

**SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION**

**I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Date of Incident:	February 4, 2020
Time of Incident:	1:50 PM
Location of Incident:	Jackson Red Line Station, 230 S. State St.
Date of COPA Notification:	February 6, 2020
Time of COPA Notification:	10:42 AM

██████████ (“██████████”) was working for the Chicago Transit Authority (“CTA”) on February 4, 2020 and responded to a stabbing at a train station, where she encountered Officer Raymond Haran (“Officer Haran”) She alleged that Officer Haran grabbed her, pushed her, and engaged in an unnecessary verbal altercation. ██████████ also alleged that when she reported the misconduct to Sergeant William Spyker (“Sergeant Spyker”), he had Officer Haran handcuff and detain her for obstruction. COPA also brought allegations related to reports approved by Sergeant Spyker.

**II. INVOLVED PARTIES**

Involved Officer #1:	Sergeant William Spyker, Star #1930, Employee ID #██████████, Date of Appointment: July 7, 1997, Sergeant of Police, Unit 145 (Traffic Section), Date of Birth: ██████████, 1971, Male, White
Involved Officer #2:	Officer Raymond Haran, Star #10571, Employee ID #██████████, Date of Appointment: July 27, 1998, Police Officer, 1 <sup>st</sup> District, Date of Birth: ██████████, 1966, Male, White
Involved Individual #1:	██████████, Date of Birth: ██████████, 1984, Female, Black

**III. ALLEGATIONS**

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Sergeant Spyker	It is alleged that on February 4, 2020, at approximately 1:50 PM, at the Jackson Red Line station, located at or near 230 S. State St., Sergeant William Spyker committed misconduct through the following acts and/or omissions:  1. Failing to report ██████████’s complaint of misconduct against Officer Haran	Sustained

	<p>2. Threatening to arrest [REDACTED] for making a complaint of misconduct</p> <p>3. Ordering Officer Haran to handcuff [REDACTED] without justification</p> <p>4. Detaining [REDACTED] without justification</p> <p>5. Engaging in an unnecessary verbal altercation with [REDACTED]</p> <p>6. Approving one or more false, misleading, inaccurate and/or incomplete statements in the preparation of a CPD Original Case Incident Report (RD # [REDACTED]) regarding the actions of [REDACTED]</p> <p>7. Approving one or more false, misleading, inaccurate and/or incomplete statements in the preparation of a CPD Investigatory Stop Report (ISR [REDACTED]) completed in connection with the detention of [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Sustained</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Sustained</p>
<p>Officer Haran</p>	<p>It is alleged that on February 4, 2020, at approximately 1:50 PM, at the Jackson Red Line station, located at or near 230 S. State St., Officer Raymond Haran committed misconduct through the following acts and/or omissions:</p> <p>1. Grabbing [REDACTED] without justification</p> <p>2. Pushing [REDACTED] without justification</p> <p>3. Engaging in an unnecessary verbal altercation with [REDACTED]</p> <p>4. Detaining [REDACTED] without justification</p>	<p>Unfounded</p> <p>Unfounded</p> <p>Exonerated</p> <p>Exonerated</p>

#### IV. APPLICABLE RULES AND LAWS

---

##### Rules

---

1. **Rule 2:** Prohibits any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department.
  2. **Rule 3:** Prohibits any failure to promote the Department's efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals.
  3. **Rule 5:** Prohibits failure to perform any duty.
  4. **Rule 6:** Prohibits disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.
  5. **Rule 7:** Prohibits insubordination or disrespect toward a supervisory member on or off duty.
  6. **Rule 8:** Prohibits disrespect to or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty.
  7. **Rule 9:** Prohibits engaging in any unjustified verbal or physical altercation with any person, while on or off duty.
- 

##### General Orders

---

1. **G02-01:** Human Rights and Human Resources.
  2. **G03-02:** Use of Force.<sup>1</sup>
  3. **G03-02-01:** Force Options.<sup>2</sup>
  4. **G08-01:** Complaint and Disciplinary Procedures.
  5. **G08-01-02:** Specific Responsibilities Regarding Allegations of Misconduct.
- 

---

<sup>1</sup> The G03-02 policy referenced in this report was effective from October 16, 2017 - February 28, 2020 (Att. 15).

<sup>2</sup> The G03-02-01 policy referenced in this report was effective from October 16, 2017 - February 28, 2020 (Att. 16).

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

### a. Interviews

██████████<sup>4</sup>

COPA interviewed ██████ on February 10, 2020. On February 4, 2020, ██████ was in her CTA uniform and on-duty when a stabbing occurred at a Red Line station. ██████ was tasked with determining if trains could stop at the station when Officer Haran grabbed her backpack and pushed her. ██████ did not recall the officer saying anything to her first. ██████ told the officer not to touch her. ██████ then saw a CPD supervisor and reported that Officer Haran “grabbed and pushed” her.<sup>5</sup> Sergeant Spyker asked ██████ what she did to provoke it and related that if ██████ complained, he would arrest her. Sergeant Spyker asked Officer Haran if ██████ was obstructing the crime scene. Officer Haran said yes, so Sergeant Spyker told ██████ she was under arrest and had Officer Haran handcuff her. Eventually, Sergeant Spyker related it was a misunderstanding, uncuffed ██████, and let her leave.

#### *Officer Raymond Haran*<sup>6</sup>

COPA interviewed Officer Haran on September 9, 2020. Officer Haran told COPA investigators that he responded to the Jackson Red Line station on February 4, 2020, after learning via radio that someone was stabbed there. He was establishing the crime scene when ██████ walked inside the perimeter, wearing her CTA uniform. Crime scene tape was not yet up, and there were “officers lining the platform around the area that needed to be secured.”<sup>7</sup> When Officer Haran initially approached ██████, she walked away. He then tapped on her shoulder, and ██████ told Officer Haran not to touch her. Officer Haran advised ██████ to exit the crime scene, but she “continued walking towards the blood splatter.”<sup>8</sup> Officer Haran proceeded to grab ██████’s shoulder and forearm, and he escorted her away from the crime scene. Officer Haran denied pushing ██████. ██████ was upset the officer touched her and related she was doing her job. Officer Haran did not arrest ██████ at this time, because the stabbing scene was CPD’s priority and because ██████ had complied and walked away. Officer Haran described ██████ as hostile and believed he was professional during the interaction. Later, Sergeant Spyker asked Officer Haran if ██████ was obstructing the crime scene and Officer Haran explained what happened. Sergeant Spyker ordered Officer Haran to handcuff ██████, and it was not the officer’s decision.

#### *Sergeant William Spyker*<sup>9</sup>

Sergeant Spyker was interviewed by COPA on August 20, 2020. On February 4, 2020, Sergeant Spyker heard a call that someone was stabbed on the Red Line and he went to assist.

---

<sup>3</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>4</sup> Att. 3

<sup>5</sup> Approximately 6:05 minute mark of Att. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Atts. 22 & 23

<sup>7</sup> Att. 22, Page 9, Lines 8 – 9.

<sup>8</sup> Att. 22, Page 9, Lines 22 – 23.

<sup>9</sup> Atts. 28 & 34

Sergeant Spyker did not personally see Officer Haran moving [REDACTED] out of the crime scene, nor had he seen [REDACTED] inside the crime scene. [REDACTED] approached Sergeant Spyker and related that Officer Haran pushed her. Sergeant Spyker spoke with Officer Haran “to determine if there was probable cause for an arrest.”<sup>10</sup> He had Officer Haran handcuff [REDACTED], once Sergeant Spyker learned [REDACTED] had ignored the officer’s orders. Sergeant Spyker denied arresting [REDACTED] because he was irritated by her demands to make a complaint. He repeatedly asserted that he arrested her because there was probable cause for an arrest. [REDACTED] was released without charges after Sergeant Spyker spoke with Officer Haran, [REDACTED], and [REDACTED]’s believed supervisor and learned that [REDACTED] may not have heard Officer Haran’s orders. Sergeant Spyker believed he treated [REDACTED] respectfully and did not believe he insulted [REDACTED]. Sergeant Spyker clarified that he was always aware [REDACTED] was a CTA employee. Sergeant Spyker believed he approved [REDACTED]’s ISR and the Case Report for this incident, and that the documents accurately reflected [REDACTED]’s CPD interactions. Sergeant Spyker acknowledged he made a mistake and he should have taken [REDACTED]’s complaint, based on CPD policy.

## b. Digital Evidence

### *Chicago Transit Authority Security Footage<sup>11</sup>*

A train was in the station and blocking view of the platform when Officer Haran approached [REDACTED]. At about the 17:42 minute mark, the train drove off and Officer Haran was briefly seen relocating [REDACTED]. He removed his hands, and [REDACTED] and Officer Haran appeared to be arguing.

### *Body Worn Camera (“BWC”)<sup>12</sup>*

Officer Haran arrives at the Jackson Red Line train platform at about 1:40 PM. Multiple civilians and CTA employees are standing and walking around the station. The station clears out after about 10 minutes. Officer Haran announces there was a crime scene. Shortly after, [REDACTED] walks past him while speaking into her radio. Officer Haran taps [REDACTED]’s arm and says, “Watch out! Whoa! Ma’am, ma’am.”<sup>13</sup> He again taps on [REDACTED]’s arm and [REDACTED] tells Officer Haran that she heard him and that she is talking with someone (via her radio). [REDACTED] then continues walking and speaking into her radio. Officer Haran tells [REDACTED] that she cannot walk in a crime scene and he asks to her exit. Soon thereafter, Officer Haran grabs [REDACTED]’s right sleeve with his right hand and guilds [REDACTED] out of the crime scene. As he walks with [REDACTED], Officer Haran used his left arm to move her body over to the right, as [REDACTED] asks to officer not to touch her. Officer Haran reiterates that [REDACTED] cannot go into the crime scene. Meanwhile, an officer in the background puts up crime scene tape. When [REDACTED] then asked officers standing nearby if the station should close, several officers responded that she should ask her own supervisor. An officer in a dark gray hoodie shouted, “Hey you know what, grab her information [inaudible], since she wants to know so much, and put her in the report.”<sup>14</sup>

At about 5-10 minutes later, [REDACTED] tires to speak with Sergeant Spyker, because she identifies him as a supervisor. She tells Sgt. Spyker that she has a problem with one of his officers.

---

<sup>10</sup> Att. 34, Page 12, Lines 18 – 19.

<sup>11</sup> Att. 13

<sup>12</sup> Att. 11

<sup>13</sup> Approximately 11:15 minute mark of Officer Haran’s BWC.

<sup>14</sup> Approximately 7:12 minute mark of Sergeant Spyker’s BWC.

Specifically, Officer Haran grabbed and pushed her. Sergeant Spyker asks ■■■ if she was within the crime scene. ■■■ insists that something must be done about Officer Haran's conduct. Sergeant Spyker tells ■■■ that if Officer Haran says that ■■■ was obstructing the crime scene, ■■■ would be arrested. ■■■ argues back that she cannot be arrested for doing her job. Sergeant Spyker responds, "Well, that's the way it's gonna go if you wanna to complain."<sup>15</sup> ■■■ and Sergeant Spyker continue to argue. Sergeant Spyker then asks ■■■, "Are you the supervisor? Is it worth to you. . . that serious. . . for this?"<sup>16</sup> ■■■ responds, "Yes, because he pushed me." Both then continue to argue about if Officer Haran was allowed to push ■■■. Meanwhile, Officer Haran approaches and relates he pushed ■■■ because she was walking through the crime scene. After confirming with ■■■ that she wanted to pursue the issue, Sergeant Spyker asked Officer Haran if he wanted ■■■ arrested for obstructing the crime scene. ■■■ laughs, and Sergeant Spyker stated, "she can laugh all she wants." Sergeant Spyker asks ■■■ if she was done with her complaint, and ■■■ responds that she was moving forward without involving Sergeant Spyker and Officer Haran. Sergeant Spyker then orders ■■■'s arrest seconds later.<sup>17</sup> Following ■■■'s arrest, ■■■ and the Sergeant Spyker continue to argue.

In the meantime, ■■■'s CTA manager arrives. ■■■'s manager relates that ■■■ was on the radio with her superiors and had not heard Officer Haran. After a continued discussion, ■■■'s manager persuades Officer Haran and Sergeant Spyker that ■■■'s arrest amounted to a misunderstanding and that ■■■ was following CTA orders. Officer Haran uncuffs ■■■.

### c. Documentary Evidence

#### *Investigatory Stop Report ("ISR")<sup>18</sup>*

Officer Haran wrote that ■■■ was detained after Sergeant Spyker learned that she ignored verbal commands to exit the crime scene.<sup>19</sup> Officer Haran was required to "physically escort her from the crime scene," and ■■■ became "irate" that he touched her. After a "full investigation," Sergeant Spyker thought "it was possible that [■■■] may not have heard [Officer Haran's] verbal commands because she was talking on her cell phone." The ISR was approved by Sergeant Spyker.

#### *CPD Reports - RD #■■■■■■■■<sup>20</sup>*

CPD reports were identified related to the stabbing incident and referenced ■■■ as an offender.<sup>21</sup> Per the Case Report, Officer Haran was "establishing and protecting the crime scene," when he saw ■■■, in CTA uniform, "walk through and potentially contaminate the scene." Officer Haran ordered her out of the scene's perimeter, but she did not comply. ■■■ "became irate and was momentarily detained." An ISR was issued and ■■■ was released without charges. This report was authored by Officer Charles Chilla (Star #121746) and approved by Sergeant Spyker.

---

<sup>15</sup> Approximately 12:40minute mark of Sergeant Spyker's BWC.

<sup>16</sup> Approximately 12:50minute mark of Sergeant Spyker's BWC.

<sup>17</sup> Approximately 15:15 minute mark of Sergeant Spyker's BWC.

<sup>18</sup> Att. 5

<sup>19</sup> ■■■'s first name was misspelled as "■■■■■■" on this ISR.

<sup>20</sup> Att. 19

<sup>21</sup> Most details in the Event Query reports pertained to the stabbing and were irrelevant to ■■■'s incident.

## 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 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.

## VII. ANALYSIS

### *Officer Haran*

#### *Allegation 1 & 2*

While Officer Haran did have physical contact with ■■■, COPA finds the allegations that Officer Haran grabbed and pushed ■■■ without justification are both unfounded. CPD directive G03-02-01 allows CPD officers to use mild physical force (i.e. holding techniques, such as wristlocks, *grabbing an arm, and come-along holds*) when engaging passive resisters. COPA finds ■■■ became a passive resister once Officer Haran asked ■■■ to exit the active crime scene and she continued to walk within crime scene and not away from it. ■■■'s characterization of Officer Haran's push was not corroborated by BWC; instead, Officer Haran asked ■■■ multiple times not to walk within the active crime scene and only physically directed ■■■ from the crime scene after she was nonresponsive to verbal commands. Officer Haran's use of force was reasonable and necessary because ■■■ was in a crime scene and not responding to Officer Haran's lawful order to exit. Finally, the force was proportional, in that video evidence captured Officer Haran only use

enough force to direct [REDACTED] from the crime scene without injury or discomfort. In sum, COPA finds [REDACTED] was a passive resistor and Officer Haran's action of physically directing [REDACTED] (not grabbing and pushing) were within policy. Accordingly, COPA finds Allegations 1 and 2 are unfounded.

### *Allegation 3*

Allegation 3, that Officer Haran engaged in an unnecessary verbal altercation with [REDACTED], is exonerated. As explained above, crime scene integrity necessitated a conversation with [REDACTED]. While assertive towards correcting [REDACTED]'s movement within the crime scene, COPA finds Officer Haran politely asked [REDACTED] to exit the crime scene before physically directing her from the area. [REDACTED] began to argue with Officer Haran who perpetuated the argument by arguing back, the duration was brief, and Officer Haran disengaged after approximately 15 seconds of disagreement. Due to the brevity of the interaction and Officer Haran being justified in initiation his interaction with [REDACTED], COPA finds allegation 3 exonerated.

### *Allegation 4*

The allegation that Officer Haran detained [REDACTED] without justification is exonerated. While Officer Haran handcuffed [REDACTED], he did so on Sergeant Spyker's orders. Had Officer Haran refused, he would have violated Rule 7 by being insubordinate towards a supervisor. In this instance, COPA finds Officer Haran was complying with a superior's directive; therefore, Allegation 4 is exonerated.

### *Sergeant Spyker*

#### *Allegation 1*

Allegation 1, that Sergeant Spyker failed to report [REDACTED]'s misconduct complaint against Officer Haran, is sustained. CPD directive G08-01-02 requires supervisors who receive a complaint of misconduct initiate an investigation with a written report to COPA and to CPD's Bureau of Internal Affairs ("BIA"), specifically complaints of excessive or unwarranted force. CPD directive G08-01 states that, "All members will comply with the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department, directives, and orders. Members that fail to comply hinder the effective performance of the Department's functions. This failure will be considered just cause for disciplinary action." As stated above, COPA agrees that Officer Haran was acting within policy when he relocated [REDACTED]. Regardless, [REDACTED] clearly advanced a complaint that Officer Haran used improper force against her. Sergeant Spyker is not the responsible party for deciding if Officer Haran's actions were misconduct. Policy does not leave room for discretion and Sergeant Spyker did not have the authority to unilaterally deem [REDACTED]'s complaint meritless. Sergeant Spyker's failed to adhere to and promote CPD policy when he refused to take [REDACTED]'s misconduct complaint against [REDACTED], and Allegation 1 is sustained, as a violation of Department rules 2, 3, 6, and 10.

### *Allegation 2 - 4*

Allegations 2, 3 & 4 against Sergeant Spyker, that he threatened to arrest [REDACTED] for making a misconduct complaint, and that he had [REDACTED] handcuffed and detained without justification, are sustained. CPD directive G02-01 states, “*The Chicago Police Department will not tolerate abuse of law enforcement authority. While the Department does recognize the concept of discretion, that discretion must be reasonable, defensible and may not be for an improper purpose.*” Regardless of the existence of any probable cause, COPA finds that in this instance Sergeant Spyker was not justified in arresting [REDACTED] *per CPD policy*, as COPA finds [REDACTED] arrest’s was convincingly an unreasonable, indefensible act of retaliation against [REDACTED] for asserting a complaint against Officer Haran.

After confirming multiple times with [REDACTED] that she wanted to pursue her complaint against Officer Haran, video evidence clearly establishes that Sergeant Spyker poses [REDACTED] an ultimatum: If [REDACTED] complains she’ll be arrested for walking within the crime scene. Nonetheless, [REDACTED] continues to demand that her complaint against Officer Haran is acknowledged. [REDACTED]’s persistence results in her arrest – Sergeant Spyker directly tells [REDACTED] she is going to be arrested and subsequently orders Officer Haran to handcuff [REDACTED].

Sergeant Spyker’s comments capture on BWC indicated he would not have arrested [REDACTED] had she dropped her complaint. In fact, there is no indication at all that Sergeant Spyker even considered arresting [REDACTED] until after [REDACTED] advanced her complaint. Sergeant Spyker specifically asked [REDACTED] if the issue was “that serious.” Most telling, when Sergeant Spyker asked [REDACTED] if she was done with her complaint, and [REDACTED] responded that she was moving forward without involving Sergeant Spyker and Officer Haran, Sergeant Spyker ordered her arrest seconds later. If Sergeant Spyker was truly concerned exclusively with probable cause and crime scene integrity, he would have acted towards arrested [REDACTED] right away instead of confirming she wanted to pursue her complaint first. Furthermore, the other civilians captured walking within the crime scene would have also be be subjected to the same scrutiny and possible arrest. This singular focus on [REDACTED] only serves to highlight the clear nexus between [REDACTED]’s action of advancing a complaint and her subsequent arrest. Accordingly, Allegations 2, 3 & 4 are sustained, as a violation of Department rules 2, 3, 6, and 10.

### *Allegation 5*

Allegation 5 against Sergeant Spyker, that he engaged in an unnecessary verbal altercation with [REDACTED], is sustained. As discussed above, Sergeant Spyker was required to acknowledge and report [REDACTED]’s complaint. Instead, Sergeant Spyker dismissed [REDACTED]’s complaint, argued with [REDACTED], and ultimately arrest [REDACTED]. The sergeant actions were unnecessary and harmful. Accordingly, Allegation 5 is sustained as a violation of Department rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.

### *Allegation 6 & 7*

Allegation 6 & 7, that Sergeant Spyker approved one or more false, inaccurate and/or incomplete statements in the preparation of the a CPD case report and an ISR, is sustained. While these reports are not fabricated, they do not give a complete and candid picture of [REDACTED]’s CPD

interactions on February 4, 2020. Specifically, both documents characterize ■■■’s detention in handcuffs as a result of her being on the crime scene and acting irate. Neither document notes that ■■■ was actually arrested after she insisted on making a complaint, and not when she was in the crime scene. In fact, neither document notes that ■■■ wanted to make a complaint at all, or that Sergeant Spyker refused. Furthermore, COPA also disagrees with ■■■ being described as irate. The word choice suggests that ■■■ was out of control in her anger and needed to be detained, which BWC refutes. While she was upset after Officer Haran pushed her and Sergeant Spyker dismissed her, ■■■ was not out of control or exhibiting a great level of anger. Lastly, neither report mentions that ■■■ was detained in handcuffs. Because Sergeant Spyker approved reports that did not accurately depict ■■■’s CPD interactions, Allegations 6 and 7 are sustained in violation of Department rules 2, 3, 6, and 10.

**VIII. RECOMMENDED DISCIPLINE FOR SUSTAINED ALLEGATIONS**

**a. Sergeant Spyker**

- i. **Complimentary and Disciplinary History:** No applicable disciplinary history. One (1) 20004 Crime Reduction Ribbon, one (1) 2009 Crime Reduction Award, one (1) 2019 Crime Reduction Award, five (5) Complimentary Letters, Thirty-Six (36) Honorable Mentions, one (1) Jr. Chamber of Commerce Awards, One (1) NATO Summit Service Award, and one (1) Presidential Election Deployment Award 2008.

**ii. Recommended Penalty: Separation**

Sgt. Spyker literally criminalized ■■■’s right to make a complaint against a CPD member. A refusal to take a complaint is already a policy violation but punishing someone for making a complaint is in direct opposition to CPD policy, an act which clearly displayed Sergeant Spyker’s inability for sound judgement as a supervisor within the Department. Sergeant Spyker’s actions amount to an abuse of his authority as a law enforcement officer and certainly bring discredit to the Department. Equally important, the fact that he did not acknowledge the severity of his misconduct when questioned by COPA, and thought he behaved properly, calls into question Sergeant Spyker’s ability to perform the required duties of sergeant within the Department going forward.

**IX. CONCLUSION**

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

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Sergeant Spyker	It is alleged that on February 4, 2020, at approximately 1:50 PM, at the Jackson Red Line station, located at or near 230 S. State St., Sergeant William Spyker committed misconduct through the following acts and/or omissions:	Sustained

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Failing to report ██████████'s complaint of misconduct against Officer Haran</li> <li>2. Threatening to arrest ██████████ for making a complaint of misconduct</li> <li>3. Ordering Officer Haran to handcuff ██████████ without justification</li> <li>4. Detaining ██████████ without justification</li> <li>5. Engaging in an unnecessary verbal altercation with ██████████</li> <li>6. Approving one or more false, misleading, inaccurate and/or incomplete statements in the preparation of a CPD Original Case Incident Report (RD # ██████████) regarding the actions of ██████████</li> <li>7. Approving one or more false, misleading, inaccurate and/or incomplete statements in the preparation of a CPD Investigatory Stop Report (ISR ██████████) completed in connection with the detention of ██████████</li> </ol>	<p>Sustained</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Sustained</p>
<p>Officer Haran</p>	<p>It is alleged that on February 4, 2020, at approximately 1:50 PM, at the Jackson Red Line station, located at or near 230 S. State St., Officer Raymond Haran committed misconduct through the following acts and/or omissions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grabbing ██████████ without justification</li> <li>2. Pushing ██████████ without justification</li> <li>3. Engaging in an unnecessary verbal altercation with ██████████</li> <li>4. Detaining ██████████ without justification</li> </ol>	<p>Unfounded</p> <p>Unfounded</p> <p>Exonerated</p> <p>Exonerated</p>

Approved:



5/24/2021

---

Matthew Haynam  
*Deputy Chief Administrator*

---

Date



5/24/2021

---

Andrea Kersten  
*Chief Administrator*

---

Date

Appendix A

Assigned Investigative Staff

---

<b>Squad#:</b>	14
<b>Investigator:</b>	Kelsey Fitzpatrick
<b>Deputy Chief Administrator:</b>	Matthew Haynam