

SUPPLEMENTAL SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

This Supplemental Summary Report of Investigation expressly and fully incorporates the facts, analysis, and findings of COPA's Summary Report of Investigation for LOG# 2020-1333. This report was prepared to document the investigatory steps taken by COPA in response to the Chicago Police Department's February 1, 2022, request¹ that COPA conduct additional investigatory steps. Specifically, the Department requested that COPA take the following steps: (1) compel ██████████ to provide a statement to COPA, (2) attempt to contact two witnesses, ██████████ and ██████████ and (3) obtain text messages between Officer Hosepian and ██████████

The information provided below summarizes the steps COPA took during the duration of this investigation.² The investigative efforts illustrate COPA's attempt to interview witnesses and collect items of evidentiary value. Thus, COPA original findings and recommendation of 180-Day Suspension up to Separation for all allegations against, Officer Anna Hosepian, Star #18922 remain unchanged.

I. INVESTIGATORY STEPS TAKEN (CMS CASE NOTES)**a. ██████████ Statement**

On March 30, 2020, COPA attempted to contact ██████████ by leaving him a voicemail. Having received no response, COPA sent ██████████ emails on March 31, 2020 and April 8, 2020. On April 9, 2020, COPA received a telephone call³ from ██████████. In summary, he said he did not want to pursue the complaint or provide a sworn statement. He indicated that he had been in an off and on-again relationship with Officer Hosepian over the past 4 years, and he ended the relationship with her approximately 2 weeks before the incident on March 20, 2020. ██████████ further indicated that Officer Hosepian became aware of his relationship with his current girlfriend ██████████ because she saw ██████████ in his vehicle.

██████████ added that on March 20, 2020, he was in his apartment watching television with ██████████ when she started receiving private Instagram messages that came from an Instagram account with the name, "██████████," which he believes was a ghost account of Officer Hosepian. The message said, "Are you fucking my boyfriend?" Officer Hosepian and ██████████ exchanged messages, and shortly thereafter, Officer Hosepian showed up uninvited to his residence causing a disturbance. ██████████ referred to Officer Hosepian's behavior as "criminal" on the night of the incident. Moreover, ██████████ described his relationship with the accused as "co-dependent" and "toxic." He said they have broken up with each other several times and somehow end up back together; then, the "cycle" repeats. ██████████ indicated that Officer Hosepian is verbally and emotionally abusive and manipulative towards him. Officer

¹ Att. 24

² COPA notes that the investigative steps outlined in this report are documented in the Notes section of the CMS file, which often includes pertinent information regarding investigative steps. The Notes are accessible by the Department during its review of all investigations.

³ CMS Note CO-0046634

██████████ said that March 20, 2020 was the first time Officer Hosepian had become violent towards him, and he denied ever being violent toward her.

COPA recognizes that ██████████ is a member of the Chicago Police Department and can therefore be compelled to provide a statement to COPA. However, as a general practice, COPA does not compel police officers who are victims of domestic violence or sexual misconduct to provide statements on cases where they are the victims. This is in line with principals of victim autonomy and victim centered approaches to investigations. Victims of domestic violence, in particular, often have individual concerns and interests that can be negatively impacted by forced cooperation in the investigative process, be it criminal or administrative. For example, a victim's physical safety may be in danger by the offender if they truthfully participate in an interview about the offender's behavior. Moreover, forced cooperation has an inherent chilling effect on reporting, particularly in cases where the offender is a police officer. Notably, allowing victim officers to have some say in their level of cooperation does not prohibit COPA from pursuing an investigation or sustaining findings, just as in cases where civilian victims choose not to provide a statement. In this case in particular, the video evidence from Body Worn Camera enabled COPA to obtain statements from ██████████ and two eyewitnesses. Those statements were taken immediately following the incident, and thus, possess a higher likelihood of truthfulness. Those statements also contained sufficient details to not necessitate further information from ██████████ in order to reach a finding based on the preponderance of the evidence.

It should be noted that while this is a general practice in our investigations, COPA could compel a victim officer to provide a statement in unique cases, such as those where there is a heightened concern for the safety of the victim officer or others (i.e. children in the home). However, COPA chooses to reserve such compelled statements for those most unique cases to ensure our practices are as in line with the principals of victim autonomy and victim centered investigations as possible. Indeed, these principals are surely familiar to the Department, as victims of domestic or sexual violence are typically not forced by way of subpoena to testify in criminal proceedings.

Thus, for all the reasons stated above, COPA relied on the statement made by ██████████ on Body Worn Camera in this case and chooses not to compel him absent some specific concern articulated by the Department.

b. Attempts to Contact ██████████ and ██████████

On March 31, 2020, COPA left a voicemail for ██████████⁴ On May 11, 2020 COPA telephoned ██████████⁵ ██████████ answered the phone and stated that he, the victim, and his landlord all agreed to not give statements to COPA, and they just wanted the case to go away. He stated that he already told another COPA investigator that they would not be cooperating. On May 13, 2020, COPA spoke with ██████████ telephonically, who stated she did not wish to provide a statement to COPA. On July 16, 2020, COPA left a voicemail for ██████████ ██████████ COPA did not receive a call back from Mr. ██████████⁶ Thus, COPA made sufficient

⁴ CMS Note CO-0045659

⁵ CMS Note CO-0049612

⁶ CMS Note CO-0058965

attempts to interview the eyewitnesses to this incident. Being unable to interview them, COPA utilized their statements made to responding officer on Body Worn Camera made immediately after the incidents.

c. Text Message Evidence

Lastly, the Department notes that Officer Hosepian stated to COPA that she was exchanging text messages with [REDACTED] on the date of the incident and that these texts were not part of the record. However, COPA did ask Officer Hosepian if she still had those text messages during her statement.⁷ However, she indicated that she obtained a new phone since the incident and the messages were deleted. Furthermore, although the text messages may have referred to Officers Hosepian and [REDACTED] efforts to reconcile and Officer Hosepian notifying him that she was at his home, there is no evidence to suggest that they would resolve any key facts at issue in this case. Officer Hosepian admitted that she arrived at his home without being invited, stating she was stopping by on her way home. Thus, COPA was unable to obtain the texts after learning they were deleted and determined that they did not provide sufficient evidentiary value warranting a subpoena.

III. CONCLUSION

The investigatory steps taken in this case were completed fairly and with thoroughness and documented in the CMS Notes. Thus, COPA stands by the thoroughness and completeness of this investigation and finds no further investigatory steps are warranted.

Approved:

[REDACTED]

Sharday Jackson
Deputy Chief Administrator

July 29, 2022

Date

⁷ Att. 20, page 24 lines 17-24 and page 25 lines 1-4. Transcript