

Involved Officer #5:	James Hladik, Star #14846, Employee # [REDACTED] DOA: 2/6/95, Rank: Police Officer, Unit of Assignment: 7 th District, DOB: [REDACTED] 69, Male, White.
Involved Officer #6:	Michael Appelhans, Star #11774, Employee # [REDACTED] DOA: 5/1/13, Rank: Police Officer, Unit of Assignment: 7 th District, DOB: [REDACTED] 88, Male, White.
Involved Civilian #1:	[REDACTED] DOB: [REDACTED] 1985, Male, Black

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Officer Michael Hughes	1. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that on or about October 14, 2017, near the vicinity of [REDACTED] Chicago, Illinois 60621, at approximately 7:00 p.m., Officer Michael Hughes kicked in his front door without justification in violation of rules 1 and 2.	Unfounded
	2. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that on or about October 14, 2017, near the vicinity of [REDACTED] Chicago, Illinois 60621, at approximately 7:00 p.m., Officer Michael Hughes ordered him to lie on the ground to be patted down for weapons without justification in violation of rules 1,2, and 8.	Exonerated
	3. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that on or about October 14, 2017, near the vicinity of [REDACTED] Chicago, Illinois 60621, at approximately 7:00 p.m., Officer Michael Hughes searched his home without a search warrant in violation of rules 1 and 2.	Sustained
Officer Jeremy Rice	1. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that on or about October 14, 2017, near the vicinity of [REDACTED] Chicago, Illinois 60621, at approximately 7:00 p.m., Officer Jeremy Rice kicked in his front door without justification in violation of rules 1 and 2.	Sustained

	<p>2. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that on or about October 14, 2017, near the vicinity of [REDACTED] Chicago, Illinois 60621, at approximately 7:00 p.m., Officer Jeremy Rice ordered him to lie on the ground to be patted down for weapons without justification in violation of rules 1, 2, and 8.</p> <p>3. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that on or about October 14, 2017, near the vicinity of [REDACTED] Chicago, Illinois 60621, at approximately 7:00 p.m., Officer Jeremy Rice searched his home without a search warrant in violation of rules 1 and 2.</p>	<p>Exonerated</p> <p>Sustained</p>
<p>Officer Jose Muñoz</p>	<p>1.It is alleged by the Civilian Office of Police Accountability that on or about October 14, 2017, near the vicinity of [REDACTED] Chicago, Illinois 60621, at approximately 7:00 p.m., Officer Jose Muñoz failed to correctly identify himself by giving his name, rank, and star number when requested to do so by [REDACTED] in violation of rules 5 and 37.</p>	<p>Not Sustained</p>
<p>Officer Reinaldo Rodriguez</p>	<p>1. It is alleged by the Civilian Office of Police Accountability that on or about October 14, 2017, near the vicinity of [REDACTED] Chicago, Illinois 60621, at approximately 7:00 p.m., Officer Reinaldo Rodriguez failed to correctly identify himself by giving his name, rank, and star number when requested to do so by [REDACTED] in violation of rules 5 and 37.</p>	<p>Not Sustained</p>
<p>Officer James Hladik</p>	<p>1.It is alleged by the Civilian Office of Police Accountability that on or about October 14, 2017, near the vicinity of [REDACTED] Chicago,</p>	<p>Not Sustained</p>

	<p>Illinois 60621, at approximately 7:00 p.m., Officer James Hladik failed to correctly identify himself by giving his name, rank, and star number when requested to do so by [REDACTED] in violation of rules 5 and 37.</p>	
<p>Officer Michael Appelhans</p>	<p>1. It is alleged by the Civilian Office of Police Accountability that on or about October 14, 2017, near the vicinity of [REDACTED] Chicago, Illinois 60621, at approximately 7:00 p.m., Officer Michael Appelhans failed to correctly identify himself by giving his name, rank, and star number when requested to do so by [REDACTED] in violation of rules 5 and 37.</p>	<p>Not Sustained</p>

IV. APPLICABLE RULES AND LAWS

Rules

Rule 1: Violation of any law or ordinance.

Rule 2: Any action or conduct which impedes the Department’s efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department.

Rule 5: Failure to perform any duty.

Rule 8: Disrespect to or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty.

Rule 37: Failure of a member, whether on or off duty, to correctly identify himself by giving his name, rank, and star number when so requested by other members of the Department or by a private citizen.

Special Orders

Special Order S03-19-01: ShotSpotter Flex Program

Federal Law

United States Constitution 4th Amendment: The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

V. INVESTIGATION ²

² COPA conducted a thorough and complete investigation. The following is a summary of the material evidence gathered and relied upon in our analysis.

a. Interviews³

COPA conducted accused **Officer Michael Hughes'** audio statement on May 16, 2018. Officer Hughes stated that on October 14, 2017, at approximately 7:00 p.m., he was on patrol in the 7th District with his partner Officer Jeremy Rice. Officer Hughes stated he was about a minute away from [REDACTED] when he heard a gunshot. Officer Hughes recalled that shortly after he heard the gunshot, dispatch relayed that ShotSpotter Technology detected gunshots being fired inside of the property at [REDACTED]. Officer Hughes stated he and Officer Rice responded to the ShotSpotter hit call. Officer Hughes described ShotSpotter technology as technology used by the Chicago Police Department to locate fired gunshots. Officer Hughes stated he believed the technology is over 90 percent accurate.

Officer Hughes stated that when he arrived in the vicinity of [REDACTED] he and the other officers observed a black male run from the front lawn into the inside of the home closing the front door. Officer Hughes recalled three or more officers on scene. Officer Hughes stated that he checked both sides of the house for officer safety due to the nature of the call. Officer Hughes stated he and Officer Rice wanted to make sure no one was hurt or shot inside of the house. Officer Hughes stated Officer Rice gained entry into the house by knocking and then using his body to forcefully open the door. Officer Hughes recalled Officer Rice waiting five to ten seconds prior to forcefully opening the door. Officer Hughes stated he and Officer Rice were met by [REDACTED] who they recognized as being the male who ran into the house. Officer Hughes recalled [REDACTED] asking the officers why they were inside of his house. Officer Hughes stated either he or another officer told [REDACTED] there was a call of shots fired at that address. Officer Hughes stated he, Officer Rice, and two other officers asked [REDACTED] to sit down and calm down. Officer Hughes stated the officers searched [REDACTED] for weapons due to the nature of the call and officer safety. Officer Hughes stated he recalled seeing a red substance on the entry foyer floor that he believed was blood. Given that assumption, Officer Hughes stated he believed someone was shot inside of the house and because the second-floor unit door was open, he and his partner went inside.

Officer Hughes stated Officer Rice went up the stairs to the second-floor unit and he followed. Officer Hughes stated there were three black males sitting on the couch. Officer Hughes stated he and Officer Rice wanted to make sure no one was shot or had a weapon so he and Officer Rice asked the three individuals to stand up. Officer Hughes stated he did not recall if he or Officer Hughes informed the three individuals of why they were in the house. Officer Hughes stated he patted down one individual. Officer Hughes stated he then saw a couch pillow which appeared to be manipulated so he picked it up to see if there was a weapon underneath it. Officer Hughes stated that neither he nor Officer Rice recovered a weapon. Officer Hughes stated he and Officer Rice were on the second-floor for under a minute and then left. Officer Hughes stated that while he and Officer Rice were in the second-floor unit, [REDACTED] was downstairs with two other officers. Officer Hughes stated that while there was a first-floor unit to the building, he did not investigate

³ On April 16, 2018, COPA was authorized an affidavit override due to complainant noncooperation. Several failed telephone attempts were made to contact witnesses [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. On October 17, 2017, Mrs. Felicia Snell-Ervin, the mother of complainant [REDACTED] stated she did not want to receive further communication from COPA until she obtained counsel. On November 6, 2017, [REDACTED] failed to show up to his scheduled statement interview and failed to respond to telephone and U.S. Mail communication.

it because the door was closed and there was a large dog inside while the second-floor unit door was open.⁴ Officer Hughes further stated he did not inform a supervisor about his entry into the home.⁵

COPA conducted accused **Officer Jeremy Rice's** audio statement on May 17, 2018. Officer Rice stated that on October 14, 2017, at approximately 7:00 p.m., he was on patrol in the 7th District with his partner Officer Michael Hughes. Officer Rice stated they were less than a minute away from the vicinity of [REDACTED] when they heard a gunshot. Officer Rice stated they got a call from the dispatcher stating a gunshot went off inside a home located at [REDACTED]. Officer Rice stated that when he was turning the corner, he observed a black male running into the home.

Officer Rice stated he was the first responding unit on scene but another unit assisted. Officer Rice stated he observed Officer Hughes canvassing the area for live rounds. Officer Rice stated he believed someone was hurt inside the home so he knocked on the door. Officer Rice stated it was only seconds from the time he arrived on scene to the point that he knocked on the door. Officer Rice stated that after a few attempts to knock on the door with no answer, he lightly kicked the door. Officer Rice stated he was not sure if he announced his office while knocking on the door. Officer Rice stated he used the bottom of his heel to tap the bottom of the door. Officer Rice stated the door was raggedy, shaky, and opened immediately. Officer Rice stated that due to the nature of the call and having seen an individual running into the home, he felt he had exigent circumstances to enter the home. Officer Rice stated that when the door was opened he was standing in the center area when a belligerent male came down the stairs. Officer Rice stated the male looked like the same person he observed running into the home. Officer Rice stated that he asked [REDACTED] to show his hands and get down on the ground due to the nature of the call and for officer safety. Officer Rice stated he did not think he performed a pat down on [REDACTED] but was sure someone did. Officer Rice stated [REDACTED] was eventually informed of the reason officers were in the home but that upon initial contact he was concerned about securing the area for officer safety. Officer Rice stated he heard Officer Hughes asking if there was blood on the floor. Officer Rice stated he did not see the red substance himself. Officer Rice stated that at that moment he had the reasonable belief that someone was hurt and as a police officer his job is to render aid to those in need of help. Officer Rice further stated he did not ask [REDACTED] for permission to enter the home and did not have a warrant to enter the home. Officer Rice stated he decided to conduct a well-being check. Officer Rice stated that he asked [REDACTED] how many people were upstairs and [REDACTED] stated a few people.

Officer Rice stated he went upstairs and saw three men. Officer Rice stated he asked the men if everyone was okay. Officer Rice stated some of the men either nodded their heads or responded that they were okay. Officer Rice stated he did not touch the men or manipulate any furniture. Officer Rice stated he did not see Officer Hughes search the home or the three men. Officer Rice stated he did not find any evidence of shots fired inside the home. Officer Rice stated he then left the residence. Officer Rice stated that [REDACTED] was aggressive and made a few threatening remarks.

⁴ Officer Hughes' BWC footage shows that he looked through a window on the first-floor unit door and saw the barking dog.

⁵ Attachment 37.

Officer Rice stated that while there was a first-floor unit, he did not investigate it because he personally saw [REDACTED] run into the home and again saw [REDACTED] coming down the stairs leading to the second-floor unit. Officer Rice stated [REDACTED] informed him that his mother lived on the first floor and he lived on the second floor. Officer Rice stated that he thought he had exigent circumstances to enter the home but that he did not inquire into the first-floor unit because there was an aggressive dog inside. Officer Rice stated he did not think there was someone injured in the first-floor unit because he saw [REDACTED] coming from the second-floor unit.

Officer Rice stated he was conducting a traffic stop when he received a call from Sergeant Fenton about the incident. Officer Rice stated he told Sergeant Fenton about the nature of the call and that he lightly kicked the door. Officer Rice stated Sergeant Fenton informed him that a complaint was going to be issued. Officer Rice stated he understood Sergeant Fenton had to issue the complaint.⁶

COPA conducted witness **Sergeant Timothy Fenton's** audio statement on May 29, 2018. Sergeant Fenton stated that on October 14, 2017, there was a ShotSpotter hit call to which Officers Hughes, Rice, Hladik, and other officers responded. Sergeant Fenton stated that the fired shot was registered in the gangway. Sergeant Fenton stated that at approximately 7:45 p.m., Felecia Snell-Ervin ("Snell-Ervin")⁷ and four witnesses arrived at the 7th District Station to file a complaint. Sergeant Fenton stated that the Snell-Ervin told him the police kicked in the door and illegally searched the house. Sergeant Fenton stated one of the witnesses told him it was a male black officer who kicked in the door. Sergeant Fenton stated Snell-Ervin gave him a police car number. Sergeant Fenton stated that car number corresponded to the vehicle Officer Hladik drove and so he called Officer Hladik to the station. Sergeant Fenton stated Snell-Ervin told him it was Officer Hladik who kicked in the door. Sergeant Fenton stated he spoke to Officer Hladik away from Snell-Ervin and Officer Hladik related that he only assisted in the call. Sergeant Fenton stated Officer Hladik then activated his BWC⁸ and spoke to Snell-Ervin. Sergeant Fenton stated Officer Hladik relayed to Snell-Ervin that he did drive that vehicle. Sergeant Fenton stated the witnesses all said it was not Officer Hladik who kicked in the door. Sergeant Fenton stated Officer Hladik informed him that Officers Hughes and Rice were on scene and he called them by phone.

Sergeant Fenton stated that when he spoke to Officer Hughes, he relayed that he and Officer Rice responded to a ShotSpotter hit and when they pulled up to the front of the house, they observed a male black look in their direction and run into the house closing the door. Sergeant Fenton stated Officer Hughes said that was when they knocked and kicked the door open. Sergeant Fenton stated Officer Hughes did not tell him who knocked and kicked the door. Sergeant Fenton stated Officer Rice told him roughly the same thing except that Officer Rice stated he kicked the door. Sergeant Fenton stated Officer Rice told him over the phone that he knocked and the door opened but that at the station Officer Rice told him that he knocked a few times, kicked once, and then the door opened. Sergeant Fenton stated he thinks he spoke to Officer Rice at about 8:00 p.m. Sergeant Fenton stated that the proper protocol for responding to a ShotSpotter hit is that officers respond, pat people down for weapons, go to the ShotSpotter hit location and look for shell casings.

⁶ Attachment 38, 39.

⁷ Snell-Ervin is [REDACTED] mother and the first-floor resident at [REDACTED].

⁸ Body Worn Camera.

Sergeant Fenton stated that if found, the shell casings are recovered, inventoried, and reports are made. Sergeant Fenton stated that officers would enter a home in a situation like this one involving ██████████. Sergeant Fenton stated that if he were responding to a shot fired call and saw someone run into a house he would go after the individual. Sergeant Fenton stated that when he spoke to Officer Hughes and Rice, he told them Ms. ██████████ was at that front desk and wanted to file a complaint and that he wanted to see their cameras. Sergeant Fenton stated he did see Officer Rice's BWC and observed that he knocked, turned his body around, and kicked backwards.⁹

COPA conducted witness **Officer Reinaldo Rodriguez's** audio statement on May 9, 2018. Officer Rodriguez stated that on October 14, 2017, at approximately 7:00 p.m., he was on patrol in the 7th District with his partner Officer Jose Muñoz. Officer Rodriguez stated there was an OEMC call of shots fired to the side of the house near the vicinity of ██████████. Officer Rodriguez stated that when he and Officer Muñoz arrived, Officers Rice and Hughes were already on scene. Officer Rodriguez stated there were other officers on scene and more that arrived but did not recall who they were. Officer Rodriguez stated he and Officer Muñoz parked behind Officers Hughes and Rice.

Officer Rodriguez stated that he and Officer Muñoz started looking for shell casings in the area and it was then that he saw ██████████ in the common area of the building. Officer Rodriguez stated he did not find any shell casings. Officer Rodriguez stated he did not recall any of Officers Hughes' or Rice's actions. Officer Rodriguez stated he and Officer Muñoz were on scene for five to ten minutes.¹⁰

COPA conducted a **second audio statement of Officer Reinaldo Rodriguez** on May 25, 2018, interviewing him as an accused with respect to his failure to identify himself to ██████████. Officer Rodriguez stated that pursuant to the Chicago Police Department Rules and Regulations, when a citizen asks an officer to identify him or herself, the officer must identify himself as a Chicago Police Officer, state his name, badge number, and unit of assignment. Officer Rodriguez stated that after seeing the BWC, he heard ██████████ asking for the names of the officers who were at his home. Officer Rodriguez, however, stated that on scene he did not hear ██████████ asking for his specific name. Officer Rodriguez stated that had ██████████ asked him specifically for his name, he would have had no problem providing his information. Officer Rodriguez stated that he was approximately 15 feet away from ██████████ when ██████████ asked for the information. Officer Rodriguez stated ██████████ was irate on scene and as a de-escalation technique, he decided to walk away. Officer Rodriguez stated the investigation of the scene was complete and he believed that the longer he remained on scene, the more hostile it would become. Officer Rodriguez did not observe any officer provide ██████████ with their information. Officer Rodriguez further stated that he now recalled being in the foyer with ██████████ while Officer Hughes and Rice were in the second-floor apartment. Officer Rodriguez stated ██████████ told him not to open the door to the first-floor apartment and that ██████████ was on the phone. Officer Rodriguez reiterated that ██████████ was being irate, screaming, and shouting and that must have been when ██████████ asked for the officer's information.¹¹

⁹ Attachment 51.

¹⁰ Attachment 13.

¹¹ Attachment 48.

COPA conducted witness **Officer Jose Muñoz's** audio statement on May 14, 2018. Officer Muñoz stated that on October 14, 2017, at approximately 7:00 p.m., he was on patrol in the 7th District with his partner Officer Reinaldo Rodriguez. Officer Muñoz stated he and Officer Rodriguez responded to a call of shots fired near the vicinity of [REDACTED]. Officer Muñoz stated that when he arrived on scene, Officers Rice and Hughes were already on scene. Officer Muñoz stated they parked their police vehicle behind Officers Rice's and Hughes' police vehicle. Officer Muñoz stated he did not recall if any other units assisted. Officer Muñoz stated that once on scene, he and Officer Rodriguez investigated the call by looking for shell casings and looking for injured individuals. Officer Muñoz stated their investigation revealed that no one was shot. Officer Muñoz stated he observed Officers Rice and Hughes speaking to an African American male ([REDACTED] inside the common area of the house. Officer Muñoz stated Officer Rice made first contact with [REDACTED] and informed him that he wanted to make sure everyone was okay. Officer Muñoz stated that [REDACTED] was being very irate. Officer Muñoz stated he did not remember whether Officers Rice and Hughes entered the common area first. Officer Muñoz stated either Officer Rice or Hughes knocked on the door but did not see who knocked. Officer Muñoz stated that to his knowledge, Officers Hughes and Rice did not have a search warrant for the house.

Officer Muñoz stated he stayed with [REDACTED] in the common area while Officers Rice and Hughes went into the second-floor unit to check for injured individuals. Officer Muñoz stated he did not go into the second-floor unit. Officer Muñoz stated Officers Hughes and Rice were in the second-floor unit for about a minute. Officer Muñoz stated that when Officers Hughes and Rice returned to the foyer, [REDACTED] threatened Officer Rice. Officer Muñoz stated all the officers, including himself, left the scene after making sure it was secure. Officer Muñoz stated he coded the call as, "other police service."¹²

COPA conducted a **second audio statement of Officer Jose Muñoz** on May 30, 2018, interviewing him as an accused with respect to his failure to identify himself to [REDACTED]. Officer Muñoz stated that pursuant to the Chicago Police Department Rules and Regulations, when a citizen asks an officer to identify him or herself, the officer must provide his or her name, rank, and star number. Officer Muñoz stated that after seeing Officer Hughes' BWC, he heard [REDACTED] asking for the names of the officers present at his home. Officer Muñoz stated he was one of the assisting officers present at [REDACTED] home but that he did not provide his information to [REDACTED]. Officer Muñoz stated he did not hear [REDACTED] asking for the information on scene. Officer Muñoz stated that while he did not provide his information because he didn't hear [REDACTED] asking for it, his information was visible on his vest. Officer Muñoz stated his vest contains his name, star, rank, and unit of assignment. Officer Muñoz stated that at the moment when Officer Hughes was walking out of [REDACTED] home and [REDACTED] requested the information, he was approximately 50 feet away from him and [REDACTED]. Officer Muñoz stated he was standing past the home's fence. Officer Muñoz stated that [REDACTED] was very aggravated and given his force mitigation technique training, he decided to create distance between himself and [REDACTED]. Officer Muñoz further stated that he could not specifically recall whether [REDACTED] asked for his information at that time. However, Officer Muñoz stated that had [REDACTED] asked him for his information at that time, he would have provided it. Officer Muñoz stated he did not see any officer provide their information to [REDACTED] on scene or hear [REDACTED] ask for any specific officer's information.¹³

¹² Attachment 40.

¹³ Attachment 52.

COPA conducted accused **Officer James Hladik's** audio statement on May 25, 2018. Officer Hladik stated that on October 14, 2017, he was on duty and working with Officer Michael Appelhans. Officer Hladik stated they responded to a ShotSpotter call. Officer Hladik stated he did not recall whether he heard if the fired gunshot was inside of the house or on the side of the house. Officer Hladik stated that upon arriving to the scene, he observed other units already on scene. Officer Hladik stated he observed officers engaging with people on the porch and inside the doorway. Officer Hladik could not remember how many officers were on scene. Officer Hladik said he went directly towards the gangway on the side of the house to look for shell casings. Officer Hladik stated he checked the two gangways and the lawn for shell casings. Officer Hladik stated it is very hard to find shell casings and so he was very concentrated when looking for them. Officer Hladik stated that Officer Appelhans was by his side looking for shell casings as well. Officer Hladik stated Officer Appelhans was a new police officer at the time and was helping him look for shell casings. Officer Hladik stated he did not find any shell casings. Officer Hladik stated he did not have any conversations with the officers on scene. Officer Hladik stated he did not know what was happening on the porch and that he was only focused on finding shell casings. Officer Hladik stated that he observed [REDACTED] locking the outer security gate. Officer Hladik stated that [REDACTED] said to him it sucked that he didn't find what he was looking for. Officer Hladik stated [REDACTED] then accused him of kicking in his door. Officer Hladik stated he then told [REDACTED] that was untrue and that he had his BWC on the whole time. Officer Hladik stated that at that time [REDACTED] did not ask him for his name or star number. Officer Hladik stated that he then left the scene.

Officer Hladik stated that pursuant to the Chicago Police Department Rules and Regulations when a citizen asks an officer to identify him or herself, the officer must give their name and star number if the officer hears the request. Officer Hladik stated that after seeing Officer Hughes' BWC, he heard [REDACTED] asking for the names of the officers present at his home. Officer Hladik stated [REDACTED] was asking for the names of the officers he was engaging with on the porch. Officer Hladik stated that at this time he was located in the gangway next door approximately 50 feet away. Officer Hladik stated he did not provide his information because he did not hear [REDACTED] specifically asking him for the information. Officer Hladik stated there was a lot of noise on scene including his police radio and the BWC going off. Officer Hladik stated that he would have provided [REDACTED] his information if [REDACTED] had asked for it. Officer Hladik stated he did not see any officer provide their name or star number to [REDACTED]. Officer Hladik stated that 30 minutes after the incident, he received a call from Sergeant Fenton asking him to go to the station. Officer Hladik stated that at the station, Sergeant Fenton told him a citizen complained about him kicking down his door. Officer Hladik stated he believed [REDACTED] was making a false police report so he activated his BWC and went out to speak to him. Officer Hladik stated he asked [REDACTED] if he thought he was the officer who kicked in his door. Officer Hladik stated [REDACTED] said no it was not Officer Hladik and further stated that the Officers Hladik and Appelhans did not do anything and were just on scene.¹⁴

COPA conducted accused **Officer Michael Appelhans'** audio statement on June 6, 2018. Officer Appelhans stated that on October 14, 2017, he was working with Officer Hladik and they responded to a ShotSpotter call. Officer Appelhans stated that at that point he had been a police officer for two months. Officer Appelhans stated that when he and Officer Hladik arrived on

¹⁴ Attachment 50.

scene, there were already four other officers on the porch of the house with [REDACTED] Officer Appelhans recalled [REDACTED] yelling something about his dog. Officer Appelhans stated he did not have any personal contact with [REDACTED] Officer Appelhans stated that he immediately began looking for shell casings because of the nature of the call. Officer Appelhans stated he did not recall whether he walked onto the property or whether he was searching near the sidewalk. Officer Appelhans stated he was about 12 to 15 feet away from [REDACTED] Officer Appelhans stated Officer Hladik was also looking for shell casings. Officer Appelhans stated that pursuant to the Chicago Police Department Rules and Regulations when a citizen asks an officer to identify him or herself, the officer must provide his or her name, star number, and identify as a police officer. Officer Appelhans stated that after seeing Officer Hughes' BWC, he heard [REDACTED] asking for the names of the officers present at his home. Officer Appelhans stated he did not provide his information to [REDACTED] because he did not hear him ask for that information on scene. Officer Appelhans stated he did not observe any officers on scene provide their information to [REDACTED]¹⁵

b. Digital Evidence

Officer Rice's **Body Worn Camera ("BWC")** footage captures Officer Rice driving the police vehicle to the vicinity of [REDACTED] Upon arriving at the residence, Officer Rice is seen walking towards the front door of the residence. Officer Rice is seen knocking on the front door five continuous times without announcing his office. Officers Hughes, Rodriguez, and Muñoz are seen walking towards the side of the house as Officer Rice is heard telling the officers to hurry up. Immediately after there is a loud thud and the front door is open. [REDACTED] is heard yelling, "why you kick my door in, hold on, hold on!"¹⁶ Officer Rice is seen pointing his gun at [REDACTED] telling him to close the open first-floor unit door and to get on the ground. [REDACTED] repeatedly asks the officers why they are at his house and why they kicked in his door. Officers Rice and Hughes are seen bringing [REDACTED] to the ground by using their hands to push down on [REDACTED] shoulders and arms. Officer Rice is heard asking [REDACTED] where the pistol is and [REDACTED] responds that there is no pistol. Officer Rice pushes the partially opened door to the second-floor unit as he asks who else is upstairs. [REDACTED] responds his little brother and cousins are upstairs and that his mother just left. [REDACTED] tells Officer Rice that his mother lives on the first floor and he lives on the second-floor. [REDACTED] continues to ask for the reason the officers are at his home. Officer Rice tells [REDACTED] a gunshot went off in the house and [REDACTED] replies that it didn't go off in his house. [REDACTED] continues to tell the officers they cannot walk through his house and asks to call his mother.

Officer Rice is heard telling Officer Hughes to watch [REDACTED] as he walks up the stairs to the second-floor apartment. [REDACTED] is heard telling the officers they do not have his permission to walk through his house and that he will call his lawyer. Officer Rice is heard telling [REDACTED] they don't need his permission. Once upstairs, Officer Rice asks three young males that are sitting on the couch if they are okay and asks if one of them shot a gun. One of the males shakes his head no and Officer Rice asks all three individuals to stand up. Officer Hughes is heard telling the individuals to lift their shirts up. Officer Rice asks if there is a weapon in the house to which one of the individuals responds no. Officer Rice then leaves down the stairs and yells at Officer Hughes to leave.

¹⁵ Attachment 53.

¹⁶ Attachment 11 BWC#2 at 00:49.

█ asks why the officers kicked in his door and Officer Rice responds the door was knocked on. █ appears visibly upset and yells at Officer Rice to take off his badge. Officer Rice then leaves the home front lawn and turns off his BWC. ¹⁷

Officer Hughes' **Body Worn Camera** captures the same footage as that described on Officer Rice's BWC. Officer Hughes BWC shows him sitting in the passenger's seat while Officer Rice drives to the vicinity of █. Upon arriving, Officer Rice parks the police vehicle in front of the residence at █ and Officers Rodriguez and Muñoz are seen parked behind Officers Hughes and Rice. Officer Muñoz is heard telling Officer Hughes that someone went inside. Officer Hughes goes towards the right-hand side of the house as Officers Rodriguez and Muñoz are seen checking the sides of the house. At the same time, Officer Rice is knocking on the front door without announcing his office. As Officer Hughes goes to check the left-hand side of the house, a loud thud is heard followed by █ asking why someone kicked in his door. Officer Hughes then goes to the front door and is heard telling █ to get on the ground. Officer Hughes assists Officer Rice in bringing █ to the ground. Officer Muñoz is seen coming into the foyer of the home and telling █ they are making sure everyone is alright. Officer Hughes is heard asking if a substance on the ground is blood. Officer Hughes then walks up to the second-floor unit and asks the three men to stand up and lift their shirts up. After looking over the three men, Officer Hughes walks down the stairs and exits the residence. ¹⁸

Officer Muñoz's **Body Worn Camera** captures him in the passenger's seat while Officer Rodriguez drives to █. Upon arrival, Officer Rodriguez parks behind Officers Rice and Hughes' vehicle. Officer Muñoz approaches the house and begins to look check the side of the house. Officer Muñoz stands on the porch and foyer with Officers Rice and Hughes as they interact with █. █ is heard telling Officers Rice and Hughes that they don't have permission to enter his house. Officer Muñoz is heard telling █ that they just want to make sure everyone is okay. Officers Muñoz and Rodriguez stayed with █ on the foyer as Officers Rice and Hughes entered the second-floor unit. █ is heard talking on the phone with his mother. █ is heard telling his mother that the police kicked in the house door. Officer Muñoz is seen walking out of the front lawn as █ is heard asking the Officers for their names. Officer Muñoz is then seen standing near the police vehicle waiting for Officer Rodriguez. ¹⁹

Officer Rodriguez's **Body Worn Camera** captures him driving his police vehicle to █. Upon arriving, Officer Rodriguez is seen checking the side of the house as Officers Muñoz, Rice, and Hughes are on the foyer with █. Officer Rodriguez stands on the porch behind Officer Muñoz and then enters the foyer. Officer Rodriguez is heard asking █ who lives on the first floor. █ is heard telling Officer Rodriguez that his mother lives on the first floor. Officers Rodriguez and Muñoz are seen standing near █ while he talks to his mother on the phone. Officer Rodriguez is seen standing on the porch as Officer Rice exits the foyer and █ asks for everyone's names. Officer Rodriguez begins walking down the stairs as █

¹⁷ Attachment 11.

¹⁸ Attachment 11.

¹⁹ Attachment 71.

continues to ask for the officers' names. Officer Rodriguez is heard saying the shot came from the side of the house.²⁰

Officer Hladik's **Body Worn Camera** captures him arriving at [REDACTED] and approaching the house as he asks who is shooting a gun. Officer Hladik enters the front lawn of the house and begins to look for shell casings near the sides of the house and the front lawn. Officer Hladik is then seen exiting the front lawn and checking the surrounding areas of the house. When [REDACTED] is heard asking for the names of the officers at his house, Officer Hladik is at a black gate near the gangway of the house. [REDACTED] can hardly be heard. At approximately 8:00 p.m., Officers Hladik and Appelhans are seen talking to Sergeant Fenton. Officer Hladik is seen talking to [REDACTED] tells Sergeant Fenton that Officer Hladik was present but did not enter his home.²¹

Officer Appelhans' **Body Worn Camera** captures him arriving at [REDACTED] and approaching the house. Officer Appelhans is seen checking the sides of the house. Officer Appelhans is seen following Officer Hladik checking for shell casings near the surrounding areas of the house. Officer Appelhans is standing in the front lawn when [REDACTED] is heard asking for all the officers' names.²²

The **In-Car Camera ("ICC")** footage captures Officers Appelhans and Hladik exit their police vehicles and walk towards [REDACTED]. Aside from video, the ICC, captures audio from the BWC's worn by Officers Hughes and Rice. [REDACTED] is heard yelling, "I need all ya'lls names kickin' my door in."²³

OEMC Event 1728712270 is audio transmitting the ShotSpotter hit. The call relayed one shot to the side of the house located at [REDACTED].²⁴

Zone 6 Radio 1912 is audio from unit 702S to an OEMC dispatcher relaying the ShotSpotter hit. 702S relayed one shot to the side of the house located at [REDACTED].²⁵

c. Documentary Evidence

OEMC Event Query Report 1728712251 documents that on October 14, 2017, at 7:13:18 p.m. ShotSpotter Technology detected one round to the side of the house at [REDACTED]. The call was subsequently transmitted to OEMC by unit 702S. Officers Hughes and Rice assisted on the call at 7:13:38 p.m. Officers Rodriguez and Muñoz assisted on the call at 7:13:43 p.m. Officers Rodriguez and Muñoz left the scene at 7:22:19 p.m. At 7:38:40 p.m. Officers Hughes and Rice left the scene and coded the call as other police service.²⁶

VI. ANALYSIS

²⁰ Attachment 71.

²¹ Attachment 71.

²² Attachment 71.

²³ Attachment 11 ICC #3 at 4:47.

²⁴ Attachment 10.

²⁵ Attachment 10.

²⁶ Attachment 26.

The burden of proof COPA uses in its analysis is the preponderance of the evidence standard. It is alleged by ██████ that Officers Hughes and Rice: (1) kicked in his door without justification; (2) ordered him to lie on the ground to be patted down for weapons without justification; and (3) searched his home without a search warrant. Through the course of the investigation, additional evidence of misconduct was discovered. Therefore, COPA further alleges assisting Officers Muñoz, Rodriguez, Hladik, and Appelhans failed to correctly identify themselves by giving their names, rank, and star numbers when requested to do so by ██████

a. Officer Rice Kicked in the Front Door of the Property Located at ██████ and Officers Rice and Hughes Subsequently Searched the Property Without Justification.

The evidence demonstrates that Officer Rice kicked in ██████ front door. Officer Rice ultimately admitted that he kicked in the door and the BWC footage demonstrates that the door was initially closed and only opened after Officer Rice kicked the door with enough force to result in a loud thud.²⁷ Both Officer Rice and Officer Hughes subsequently entered the foyer and later entered ██████ unit despite ██████ expressly telling Officers Rice and Hughes that they did not have permission to enter.

Searches of a home without a warrant issued by an independent judge based upon a showing of probable cause are presumptively unreasonable because “[t]he physical entry of the home is the chief evil against which the fourth amendment is directed” and are only permitted when exigent circumstances are present. *People v. Williams*, 677 N.E.2d 841, 846 (1997). Probable cause to arrest “exists when the totality of the facts and circumstances known to the officers is such that a reasonably prudent person would believe that the suspect is committing or has committed a crime.” *People v. Montgomery*, 112 Ill. 2d 517, 525 (1986). Probable cause to search must be based on facts which would cause a reasonable person to believe that a crime has been committed and those facts must cause a reasonable person to believe that evidence can be found in the place to be searched. *Illinois v. Gates*, 462 U.S. 213, 238 (1983). It is undisputed that Officer Rice and Hughes did not have a search warrant or an arrest warrant when they entered the property located at ██████

The Illinois Supreme Court set out the relevant factors to determine the existence of exigent circumstances in *People v. Williams*. These factors are whether:

²⁷ Officer Rice and Hughes initially entered the foyer of the property located at ██████ but the foyer of a two-flat house located behind a closed door is clearly part of the curtilage of the property and therefore is protected by the Fourth Amendment. *People v. Burns*, 2016 IL 118973 (holding that the third-floor landing located within a locked apartment building was part of the curtilage of the apartment and that a dog sniff outside the apartment violated the Fourth Amendment); *People v. Bonilla*, 2017 IL App (3d) 160457 (extending the holding of *Burns* to a common area in an unlocked apartment building). The property located at ██████ is more akin to a single-family home than an apartment building and it is not even apparent from the outside that the property has two separate units on the inside. In any event, even assuming *arguendo* that the foyer was not part of the curtilage of ██████ apartment, both Officers Rice and Hughes subsequently entered ██████ unit without consent or other lawful justification. While Officers Rodriguez and Muñoz also entered the foyer, there is no evidence they knew that Officer Rice forcefully kicked in the door and therefore no allegations were served against these officers.

(1) the crime under investigation was recently committed; (2) there was any deliberate or unjustified delay by the police during which a warrant could have been obtained; (3) a grave offense was involved, particularly a crime of violence; (4) there was a reasonable belief that the suspect was armed; (5) the police officers were acting on a clear showing of probable cause; (6) there was a likelihood that the suspect would escape if he was not swiftly apprehended; (7) there was a strong reason to believe that the suspect was in the premises and police entry was made peaceably, albeit nonconsensually.

Id. The factors are not exhaustive and the “fundamental guiding principle is reasonableness.” *Id.* at 847. The relevant inquiry is whether circumstances “militate against delay and justify the officers’ decision to proceed without a warrant.” *Id.* Further, an officer may have exigent circumstances to enter into a home if the commission of the offense was made in the presence of the officer or the suspect flees from a public place into his residence in an effort to defeat an arrest already set in motion. *Id.* Finally, community caretaker exception may justify a search or a seizure if the (1) the officer is performing a function other than the investigation of a crime and (2) the search or seizure is reasonable to protect the public safety under the totality of the circumstances. *People v. McDonough*, 239 Ill. 2d 260, 272 (2010).

In the instant case, the totality of the circumstances did not justify Officer Rice’s and Hughes’ warrantless entry into the property located at [REDACTED]. Both Officer Rice and Officer Hughes stated that they heard a gunshot and received a ShotSpotter hit call from dispatch reporting the gunshot near the property located at [REDACTED].²⁸ However, consistent with the reasonableness standard set forth by the Fourth Amendment, Department policy clearly and expressly states that “[a] ShotSpotter alert, by itself, does not give responding Department member(s) the legal authority to enter private property.” Special Order S03-19-01. The only other justification proffered by Officer Rice and Hughes to justify their entry into the property was that they purportedly observed a black male, now known to be [REDACTED] running into the property located at [REDACTED] and close the front door to the property as they approached in their police vehicle.

Officer Rice and Hughes’ observations were insufficient to establish probable cause to either search the home or arrest yet alone establish sufficient exigent circumstances to justify a warrantless entry into a home. It is undisputed that Officers Rice and Hughes had not even attempted to detain [REDACTED] at the time he purportedly ran inside the property. Regardless, it was entirely reasonable for [REDACTED] to take cover inside his house or otherwise flee when a loud sound consistent with gunfire emanated from the side of his property less than a minute before. Neither Officer Rice nor Officer Hughes observed [REDACTED] discharge a firearm, hold a firearm, or act in a manner consistent with possession of a firearm such as holding his side. Finally, Officer Rice and Officer Hughes did not find any evidence, such as shell casings, to corroborate that a gun had recently been fired at or near [REDACTED] nor did they hear any noises either inside or

²⁸ Both Officer Rice and Hughes told COPA investigators that dispatch stated the shot came from inside the house, but the evidence demonstrates that the officers were told that the shot came from the side of the house located at 6420 S. Peoria St and their actions on the date of the incident demonstrate that they believed the shot came from the side of the house on the date of the incident (e.g. Officer Hughes searching for shell casings outside the property, their concern that [REDACTED] discharged even though he was clearly outside the property).

outside the property located at [REDACTED] consistent with someone having just been shot at such as screaming or other commotion. Observing a man run inside a property after hearing gunfire alone cannot justify a warrantless entry into a home.

No other exception to the warrant requirement applied in this case. Officer Rice and Officer Hughes also did not receive any information from dispatch or any other source indicating that someone was shot or otherwise injured inside the house which would have justified a warrantless entry into the property under a community care-taker function. Moreover, the community caretaker exception would not apply because Officer Hughes' and Rice's actions demonstrate that their primary focus was the investigation of a crime and not rendering aid.²⁹ Finally, Officers Rice and Hughes initial actions reflect that they were not in hot pursuit of [REDACTED]. Specifically, Officer Rice knocked on the door several times before kicking it in and Officer Hughes did not even attempt to enter until after Officer Rice kicked in the door. Regardless, hot pursuit is not applicable to this incident because Officers Rice and Hughes did not have probable cause to arrest [REDACTED]. Indeed, Officers Rice and Hughes did not even arrest [REDACTED] even after they gained access to the property which reflects that they recognized that they did not have probable cause to arrest him.

For the above reasons, COPA recommends a finding of **Sustained** for allegations #1 (kicking in the door) and #3 (searching the property) against Officer Rice. However, although Officer Hughes unlawfully entered and searched the property, there is no evidence that Officer Hughes kicked in [REDACTED] front door. Therefore, COPA recommends a finding of **Unfounded** for allegation #1 against Officer Hughes (kicking in the door) and **Sustained** for allegation #3 against Officer Hughes (searching the property).³⁰

b. Officers Rice and Hughes had Articulate, Reasonable Suspicion to Conduct a Protective Pat Down of [REDACTED]

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).

A person is seized when her freedom of movement is restrained by physical force or a show of authority. *People v. Almond*, 2015 IL 113817, ¶ 57. The test is whether a reasonable person would conclude, in light of the totality of the circumstances, that she is not free to leave. *Id.* The

²⁹ For example, Officer Hughes stated that he picked up a pillow to search for a gun and Officer Rice and Hughes did not even check most of the rooms in the property for an injured person.

³⁰ Assuming *arguendo* Officer Hughes and Officer Rice entry and search of the property located at [REDACTED] was justified by exigent circumstances (it was not), the cursory nature of their search would demonstrate that they were inattentive of duty in violation of Rule 10. Specifically, Officer Rice and Hughes did not even check various rooms in the second-floor unit for the firearm or injured persons and did not enter the first-floor unit at all because a large dog was present. If Department members enter a property without a warrant or consent based on exigent circumstances, they certainly must then take all lawful and reasonable steps to ensure any threat is eliminated (e.g. thoroughly search the house for the firearm, evidence of a firearm discharge, and injured persons).

following factors, outlined in *United States v. Mendenhall*, 446 U.S. 544, 553 (1980), are instructive in determining whether a seizure has occurred: (1) the threatening presence of several officers; (2) the display of a weapon by an officer; (3) some physical touching of the person; or (4) using language or tone of voice compelling the individual to comply with the officer's requests. *Almond*, 2015 IL 113817, ¶ 57. “[T]he absence of any of the *Mendenhall* factors is ‘highly instructive’ on the issue of whether a seizure has occurred.” *Id.*

A police officer may temporarily detain an individual for an investigatory stop when “the officer's decision is based on specific, articulable facts which warrant the investigative stop intrusion.” *People v. Moore*, 286 Ill. App. 3d 649, 653 (3d Dist. 1997) (citing *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1, 21, (1968)); *People v. Stewart*, 242 Ill. App. 3d 599, 605 (1993). “The police officer must have an ‘articulable suspicion’ that the person has committed or is about to commit a crime.” *Moore*, 286 Ill. App. 3d at 653 (citations omitted). An officer may not detain an individual based on mere hunches or unparticularized suspicions. *Id.* (citations omitted). Reasonable suspicion requires less than probable cause.

Officers may not conduct a limited search for weapons during every valid investigatory stop. *People v. Sorenson*, 196 Ill. 2d 425, 433 (2001). “The officer may subject the person to a limited search for weapons . . . only if the officer reasonably believes that the person is armed and dangerous.” *Id.* (citation omitted). An officer's subjective belief is not determinative, but is probative in determining the validity of the frisk. *Id.*

The evidence demonstrates that Officers Rice and Hughes detained [REDACTED] and conducted a protective pat down. A reasonable person would not feel free to leave when an officer orders him to stop and points a gun at him. However, although [REDACTED] flight was insufficient to establish probable cause for his arrest or for a warrantless entry into the property located at [REDACTED] his purported flight in combination with the ShotSpotter call from dispatch justified Officer Rice and Hughes conducting a brief investigatory stop and protective pat down of [REDACTED]. See, e.g. *Illinois v. Wardlow*, 528 U.S. 119, 123-25 (2000). Importantly, Officer Rice and Hughes only detained [REDACTED] briefly and did not handcuff [REDACTED] or place him in their police vehicle. Therefore, COPA recommends a finding of **Exonerated** for allegation #2 against Officers Rice and Hughes.³¹

c. There is Insufficient Evidence to Demonstrate that Officers Muñoz, Rodriguez, Hladik, and Appelhans Failed to Correctly Identify Themselves

³¹ COPA, unlike a criminal court, does not apply the fruit of the poisonous doctrine. COPA analyzes this allegation separate and distinct from the allegations that stem from Officer Rice's and Hughes' unlawful warrantless entry into the property. However, to be pellucidly clear, Officer Rice's and Hughes' articulable, reasonable suspicion was not sufficient to justify a warrantless entry into the property. See, e.g., *People v. D.W. (In re D.W.)*, 341 Ill. App. 3d 517 (1st Dist. 2003).

Video evidence shows that [REDACTED] yelled out from the porch, “I need all ya’lls names kickin’ my door in.”³² While [REDACTED] request can be heard on the assisting officers’ BWC, COPA could not determine by a preponderance of the evidence that the officers in fact heard and/or understood the request on scene and deliberately ignored [REDACTED]. The officers further indicated that their information was visible on their uniform and stated that had they understood [REDACTED] was asking for their information they would have provided it to [REDACTED]. Therefore, COPA recommends a finding of Not Sustained for allegation #1 against Officers Muñoz, Rodriguez, Hladik, and Appelhans.

V. CONCLUSION

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

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Officer Michael Hughes	1. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that on or about October 14, 2017, near the vicinity of [REDACTED] Chicago, Illinois 60621, at approximately 7:00 p.m., Officer Michael Hughes kicked in his front door without justification in violation of rules 1 and 2.	Unfounded
	2. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that on or about October 14, 2017, near the vicinity of [REDACTED] Chicago, Illinois 60621, at approximately 7:00 p.m., Officer Michael Hughes ordered him to lie on the ground to be patted down for weapons without justification in violation of rules 1, 2, and 8.	Exonerated
	3. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that on or about October 14, 2017, near the vicinity of [REDACTED] Chicago, Illinois 60621, at approximately 7:00 p.m., Officer Michael Hughes searched his home without a search warrant in violation of rules 1 and 2.	Sustained
Officer Jeremy Rice	1. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that on or about October 14, 2017, near the vicinity of [REDACTED] Chicago, Illinois 60621, at approximately 7:00 p.m., Officer Jeremy Rice kicked in his front door without justification in violation of rules 1 and 2.	Sustained
	2. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that on or about October 14, 2017, near the vicinity of [REDACTED]	Exonerated

³² Attachment 11 BWC#2 at 00:49

	<p>■ Chicago, Illinois 60621, at approximately 7:00 p.m., Officer Jeremy Rice ordered him to lie on the ground to be patted down for weapons without justification in violation of rules 1,2, and 8.</p> <p>3. It is alleged by ■ that on or about October 14, 2017, near the vicinity of ■ Chicago, Illinois 60621, at approximately 7:00 p.m., Officer Jeremy Rice searched his home without a search warrant in violation of rules 1 and 2.</p>	<p>Sustained</p>
<p>Officer Jose Muñoz</p>	<p>1.It is alleged by the Civilian Office of Police Accountability that on or about October 14, 2017, near the vicinity of ■ Chicago, Illinois 60621, at approximately 7:00 p.m., Officer Jose Muñoz failed to correctly identify himself by giving his name, rank, and star number when so requested by a private citizen in violation of rules 5 and 37.</p>	<p>Not Sustained</p>
<p>Officer Reinaldo Rodriguez</p>	<p>1.It is alleged by the Civilian Office of Police Accountability that on or about October 14, 2017, near the vicinity of ■ Chicago, Illinois 60621, at approximately 7:00 p.m., Officer Reinaldo Rodriguez failed to correctly identify himself by giving his name, rank, and star number when so requested by a private citizen in violation of rules 5 and 37.</p>	<p>Not Sustained</p>
<p>Officer James Hladik</p>	<p>1. It is alleged by the Civilian Office of Police Accountability that on or about October 14, 2017, near the vicinity of ■ Chicago, Illinois 60621, at approximately 7:00 p.m., Officer James Hladik failed to correctly identify himself by giving his name, rank, and star number when so requested by a private citizen in violation of rules 5 and 37.</p>	<p>Not Sustained</p>

Officer Michael Appelhans

1. It is alleged by the Civilian Office of Police Accountability that on or about October 14, 2017, near the vicinity of [REDACTED] Chicago, Illinois 60621, at approximately 7:00 p.m., Officer Michael Appelhans failed to correctly identify himself by giving his name, rank, and star number when so requested by a private citizen in violation of rules 5 and 37.

Not Sustained

Approved: 



Andrea Kersten
Deputy Chief Administrator

Date: 7/30/18

Appendix A

Assigned Investigative Staff

Squad#:	10
Investigator:	Sandra Trujillo
Supervising Investigator:	Erica Sangster
Deputy Chief Administrator:	Andrea Kersten

