been parked at the restaurant, and found that it had been towed. ██████████ stated, “They said they had a sign that was posted on the restaurant window. When I walked out, I saw the sign they were talking about. The sign is not the sign that is on the Illinois State Police website. The sign on the website is a 4 by 6 inch sign that has the Illinois Pursuit Code ; 430 ILCS 66/65 which in Conceal Carry is the only valid sign that I have to go by.”⁶ ██████████ stated from his Concealed Carry class, understood this to mean that if 430 ILCS 66/65 is clearly posted on a sign restricting firearms, that he, as a Concealed Carry permit holder, would be restricted from entering the location. ██████████ provided photographs of the sign that was displayed at the restaurant to the COPA investigators.⁷

In his interview with COPA on October 31, 2019,⁸ **Officer Angel A. Martinez, Star #5124**, stated that he arrived with his partner, Officer Lane, at 7904 S. Vincennes Ave Chicago, IL 60620, after hearing a call from OEMC of a person with a knife at the King Gyros restaurant. There were two male individuals in the restaurant, as well as Officer Carozza, when they arrived. Officer Carozza asked the two individuals if either had a knife, and both said they did not. Officer Carozza continued to talk with the Complainant, who stated, “Officer I have a gun. I want to be honest.”⁹ At that point, Officers Martinez and Carozza detained ██████████ for officer safety, and then handcuffed him. Officer Lane recovered the handgun from ██████████ right side, in his waist band. Officer Martinez said, “I retrieved the ID, FOID card and Concealed Carry License (CCL) from

⁵ Attachment #20.

⁶ Attachment #20 at 5:20.

⁷ Attachment #31.

⁸ Attachment #2.

⁹ Attachment #2 at 9:39.

██████ wallet, in his pocket.”¹⁰ Officer Martinez ran ██████ information into his PDT to obtain his information, then saw the sign on the front of the building indicating that guns are prohibited inside King Gyros. Officers Martinez said, “Any type of sign saying the establishment does not want a weapon, should be valid.”¹¹ Officer Martinez and Officer Lane then placed ██████ under arrest. The arrest was made due to the sign outside of the building indicating that guns were prohibited even though, ██████ had a valid Concealed Carry license. Officer Martinez said, “I made the decision to arrest ██████ since there was a gun violation and the gun I do not want on the streets.”¹² Officer Martinez further added, “I do not recall the statue on the sign. As long as the sign is posted that the establishment did not want any guns, present, that would be a violation.”¹³ ██████ was then transported to the 6th District for processing.

In his interview with COPA on October 21, 2020,¹⁴ **Officer Richard Lane, Star #16704**, stated substantially the same as Officer Martinez’ in his COPA interview. Officer Lane added, “Having a gun in an establishment is not a violation, unless they have a sign posted that said they do not want them there.”¹⁵ Additionally, he stated, “ I don’t know what needs to be on the sign. I just know they need to have the sign out.”¹⁶

In his interview with COPA on November 26, 2019,¹⁷ **Officer Antonio Brand Jr., Star #19253**, stated sustainably the same as Officer Martinez’s in his COPA interview. Additionally, Officer Brand Jr. stated, “I went straight back to talk to the cooks to see if they had any video to show who was on the parking lot.”¹⁸ Officer Brand Jr. said, “There is a weapon there with a red line crossing it which means the weapons are prohibited”¹⁹ He added, “The statue was not on the sign.”²⁰ Lastly, he continued to say that the sign that was displayed on the restaurant was all that was needed to prohibit any firearms in the building.

In his interview with COPA on January 22, 2020.²¹ **Officer Anthony Carozza, Star #16555**, stated sustainably the same as Officer Martinez’ in his COPA interview, except, Officer Carozza added, “My understanding is if a private business has a sign that says firearms are prohibited, Concealed Carry license is incumbent to recognize that and to not bring it into the restaurant. If they do so, it would be in violation of the Concealed Carry Act.”²² “The sign in Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2, they are different. There is a white outline in Exhibit 2. It says fire arms are strictly prohibited, on Exhibit 2, which is not on Exhibit 1 and the statue number is not on

¹⁰ Attachment #2 at 13:35.

¹¹ Attachment #2 at 17:00.

¹² Attachment #2 at 22:50.

¹³ Attachment #2 at 25:10.

¹⁴ Attachment #4.

¹⁵ Attachment #4 at 14:47.

¹⁶ Attachment #4 at 24:09.

¹⁷ Attachment #3.

¹⁸ Attachment #3 at 10:27.

¹⁹ Attachment #3 at 20:00.

²⁰ Attachment #3 at 20:33.

²¹ Attachment #14.

²² Attachment #14 at 8:25.

Exhibit 1.”²³ Lastly he said, “Knowing what I know now, I would not have put [REDACTED] under arrest.”²⁴

b. Digital Evidence

The **Body Worn Camera (BWC)** of Officer Martinez, from September 7, 2019,²⁵ captures the interactions between Officer Martinez, his partner Officer Lane and with the complainant [REDACTED]. At 03:41 a.m. OEMC receives a phone call of a person with a knife at the location of 7900 S. Vincennes Ave, Chicago, IL 60620. The Officers arrive at the location and talk with the women about the tires. Other assisting officers are present, Officer Carozza being one of them. Officer Martinez then speaks with two males inside the building. [REDACTED] states, “I am going to let you know right now, I have a gun on me.”²⁶ Officer Martinez says, “stand up.”²⁷ Officer Carozza puts handcuffs on [REDACTED] and states, “You are not under arrest, we just have to figure this out.”²⁸ [REDACTED] replies, “My Concealed Carry is in my pocket right there.”²⁹ Officer Martinez takes [REDACTED] wallet out of his pocket and gives his ID and information to Officer Carozza. Officer Martinez walks outside to look at the flat tire, then walks back inside the restaurant. Officer Martinez states, “the sign is out there, you cannot have any type of weapons and the restaurant does not want any guns inside, it is a big sign out front.”³⁰ [REDACTED] responds, “ I have a CCL in my pocket and I did not see that sign at all.”³¹ Officer Martinez replies, “ Alright man, you are going with us.”³² Officer Martinez searches [REDACTED] and puts him in the back of a CPD vehicle.

The **Body Worn Camera (BWC)** of Officer Lane from September 7, 2019,³³ captures the interactions between Officers Lane and Martinez with the complainant [REDACTED]. The BWC of Officer Lane shows substantially the same video as Officer Martinez’ BWC video. Additionally, Officer Lane takes the gun off of [REDACTED] right hip. [REDACTED] states, “I have a CCL in my pocket and I did not see that sign at all., I don’t get in trouble or nothing like that, at all.”³⁴ Officer Martinez walks [REDACTED] out of the restaurant, Officer Lane points to the sign that is outside by the door. Officer Lane takes the gun apart and states, “One in the chamber, 13,”³⁵ referring to the number of live rounds in the gun. He places the gun on the hood of the vehicle and puts the pieces of the gun into a purple glove. He gets into a CPD vehicle and drives to the 6th District.

Once he arrives, he walks into the processing room, where [REDACTED] has been placed in, and [REDACTED] states, “Officer, that is not the right sign for Concealed and Carry. I walked in for food and

²³ Attachment #14 at 13:30.

²⁴ Attachment #14 at 15:52.

²⁵ Attachment #25.

²⁶ Attachment #25 at 4:38.

²⁷ Attachment #25 at 4:41.

²⁸ Attachment #25 at 4:50.

²⁹ Attachment #25 at 4:59.

³⁰ Attachment #25 at 10:33.

³¹ Attachment #25 at 12:28.

³² Attachment #25 at 13:05.

³³ Attachment #24.

³⁴ Attachment #24 at 12:35.

³⁵ Attachment #24 at 15:18.

walked out.”³⁶ Officer Lane responds, “It’s posted and one you’re under arrest right now then. They have the sign and then you admitted to drinking.”³⁷ Officer Lane conducts a pat down of [REDACTED] and then walks out of the room.

Digital Photograph showing a sign prohibiting firearms, pursuant to 430 ILCS 66/65, and required by the Illinois State Police to validly restrict the carrying of firearms at a location.³⁸

c. Documentary Evidence

Arrest Report, CB # [REDACTED], for the arrest of [REDACTED] on September 7, 2019, in Chicago, Illinois.³⁹ The report indicates [REDACTED] was arrested for Concealed Carry 430 ILCS 66.0/65-A-10 and that the arrest occurred at 04:00 hours.

Case Incident Report, RD# [REDACTED], for the arrest of [REDACTED] on September 7, 2019, in Chicago, Illinois.⁴⁰ This report indicates that officers arrived at 03:43 hours and [REDACTED] was arrested at 04:00 hours.

Event Query Report, Event # [REDACTED] regarding the call for a person with a knife at King Gyros restaurant.⁴¹

Sworn Affidavit of [REDACTED], executed at COPA on September 10, 2019.⁴²

State of Illinois Concealed Carry License, [REDACTED], License # [REDACTED].⁴³

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

³⁶ Attachment #24 at 25:54.

³⁷ Attachment #24 at 26:06.

³⁸ Attachment #38: This type of sign is required to display 403 ILCS 66/65. The design of the sign is referenced on the Illinois State Police website.

³⁹ Attachment #11.

⁴⁰ Attachment #9.

⁴¹ Attachment #15.

⁴² Attachment #19.

⁴³ Attachment #8.

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.

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.

VI. ANALYSIS

1. Officers Arrested ██████████, without lawful justification.

The Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution and the Illinois Constitution of 1970 guarantee the right of individuals to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures. U.S. Const., amend. IV; Ill. Const. 1970, art. I, § 6. Police-citizen encounters are categorized into three tiers: (1) an arrest of a citizen, which must be supported by probable cause; (2) a temporary investigative seizure conducted pursuant to *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1 (1968) and 725 ILCS 5/107-14, which must be supported by a reasonable, articulable suspicion of criminal activity; and (3) a consensual encounter, which does not implicate any Fourth Amendment interests. *People v. McDonough*, 239 Ill. 2d 260, 268 (2010).

Investigation in this matter has determined that on September 7, 2019, at approximately 3:42 a.m., in the vicinity of 7904 South Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, ██████████ Complainant, was arrested by the Accused Officers. ██████████ was charged with a violation of the Illinois Concealed Carry Act.⁴⁴ At the time of his arrest, ██████████ had volunteered to Officer Martinez, that he was in possession of a firearm. ██████████ lifted his shirt, revealing the weapon. He was subsequently handcuffed by Officer Martinez, searched, and his firearm was confiscated. Officer Martinez was assisted in the arrest by Officer Brand and Officer Lane.

██████████ arrest occurred in a restaurant, which displayed on the front window, a sign, restricting the carrying of firearms on the premises. The sign, however, did not include the requisite language required by the Illinois State Police, namely a reference to the Concealed Carry Act, which would restrict Concealed Carry owners from bringing their firearms onto the premises. In his interview with COPA, ██████████ made this exact point, that as a Concealed Carry License holder,

⁴⁴ 430 ILCS 66/65.

he was not restricted from being present in the restaurant at the time of his arrest; that the sign on the restaurant's window only restricted persons without Concealed Carry Licenses (CCL) from bringing firearms onto the premises. Hence, his arrest was unlawful. Due to the preponderance of evidence, COPA finds the allegation that the Officers that arrested ██████████ without lawful justification to be **sustained**.

2. *Officers improperly enforced 430 ILCS 66/65 which lead ██████████ to be under arrest.*

Signs stating that the carrying of firearms is prohibited shall be clearly and conspicuously posted at the entrance of a building, premises, or real property specified in this Section as a prohibited area, unless the building or premises is a private residence. Signs shall be of a uniform design as established by the Department and shall be 4 inches by 6 inches in size. The Department shall adopt rules for standardized signs to be used under this subsection.⁴⁵

The issue in the case is whether ██████████ was restricted from carrying a firearm into the restaurant, which did not have the appropriate signage conspicuously displayed.⁴⁶ As such, ██████████ would not have been put on notice that his carrying his firearm onto the premises was restricted. At the time, ██████████ had a valid Concealed Carry license.⁴⁷

Firearm Concealed Carry Act states “the owners of private real property of any type may prohibit a CCL licensee from carrying concealed firearms on the property under their control. The owners must post a sign in accordance to the Act indicating that firearms are prohibited on their property, unless the property is a private residence.”⁴⁸ It appears that the arresting Officers misinterpreted the law, the sign on the restaurant did not have the correct statute that the Act requires by law. The sign on the restaurant did not restrict ██████████ who had a valid Concealed Carry license, from entering the premises with his firearm. As such, ██████████ subsequent arrest was without justification, and was based upon a mistaken construction of the relevant statute by the officers.⁴⁹ Due to the preponderance of evidence, COPA finds the allegation that the Officers improperly enforced 430 ILCS 66/65 which lead ██████████ to be under arrest to **be sustained**.

VII. RECOMMENDED DISCIPLINE FOR SUSTAINED ALLEGATIONS

a. Officer Martinez

⁴⁵ Attachment 16- 430 ILCS 66/65- Letter d.

⁴⁶ The sign did not display 430 ILCS 66/65, as required by the Illinois State Police, which would restrict Concealed Carry owners from entering the premises in possession of firearms.

⁴⁷ Attachment #8.

⁴⁸ S06-05-02 Letter F.

⁴⁹ See *Benson v. Hightower*, 633 F.2d 869 (9th Cir., 1981): An officer is not privileged to arrest another whom he reasonably suspects of having committed an act which the officer, through a mistake of law reasonable in one of his position, believes to be a common law felony. So too, a peace officer is not privileged to arrest another whom he reasonably suspects of having committed an act which the officer, through a mistaken construction of a statute, believes to have been made a felony by such statute.

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History

1. Officer Angel Martinez has received a 2019 Crime Reduction Award and an Honorable mention.
2. Officer Angel Martinez has received a reprimand for preventable accident.

ii. Recommended Penalty, by Allegation**1. Allegation No. 1 and Allegation No. 2**

a. COPA recommends additional training for Officer Martinez in 430 ILCS 66/65 *Firearm Concealed Carry Act, prohibited areas*, section (a-10), subsection (d) signs.

b. Mitigating factors: In the past Officer Martinez has had a reprimand for preventable accident in May of 2019. Other than that, Officer Martinez's Complimentary History demonstrates that normally he is attentive to duties and responsibilities as a sworn member of CPD.

c. Aggravating factors: Arrested [REDACTED] because of his understanding of the Conceal Carry statute was inaccurate.

b. Officer Lane**i. Complimentary and disciplinary History**

1. Officer Richard Lane received a 2019 Crime Reduction Award, emblem of recognition- physical fitness and honorable mention.
2. Officer Richard Lane has no disciplinary history.

ii. Recommended Penalty, by Allegation**1. Allegation No. 1 and Allegation No. 2**

a. COPA recommends additional training for Officer Lane in 430 ILCS 66/65 *Firearm Concealed Carry Act, prohibited areas*, section (a-10), subsection (d) signs.

b. Mitigating factors: Officer Lane has no disciplinary history and his Complimentary History demonstrates that he is attentive to duties and responsibilities as a sworn member of CPD.

c. Aggravating factors: Arrested [REDACTED] because of his understanding of the Conceal Carry statute was inaccurate.

c. Officer Brand Jr.

i. Complimentary and disciplinary History

1. Officer Antonio Brand Jr. 's received a 2019 Crime Reduction Award, attendance recognition award, honorable mention, joint operations award, lifesaving award, military service award and a problem-solving award.
2. Officer Antonino Brand Jr. has no disciplinary history.

ii. Recommended Penalty, by Allegation**1. Allegation No. 1 and Allegation No. 2**

- a. COPA recommends additional training for Officer Brand Jr. in 430 ILCS 66/65 *Firearm Concealed Carry Act, prohibited areas*, section (a-10), subsection (d) signs.
- b. Mitigating factors: Officer Brand Jr. has no disciplinary history and his Complimentary History demonstrates that he is attentive to duties and responsibilities as a sworn member of CPD.
- c. Aggravating factors: Arrested [REDACTED] because of his understanding of the Conceal Carry statue was inaccurate.

d. Officer Carozza**i. Complimentary and disciplinary History**

1. Officer Anthony Carozza received a 2019 crime reduction award, attendance recognition award, department commendation, honorable mention, joint operations award, problem solving award, superintendents award of tactical excellence.
2. Officer Anthony Carozza has no disciplinary history.

ii. Recommended Penalty, by Allegation**1. Allegation No. 1 and Allegation No. 2**

- a. COPA recommends additional training for Officer Carozza in 430 ILCS 66/65 *Firearm Concealed Carry Act, prohibited areas*, section (a-10), subsection (d) signs.

b. Mitigating factors: Officer Carozza has no disciplinary history and his Complimentary History demonstrates that he is attentive to duties and responsibilities as a sworn member of CPD.

c. Aggravating factors: Arrested [REDACTED] because of his understanding of the Conceal Carry statue was inaccurate.

VIII. CONCLUSION

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

Officer	Allegation	Finding / Recommendation
Officer Angel A. Martinez	<p>1. That on or about September 7, 2019, at or near 7904 South Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, you placed [REDACTED] under arrest, without lawful justification.</p> <p>2. That on or about September 7, 2019, at or near 7904 South Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, you unlawfully placed [REDACTED] under arrest, as a result of your improperly enforcing 430 ILCS 66/65.</p>	<p>Sustained/Additional Training</p> <p>Sustained/Additional Training</p>
Officer Richard N. Lane	<p>1. That on or about September 7, 2019, at or near 7904 South Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, you placed [REDACTED] under arrest, without lawful justification.</p> <p>2. That on or about September 7, 2019, at or near 7904 South Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, you unlawfully placed [REDACTED] under arrest, as a result of your improperly enforcing 430 ILCS 66/65.</p>	<p>Sustained/Additional Training</p> <p>Sustained/Additional Training</p>
Officer Antonio Brand, Jr.	<p>1. That on or about September 7, 2019, at or near 7904 South Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, you placed [REDACTED] under arrest, without lawful justification.</p> <p>2. That on or about September 7, 2019, at or near 7904 South Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, you unlawfully placed [REDACTED] under arrest, as a result of your improperly enforcing 430 ILCS 66/65.</p>	<p>Sustained/Additional Training</p> <p>Sustained/Additional Training</p>

<p>Officer Anthony Carozza</p>	<p>1. That on or about September 7, 2019, at or near 7904 South Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, you placed [REDACTED] under arrest, without lawful justification.</p> <p>2. That on or about September 7, 2019, at or near 7904 South Vincennes Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, you unlawfully placed [REDACTED] under arrest, as a result of your improperly enforcing 430 ILCS 66/65.</p>	<p>Sustained/Additional Training Sustained/Additional Training</p>
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------

Approved:

[REDACTED]

7-28-2021

Angela Hearts-Glass
Deputy Chief Administrator

Date

Appendix A

Assigned Investigative Staff

Squad#:	12
Investigator:	Andrew Dalkin/Madilyn Kohs
Supervising Investigator:	Andrew Dalkin
Deputy Chief Administrator:	Angela Hearts-Glass