

SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Date of Incident:	January 23, 2019
Time of Incident:	5:41 PM
Location of Incident:	6100 S. Carpenter St.
Date of COPA Notification:	January 23, 2019
Time of COPA Notification:	6:26 PM

On January 23, 2019, the complainants, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were subject to a traffic stop by Officers Roger Farias and Shahrukh Ali. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] asserted, in part, that that they were stopped and searched without justification. Additionally, it is alleged that the officers also failed to adequately complete paperwork or record the stop on In Car Camera (ICC). Finally, it is alleged that Sergeant Timothy Madison failed to intervene or take a complaint from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. COPA’s findings are discussed in the Analysis portion of this report.

II. INVOLVED PARTIES

Involved Officer #1:	Roger Farias, Star # 9942, Employee ID # [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: December 16, 2009, Police Officer, 7 th District, Date of Birth: [REDACTED], 1985, Male, Hispanic
Involved Officer #2:	Shahrukh Ali, Star #14112, Employee ID # [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: October 26, 2015, Police Officer, 7 th District, Date of Birth: [REDACTED], 1986, Male, Asian
Involved Officer #3:	Timothy Madison, Star #936, Employee ID # [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: May 10, 1999, Sergeant of Police, 7 th District, Date of Birth: [REDACTED], 1972, Male, Black
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] Date of Birth: [REDACTED], 1987, Male, Black
Involved Individual #2:	[REDACTED] Date of Birth: [REDACTED], 1990, Male, Black

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer	Allegation	Finding / Recommendation
Officer Farias	1. Performed a traffic stop on [REDACTED] without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.	Exonerated

	<p>2. Threatened to arrest ██████ if he did not provide identification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 8.</p> <p>3. Handcuffed ██████ without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.</p> <p>4. Handcuffed ██████ without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.</p> <p>5. Performed a pat down on ██████ without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.</p> <p>6. Performed a pat down on ██████ without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.</p> <p>7. Searched ██████ vehicle without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.</p> <p>8. Terminated ██████ phone call without permission, in violation of Rule 2, Rule 6, and Rule 8.</p> <p>9. Failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) for ██████ in violation of Rule 6.</p> <p>10. Failed to include all factors that supported reasonable articulable suspicion and/or probable cause in ██████ ISR to justify the traffic stop and car search, in violation of Rule 6.</p> <p>11. Provided a false report on ██████ ISR that a pat down was performed on ██████ due to "a gun shaped bulge of the front pocket of the sweater [...]," in violation of Rule 14.</p> <p>12. Failed to record the incident on In Car Camera (ICC), in violation of Rule 6.</p>	<p>Sustained</p> <p>Exonerated</p> <p>Exonerated</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Exonerated</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Unfounded</p> <p>Sustained</p>
Officer Ali	<p>1. Performed a traffic stop on ██████ without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.</p> <p>2. Threatened to arrest ██████ if he did not provide identification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 8.</p>	<p>Exonerated</p> <p>Sustained</p>

	<p>3. Handcuffed ██████ without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.</p> <p>4. Handcuffed ██████ without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.</p> <p>5. Performed a pat down on ██████ without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.</p> <p>6. Performed a pat down on ██████ without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.</p> <p>7. Searched ██████ vehicle without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.</p> <p>8. Failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) for ██████ in violation of Rule 6.</p> <p>9. Failed to include all factors that supported reasonable articulable suspicion and/or probable cause in ██████ ISR to justify the traffic stop and car search, in violation of Rule 6.</p> <p>10. Provided a false report on ██████ ISR that a pat down was performed on ██████ due to "a gun shaped bulge of the front pocket of the sweater [...]," in violation of Rule 14.</p> <p>11. Failed to record the incident on In Car Camera (ICC), in violation of Rule 6.</p>	<p>Exonerated</p> <p>Exonerated</p> <p>Unfounded</p> <p>Exonerated</p> <p>Exonerated</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Unfounded</p> <p>Unfounded</p> <p>Sustained</p>
<p>Sergeant Madison</p>	<p>1. Failed to intervene when Officer Farias (Star #9942) and Officer Ali (Star #14112) searched ██████ in violation of Rule 3 and Rule 6.</p> <p>2. Failed to intervene when Officer Farias (Star #9942) and Officer Ali (Star #14112) searched ██████ in violation of Rule 3 and Rule 6.</p> <p>3. Failed to take a complaint from ██████ in violation of Rule 3 and Rule 6.</p> <p>4. Failed to take a complaint from ██████ in violation of Rule 3 and Rule 6.</p>	<p>Exonerated</p> <p>Exonerated</p> <p>Not Sustained</p> <p>Not Sustained</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 6:** Prohibits disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.
 4. **Rule 8:** Prohibits disrespect to or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty.
 5. **Rule 14:** Prohibits making a false report, written or oral.
-

General Orders

1. **G08-01:** Complaint and Disciplinary Procedures.
 2. **G08-01-02:** Specific Responsibilities Regarding Allegations of Misconduct.
 3. **G02-01:** Human Rights and Human Resources.
-

Special Orders

1. **S03-05:** In-Car Video Systems.
 2. **S04-13-09:** Investigatory Stop System.
 3. **S08-01-01:** Conduct of Complaint Investigations.
-

Federal Laws

1. **Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution:** Guarantees protection from unlawful arrest and unreasonable search and seizure to all persons in this country.
-

State Laws/Municipal Code

1. **Article I, Section 6 of the Illinois Constitution:** Guarantees protections from unreasonable search and seizure.
2. **720 ILCS 5/31-4.5:** Obstructing Identification.
3. **625 ILCS 5/12-603.1:** Driver and passenger required to use safety belts, exceptions and penalty.

City of Chicago Municipal Code

1. **9-76-090**: Parked Vehicles – Lighting Regulations.

2. **9-76-050**: Required Lighting.

3. **9-76-180**: Safety Belts

V. INVESTIGATION¹

a. Interviews

COPA interviewed the complainant, ██████████ on January 25, 2019.² ██████████ related that on January 23, 2019, he was legally parked in his vehicle and waiting for his friend, ██████████ got into ██████████ car, and while ██████████ was still parked, a marked police car pulled behind him. ██████████ signaled to pull away from the curb and the police vehicle blocked him in. Officers Farias and Ali approached the vehicle while yelling at ██████████ and ██████████ to exit. One officer told ██████████ that he broke a city parking ordinance and mentioned ██████████ headlights. ██████████ then asked the officers to call a supervisor. The officers continued asking ██████████ to exit the vehicle, but ██████████ refused. ██████████ alleged that Officer Farias told him, “If you don’t get the fuck out this car right now, I’m gunna lock your ass up.”³ ██████████ was pulled out of the car and ██████████ exited voluntarily once he saw that. Once out of the car, ██████████ was handcuffed and detained by his trunk. Officers Ali and Farias proceeded to search ██████████ car and performed a pat down on ██████████. Additional units arrived, including Sergeant Madison. Nothing was found. ██████████ did not receive a citation, and he was uncuffed. ██████████ then went to the police station at 63rd and Loomis and asked to speak to a supervisor. Once at the station, Sergeant Madison emerged and asked ██████████ to leave. ██████████ believed Sergeant Madison spoke unprofessionally at the scene and at the station.

COPA interviewed ██████████ on January 25, 2019.⁴ ██████████ related that on January 23, 2019, ██████████ was picking him up and parked outside. Once ██████████ entered the vehicle, a squad car went next to ██████████ car and blocked them in. Officers approached and related that it was a traffic stop because ██████████ did not have on a seatbelt. ██████████ questioned why they would be stopped for seatbelts when the car had not moved. The officer then stated ██████████ was violating a law because he was parked with his lights on. Officer Ali asked for ██████████ ID, but ██████████ did not want to provide it. The officer became aggravated and Officer Farias related that if ██████████ did not provide his ID within two minutes he would be arrested for obstructing justice. ██████████ and ██████████ then provided their IDs and the officers ran their backgrounds. The officers also told the men not to record on their phones. ██████████ and ██████████ were asked out of the vehicle. The officers related that they needed to search the car for weapons because ██████████ was previously charged with

¹ COPA conducted a thorough and complete investigation. The following is a summary of the material evidence gathered and relied upon in our analysis.

² Att. 4

³ Approximately 8:10 minute mark of Att. 4.

⁴ Att. 9

possession of a firearm.⁵ [REDACTED] exited the vehicle and about eight Department members had arrived, including Sergeant Madison. [REDACTED] was handcuffed and detained near the trunk of [REDACTED] car. The officers performed pat downs on [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] then searched the car. Nothing was found, and the men were allowed to leave. The men then went to the police station at 63rd and Loomis and spoke to Sergeant Madison, who was rude to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

COPA interviewed **Officer Roger Farias** on June 6, 2019.⁶ Officer Farias related that, at the time of his interview, he had been working in the 7th District for approximately seven years. On January 23, 2019, Officers Farias and Ali were on patrol when they performed a traffic stop near 61st and Carpenter. Officer Farias described this as a high-crime area. [REDACTED] was reportedly violating city lighting regulations by having his lights on while parked at night in a lighted residential area. Officer Farias knew the car was parked because it was close to the curb and not moving. The officers saw the car, drove around the block, saw the car again, and approached. When asked why [REDACTED] ISR said [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were uncooperative, Officer Farias related that he argued with [REDACTED] about the violation. [REDACTED] was also being uncooperative with Officer Ali. Officer Farias told [REDACTED] to end his phone call for officer safety, so that no one arrived on scene. [REDACTED] was asked for his license because he was not wearing a seatbelt. When asked if passengers in a parked car are required to wear a seatbelt, Officer Farias responded that it is safer to always have a seatbelt on while in a vehicle. Additionally, the men told the officers they were about to drive off. Officer Farias denied seeing the car in motion. Officer Farias stated the officers had a probable cause to speak with [REDACTED] because he did not have on a seatbelt and they wanted his name. Eventually, the officers requested assistance and [REDACTED] gave his ID; however, Officer Farias could not recall in which order these two actions occurred. Officer Farias related that [REDACTED] failed to provide an ID, which made Officer Farias suspicious. Officer Farias also heard Officer Ali tell [REDACTED] to show his hands. The officers eventually learned that [REDACTED] was a convicted gun offender.

When asked about [REDACTED] ISR reporting a gun-shaped bulge, Officer Farias reported that he first noticed the bulge when [REDACTED] exited the car. Officer Farias then quickly patted the area of [REDACTED] front sweater pocket and determined it was miscellaneous items, not a gun. Officer Farias denied doing a pat-down on [REDACTED] and did not recall performing a second pat-down on [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were then handcuffed. The car was searched because the men had been evasive in identifying themselves, it was a high-crime area, the officers initially saw movement from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] was a convicted gun offender. Officer Farias related that he terminated [REDACTED] phone call after the men exited the car because sometimes unknown subjects come to the scene, which can be unsafe and an interference. Officer Farias related that there was no ISR for [REDACTED] because he was not feeling well and did not finish it. Neither man was arrested or cited based on officer discretion.

After watching his BWC from this incident, Officer Farias acknowledged he did a second pat-down on [REDACTED] Officer Farias related that the video refreshed his memory and he elaborated that [REDACTED] behavior earlier was suspicious and he wanted to ensure [REDACTED] was not armed. When asked why Officer Farias lifted [REDACTED] floor mat, Officer Farias related that he has

⁵ [REDACTED] was arrested for attempted armed robbery on September 7, 2008 (see Att. 20). On September 20, 2008, [REDACTED] was arrested for unlawful use of a weapon (see Att. 21).

⁶ Atts. 33, 34

previously found a gun under a floormat. Officer Farias related that he sometimes puts his gun under the floor mat of his personal car, which is why he looked. Officer Farias related that ICC did not film the encounter, but he thought it was on at the time of the incident. When asked about Officer Farias's previous assertion that [REDACTED] did not immediately provide ID in light of BWC showing that [REDACTED] immediately provided his license, Officer Farias related he may have been confusing [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

On June 6, 2019, COPA interviewed **Officer Shahrukh Ali**.⁷ On January 23, 2019, Officer Ali was on patrol in the 7th District and partnered with Officer Farias. The officers performed a traffic stop near 6100 S. Carpenter street. Officer Ali described this area as "high crime" with "gun violence and narcotics."⁸ Officer Ali observed that [REDACTED] vehicle was violating a parking ordinance. Officer Ali elaborated that the car had its headlights on while parked on a lighted, residential street. Officer Ali related that the officers knew the car was parked because they had driven past earlier, and the car was still there. The officers approached the vehicle and Officer Ali saw the passenger make a "quick movement" by lowering "his left shoulder in an up and down movement real quick."⁹ Officer Ali told the passenger to show his hands, and [REDACTED] complied. When asked why the ISR described [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] as uncooperative, Officer Ali heard the driver refuse to provide his license. Additionally, [REDACTED] turned on his turn signal right when the officers made the stop, and the passenger was not wearing a seatbelt. Per Officer Ali, if [REDACTED] was about to drive off, then [REDACTED] should have been wearing his seatbelt. [REDACTED] then also refused to provide identification. When asked to explain the discrepancy between officers asserting [REDACTED] was parked and should not have had his lights on with the officers also asserting [REDACTED] was driving so [REDACTED] should have had his seatbelt on, Officer Ali explained [REDACTED] was actually parked and had not been driving. However, when they approached the vehicle, [REDACTED] signaled as if he was about to drive, but did not actually move the vehicle. Officer Ali related that [REDACTED] had to provide his license because passengers are required to wear their seatbelt in a moving car. Officer Ali stated that the occupants told the officers they were just about to drive off, so Officer Ali believed [REDACTED] should have been belted.

With regards to [REDACTED] Officer Ali related he was evasive, did not give his license, and was in a high-crime area. Officer Ali elaborated that since it was a high-crime area and [REDACTED] was evasive, it raised the officers' awareness. The officers asked the two men to exit the car due to [REDACTED] initial furtive movement, that the men initially argued with the officers, and the fact that the officers eventually learned [REDACTED] is a convicted gun offender. Once [REDACTED] exited the vehicle, Officer Ali remained on the passenger's side. Officer Ali denied performing a pat down on [REDACTED]. Officer Ali denied that Officer Farias ever expressed concern to him that [REDACTED] was armed, but the officers requested assistance before the men left the car. Officer Ali related that the men were cooperative once they exited the car. The men were also handcuffed for officer safety. Officer Ali explained that he searched [REDACTED] vehicle in the area accessible to [REDACTED] because of the furtive movement [REDACTED] had made, and nothing was found. Officer Ali believed he performed a pat down on [REDACTED] only. Per Officer Ali, there was no ISR for [REDACTED] because the officers forgot. Neither man received a citation based on officer discretion.

⁷ Atts. 27, 28

⁸ Approximately 5:12 and 5:39 minute marks of Att. 27.

⁹ Approximately 7:38 minute mark of Att. 27.

After watching his own BWC from this incident, Officer Ali related that he told ██████ he could be arrested for obstruction by interfering with their investigation by not providing his ID. Officer Ali told ██████ he needed the ID for documentation. Officer Ali elaborated that the encounter started as a traffic investigation but that changed when he saw ██████ make a furtive movement. Officer Ali denied authoring ██████ ISR. When asked about the bulge reported on ██████ ISR, Officer Ali denied seeing this bulge during the stop, but related Officer Farias mentioned the bulge afterward. Officer Ali related that Officer Farias turned on their car's lights to make the stop. Officer Ali acknowledged that the incident was not recorded on ICC and speculated that Officer Farias had not activated the lights completely. Per Officer Ali, when all the lights are turned on, the ICC turns on.

COPA interviewed **Sergeant Timothy Madison** on June 11, 2019.¹⁰ On January 23, 2019, Sergeant Madison responded to a request for assistance at a traffic stop near 6100 S. Carpenter. When he arrived, Sergeant Madison stood at a distance and did not know why the men were stopped. Sergeant Madison denied being informed that ██████ and ██████ wanted to make a complaint on scene. Sergeant Madison related that Sergeant Ector was also present. Sergeant Madison believed the detention, pat down, and vehicle search were justified because case law allowed the officers' actions. Sergeant Madison did not specifically know the purpose of the officers' search. Sergeant Madison recalled briefly seeing ██████ and ██████ at the police station. Sergeant Madison related that the men were asking if the officers' actions were legal. Sergeant Madison explained to the men that the stop was legally justified because of how the men were parked and because the car had tinted windows. Sergeant Madison did not recall if ██████ and ██████ told him they wanted to make a complaint once at the station. Sergeant Madison did not know why the men came to the station and he assured them that the incident had been documented.

b. Digital Evidence

Body Worn Camera (BWC) and In Car Camera (ICC) footage was obtained stemming from ██████ traffic stop on January 23, 2019.¹¹

Officer Farias

Officer Farias exits his vehicle at about 5:40 PM and approaches ██████ car on the driver's side. ██████ immediately hands Officer Farias his driver's license. Officer Farias tells ██████ to turn off his phone and put his car in park, as ██████ is talking to someone on speaker phone. At about 5:41 PM, Officer Farias tells ██████ he is "violating city light regulations under a lighted residence. Therefore, that's illegal."¹² At roughly 5:42 PM, Officer Farias asks ██████ if he is providing his information to Officer Ali because ██████ does not have on a seatbelt. When ██████ replies that they were not moving, Officer Farias replies, "That's my point. You're not moving. You're parked. You're violating city light regulations."¹³ At about 5:43 PM, Officer Farias tells ██████ that if he refuses to provide his ID, he will be arrested for obstruction of identification. Officer Farias takes ██████ license to the squad car at roughly 5:44 PM and

¹⁰ Att. 39

¹¹ Att. 24

¹² Approximately 1:45 minute mark of Officer Farias' BWC.

¹³ Approximately 3:09 minute mark of Officer Farias' BWC.

requests an assist car shortly thereafter. At about 5:46 PM, Officer Ali enters the squad car holding ██████ ID. Officer Farias exits his squad car at about 5:48 PM and additional officers are on scene. Officer Farias asks ██████ and ██████ to exit their vehicle to ensure there are no guns in ██████ car. ██████ asks to speak to a supervisor and if Officer Farias' actions are legal.

The men exit ██████ vehicle at approximately 5:50 PM and stand near ██████ trunk. Shortly after, Officer Farias tell ██████ "Unfortunately your past follows you around [...] if you don't like that, you get it expunged."¹⁴ Officer Farias proceeds to handcuff ██████ and relates he is being detained. ██████ is also in handcuffs. Officer Farias then searches the vehicle and terminates ██████ phone call at about 5:51 PM. Officer Farias searches inside the center counsel, the front seat, under the front seat, the back seat, inside a grocery bag, and under floor mats. Officer Farias then approaches the two men at about 5:54 PM and performs protective pat downs. At about 5:57 PM, ██████ is given an ISR receipt and Officer Farias terminates his BWC shortly after.

Officer Ali

At approximately 5:39 PM, Officer Ali approaches ██████ vehicle on the passenger side while the police car is parked in front of ██████ car. ██████ tells Officer Ali he has just been picked up from his girlfriend's house. Officer Ali states it is a traffic stop and he asks ██████ for identification. ██████ asks why he needed to give his ID and Officer Ali states it is because ██████ was not wearing his seatbelt. Officer Ali relates that he did not know when ██████ got into the car and the officers need to document that they spoke with ██████. At roughly 5:43 PM, Officer Ali tells ██████ to provide his ID so that the officers could "get about [their] day."¹⁵ At about 5:44 PM, Officer Farias walks off and Officer Ali stays by ██████ car. Officer Ali tell the men that per municipal code 9-76-050, ██████ could not have his headlights on while parked under a lighted source. Officer Ali further relates that both driver and passenger need seatbelts on while the car is turned on. Assisting units began arriving at approximately 5:46 PM. Officer Ali returns to the squad car shortly after and hands Officer Farias ██████ ID. Officer Ali returns to the passenger's side of ██████ vehicle at roughly 5:49 PM.

At about 5:50 PM, the officers tell ██████ that he is being asked out of the car because he has previously been charged with armed offenses and they needed to search for guns. ██████ gets out of the vehicle shortly thereafter and Officer Ali performs a pat down on ██████ before handcuffing ██████. Both men were detained near ██████ trunk while in handcuffs. At approximately 5:51 PM, Officer Ali begins searching the passenger area of ██████ vehicle. At about 5:54 PM, Officer Farias is seen patting down both men. Officer Ali removes ██████ cuffs at approximately 5:55 PM and ██████ cuffs at about 5:57 PM, before returning to the squad car and terminating his BWC.

Beat 724

ICC was obtained from the vehicle operated by Officers Farias and Ali on January 23, 2019. This footage did not include video from ██████ traffic stop.

¹⁴ Approximately 10:52 minute mark of Officer Farias' BWC.

¹⁵ Approximately 3:33 minute mark of Officer Ali's BWC.

Sergeant Madison

Sergeant Madison initiated his BWC at approximately 5:47 PM. Sergeant Madison approaches the scene and at least four additional squad cars are present. Sergeant Madison speaks to ██████ at about 5:49 PM and relates the officers are allowed to ask the men to exit the car. Sergeant Madison then relates that the car had tinted windows and the officers could not see into the car. Sergeant Madison remains to the side while ██████ and ██████ are detained. At roughly 5:51 PM, Sergeant Madison talks with ██████ about the stop's legality. At about 5:53 PM, Sergeant Madison tells the men they are being detained because of how the men parked and because ██████ did not have a seatbelt on. Officer Farias is seen putting the ISR receipt in ██████ jacket pocket at roughly 5:56 PM, while ██████ is in handcuffs. Sergeant Madison returns to his squad car and tells Officer Farias to complete ISRs.

Assisting Officers

BWC was obtained from the following assisting officers: Berry, Brown, Estrada, Herrera, Jetel, and Montesdeoc. No additional, relevant content was captured by BWC from these officers.

c. Physical Evidence

No relevant physical evidence was obtained pertaining to the present investigation.

d. Documentary Evidence

An **Investigatory Stop Report** (ISR) was completed for ██████ but not for ██████¹⁶ Per this report, the officers stopped ██████ and performed a pat down without consent due to a suspicious bulge/object. A vehicle search was also performed without consent. No contraband was found and no citations were issued. The stop was based on probable cause after ██████ was violating lighting regulations 9-76-090.¹⁷ ██████ “refused to hang up his cell phone and became uncooperative [*sic*].” Officer Farias also observed that ██████ was not wearing a seatbelt and became uncooperative when asked to provide ID.¹⁸ When the officers learned ██████ had “prior weapon offenses” Officer Farias requested assisting units. When an assisting unit arrived, the officers asked ██████ and ██████ out of their vehicle, at which point Officer Farias “observed a gun shaped bulge of the front pocket of the sweater.” A pat down was performed, and the object was discovered to be miscellaneous items. No weapons were found in a “search of the immediate area of the occupants.”

¹⁶ Att. 22

¹⁷ During his COPA interview, Officer Ali clarified that he misspoke, as seen on BWC, when he told ██████ he was in violation of municipal code 9-76-050.

¹⁸ ██████ was not named in this report and was instead referred to as the passenger.

An **Office of Emergency Management and Communications Event Query Report** with **Event Number 1902311299** was initiated on January 23, 2019 at approximately 5:41 PM.¹⁹ Beat 724 (Officers Ali and Farias) performed a traffic stop and searched [REDACTED] driver's license at about 5:44 PM. Additional beats assisted, and at roughly 6:02 PM, Beat 724 reported going to the 7th District to complete an ISR.

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 been 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 standard, 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

Allegation 1 against **Officer Farias** and **Officer Ali**, that they performed a traffic stop on [REDACTED] without justification, is **Exonerated**.

A lawful traffic stop requires "at least [an] articulable and reasonable suspicion that the particular person stopped is breaking the law," including traffic law. *United States v. Rodriguez-Escalera*, 884 F.3d 661, 667-68 (7th Cir. 2018) (citing *Delaware v. Prouse*, 440 U.S. 648, 663 (1979)). Articulable and reasonable suspicion means that the police "must be able to identify some

¹⁹ Att. 17

‘particularized and objective basis’ for thinking that the person to be stopped is or may be about to engage in unlawful activity,” amounting to more than a hunch. *United States v. Miranda-Sotolongo*, 827 F.3d 663, 666 (7th Cir. 2015) (quoting *United States v. Cortez*, 449 U.S. 411, 417 (1981)). Police need not meet the higher threshold of probable cause to perform a traffic stop, but if the stop *is* supported by probable cause, its lawfulness is still evaluated under *Terry*. *Rodriguez v. United States*, 135 S. Ct. 1609, 1617-18 (2015). An officer’s subjective intent does not enter into the analysis; even where officers hope to effectuate a goal unrelated to addressing a traffic violation (such as uncovering criminal activity), intent alone does not invalidate a stop that is otherwise objectively justified by reasonable articulable suspicion. *See Whren v. United States*, 517 U.S. 806, 812 (1996).

Officer Ali’s BWC confirmed that [REDACTED] headlights were on when the officers performed their traffic stop. Per Chicago ordinance 9-76-090, “Whenever a vehicle is lawfully parked at nighttime upon any lighted street within a business or residence district, no lights need be displayed upon such parked vehicle,” and “Any lighted head lamps upon a parked vehicle shall be depressed or dimmed.” By [REDACTED] own account, he was legally parked and waiting for [REDACTED]. Based on the ordinance, [REDACTED] headlights should have been depressed or dimmed. Based on the BWC, [REDACTED] was parked and not driving, therefore the officers were justified in curbing [REDACTED] and this allegation is Exonerated.

Allegation 2 against **Officer Farias** and **Officer Ali**, that they threatened to arrest [REDACTED] if he did not provide identification, is **Sustained**. An officer must have probable cause to arrest a subject. *People v. Johnson*, 408 Ill. App. 3d 107 (citing *Beck v. Ohio*, 379 U.S. 89, 91, (1964)). “Probable cause to arrest exists when the totality of the facts and circumstances known to a police officer would lead a person of reasonable caution to believe that the person apprehended has committed a crime, and its existence depends on the totality of the circumstances at the time of the arrest.” *People v. D.W. (In re D.W.)*, 341 Ill. App. 3d 517, 526 (1st Dist. 2003). The officer’s subjective belief is not determinative; rather probable cause is an objective standard. *People v. Chapman*, 194 Ill. 2d 186, 218-19, (2000).

Both officers acknowledged that [REDACTED] vehicle never moved and, as stated above, the officers had probable cause to perform the traffic stop based on [REDACTED] headlights. Because [REDACTED] vehicle was stationary, the officers had no probable cause to cite [REDACTED] for not wearing a seatbelt.²⁰ Therefore, the officers’ assertions that [REDACTED] needed to provide his license because he was not wearing a seatbelt is invalid. Special Order S04-13-09 states that a subject’s failure to identify themselves “is not [...] an arrestable offense or grounds for further detention, and a subject may choose not to answer any of the officer’s questions.” Regardless, Illinois courts have routinely held that refusal to provide identifying information is akin to a “mere argument” with an officer and therefore will not support a conviction of obstruction. *See People v. Fernandez*, 2011 Il App (2d) 100473, ¶¶ 6-11 (2011). While Illinois law permits police officers to demand identification during a *Terry* stop, Illinois law does not require non-driver occupants of a vehicle to produce identification. *Id.* Officer Farias and Ali could not lawfully arrest [REDACTED] for refusing to provide his identification, and therefore could not threaten arrest him for refusing to provide his identification. For the reasons cited above, the allegations are Sustained.

²⁰ Whether [REDACTED] turned on his turn signal and whether [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were about to drive off is not relevant because it is undisputed the vehicle did not actually move.

Allegations 3 and 4 against **Officer Ali** and **Officer Farias**, that they handcuffed and [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] without justification, are **Exonerated**.

“There are situations in which concerns for the safety of the police officer or the public justify handcuffing the detainee for the brief duration of an investigatory stop.” *People v. Arnold*, 394 Ill. App. 3d 63, 71 (2009). The critical question is whether “the use of such restraints is [] reasonably necessary for safety under the specific facts of the case.” *People v. Arnold*, 394 Ill. App. 3d 63, 71 (2d Dist. 2009). If not, “their use will indicate that the encounter should be viewed as an arrest.” *Id.*

COPA finds that the officers were permitted to handcuff [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Both officers related that the stop occurred in a high-crime area, and noted learned [REDACTED] had a previous gun conviction and had made furtive movements in the vehicle. This provided sufficient justification to handcuff [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] while the searched the vehicle for weapons. COPA finds that Officer Ali’s and Farias’ concern for their safety was reasonable under the circumstances.

Allegation 5 against **Officer Ali**, that he patted down [REDACTED] without justification, is **Unfounded**.

Officers are not permitted to 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.* Similarly, per Special Order S04-13-09 an officer “must possess specific and articulable facts, combined with rational inferences from these facts, that the suspect is armed and dangerous and reasonably suspects that the person presents a danger of attack,” before enacting a protective pat down.

Based on Officer Ali’s COPA interview and available BWC footage, Officer Ali never performed a pat down on [REDACTED] and this allegation is Unfounded.

Allegation 6 against **Officer Ali**, that he performed a pat down on [REDACTED] without justification, is **Exonerated**. Officer Ali related that he searched [REDACTED] because of [REDACTED] initial furtive movement, [REDACTED] arguing with the officers, and the fact that [REDACTED] was a convicted gun offender. These factors created reasonable articulable suspicion that [REDACTED] was armed and dangerous, and Officer Ali was therefore justified in performing a pat down. However, this pat down should have been properly documented, as detailed below.

Allegations 5 against **Officer Farias**, that he performed a pat down on [REDACTED] without justification, is **Sustained**. [REDACTED] ISR related that Officer Farias performed the pat down due to a gun-shaped bulge in [REDACTED] sweatshirt. Officer Farias also included [REDACTED] suspicious movement and his criminal history as a convicted gun offender as justification for the search of [REDACTED]. However, Officer Farias told COPA that he patted the bulge created by [REDACTED] front hoodie pocket as [REDACTED] exited the car and verified it was not a weapon. This pat-down was reasonable.

However, once the bulge was eliminated as a threat, Officer Farias did not have reasonable articulable suspicion, apart from being in a high-crime area, to perform a second protective pat-down. Officer Farias told COPA that [REDACTED] was suspicious because he was not compliant at the beginning of the stop. However, BWC shows that [REDACTED] immediately provided his license and insurance to the officers. [REDACTED] was not “non-compliant” by requesting an explanation for the stop. [REDACTED] criminal history and furtive movement did could justify an additional pat down of [REDACTED]. Because the threat of the unidentified bulge in [REDACTED] hoodie pocket was eliminated after the first pat down and [REDACTED] was compliant with the officers, Officer Farias did not have a reasonable basis to continue to believe [REDACTED] was armed. Therefore, Officer Farias did not have justification for a second pat down and the allegation is Sustained.

Allegations 6 against **Officer Farias**, that he performed a pat down on [REDACTED] without justification, is **Sustained**. Based on the BWC footage, Officer Farias gave [REDACTED] a pat down after he searched [REDACTED] car. However, Officer Ali performed a pat down on [REDACTED] as soon as [REDACTED] exited [REDACTED] car. Officer Ali’s pat down dispelled any reasonable articulable suspicion that [REDACTED] was armed and dangerous. Therefore, Officer Farias had no justification for an additional pat down and this allegation is Sustained.

Allegation 7 against **Officer Ali** and **Officer Farias** that they searched [REDACTED] car without justification, is **Exonerated**.

Under the “automobile exception” to the search warrant requirement, “law enforcement officers may undertake a warrantless search of a vehicle if there is probable cause to believe that the automobile contains evidence of criminal activity that the officers are entitled to seize.” *People v. James*, 163 Ill. 2d 302, 312 (Ill. 1994) (citing *Carroll v. United States*, 267 U.S. 132 (1925)). “When officers have such probable cause, the search may extend to ‘all parts of the vehicle in which contraband or evidence could be concealed, including closed compartments, containers, packages, and trunks.’” *United States v. Richards*, 719 F.3d 746, 754 (7th Cir. 2013) (citing *United States v. Williams*, 627 F.3d 247, 251 (7th Cir. 2010)). Officers are not limited to searching the driver’s possessions; “police officers with probable cause to search a car may [also] inspect passengers’ belongings found in the car that are capable of concealing the object of the search.” *Wyoming v. Houghton*, 526 U.S. 295, 307 (1999).

Furthermore, when officers perform a traffic stop, they may search the passenger compartment for weapons if they “possess an articulable and objectively reasonable belief that the suspect is potentially dangerous.” *Michigan v. Long*, 463 U.S. 1032, 1051 (1983).

Available BWC footage shows that Officer Ali began searching [REDACTED] car at approximately 5:51 PM. Officer Ali searched around the front passenger area, including the floor, the center console compartment, and the passenger door. Also, at about 5:51 PM, Officer Farias entered [REDACTED] car via the driver’s side door and began searching. Officer Farias’ search included the center console compartment, the backseat, inside a shopping bag, and under a floor mat. The officers performed a cursory search of the areas immediately accessible to [REDACTED] and nothing was found. The officers had reasonable articulable suspicion to search the vehicle for weapons based on [REDACTED] initial furtive movement, the fact that [REDACTED] was identified as a convicted gun offender,

and that the incident took place in a high-crime area²¹. As such, this allegation is Exonerated against both officers.

Allegation 8 against **Officer Farias**, that he terminated [REDACTED] phone call without permission, is **Sustained**. Officer Farias told COPA he terminated the call because he did not want anyone coming to the scene as a result of the phone call. However, the phone call was not illegal, and Officer Farias did not have [REDACTED] permission to end it. While officers may possibly be permitted to end phone calls under some circumstances, in this case ending [REDACTED] phone call was disrespectful, unnecessary, and invasive. General Order G02-01 requires officers to “treat all persons with the courtesy and dignity which is inherently due every person as a human being.” Terminating [REDACTED] phone call was unnecessary and unreasonable under the circumstances. Although [REDACTED] may have been on the phone, the phone call was in no way interfering with the stop, as it was on speakerphone and in [REDACTED] lap. [REDACTED] did not have the phone to his ear during the stop, which may have constituted a disruption. Further, [REDACTED] was not conversing with the person on the other line in such a way that hindered the traffic stop; the person on the other line barely spoke, and when she did, it was not disruptive or intrusive. In fact, at one point she even told [REDACTED] to put the phone down. There was no threat of her coming to the scene as a result of the phone call. More importantly, citizens are free to observe and even video police officers when they are performing their police duties in public. Indeed, [REDACTED] could have lawfully filmed the encounter so long as his actions did not interfere with the officers. Therefore, Officer Farias had no justification for terminating [REDACTED] phone call, as it was not interfering with the traffic stop, and this allegation is Sustained.

Allegation 9 against **Officer Farias** and **Allegation 8** against **Officer Ali**, that they failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) for [REDACTED] are **Sustained**. Both officers related that they forgot to complete an ISR. Special Order S04-13-09 requires officers to complete an ISR after conducting “a Protective Pat Down [...] in a public place.” [REDACTED] was patted down in a public place by both officers and both officers acknowledged that they failed to do an ISR. Therefore, this allegation is Sustained.

Allegation 10 against **Officer Farias** and **Allegation 9** against **Officer Ali**, that they failed to include all factors that supported reasonable articulable suspicion and/or probable cause in [REDACTED] ISR to justify the traffic stop and car search, is **Sustained** for **Officer Farias** and **Unfounded** for **Officer Ali**. Per available evidence, Officer Farias was the sole author of the report. Based on his COPA interview, Officer Farias should have also included that they were in a high crime area and [REDACTED] made a suspicious movement when the officers first approached. Officer Farias also should have explained why he performed a second pat down on [REDACTED]

Allegation 11 against **Officer Farias** and **Allegation 10** against **Officer Ali**, that they provided a false report on [REDACTED] ISR that a pat down was performed on [REDACTED] due to "a gun shaped bulge of the front pocket of the sweater [...]," are **Unfounded**. This allegation is Unfounded for Officer Ali because, as stated above, Officer Farias was identified as the sole author of the ISR. Officer Farias initially patted down [REDACTED] when [REDACTED] exited the car, however, as [REDACTED] exited the car he turned away from available cameras. Therefore, the pat down Officer

²¹ The incident occurred in Chicago's 7th District which is known to have a higher volume of arrests and calls. Further, Officer Farias articulated his experience in and the reputation of the area as justification for his suspicion.

Farias conducted at that time was not visible. Officer Farias then proceeded to perform another pat down of [REDACTED] after he was detained at the back of his car. COPA's inability to observe the initial pat down, coupled with Officer Farias conducting a more thorough search where Officer Farias did not act concerned with a bulge, led COPA to question Officer Farias' statements in the report. When viewing the BWC with Officer Farias, Officer Farias provided a reasonable explanation as to when he observed the bulge and how he investigated it. In sum, COPA does not believe Officer Farias was untruthful in reporting he observed a gun shaped bulge on [REDACTED]

Allegation 12 against **Officer Farias** and **Allegation 11** against **Officer Ali**, that they failed to record the incident on In Car Camera (ICC), is **Sustained**. Per Special Order S03-05, "Uniformed Department members the rank of police officer [...] assigned to vehicle equipped with in-car video systems will [...] activate the systems to simultaneously audibly and visually record the entire incident for all enforcement stops [...]." Both officers acknowledge that they failed to adhere to this directive. Therefore, these allegations are Sustained.

Allegations 1 and **2** against **Sergeant Madison**, that he failed to intervene when Officer Farias and Officer Ali searched [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] are **Exonerated**. Sergeant Madison told COPA that he remained at a distance while the officers conducted their investigation and he did not know why [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] had been stopped. Based on BWC, when Sergeant Madison arrived, an officer informed him that the men were seeking a "white shirt." Sergeant Madison remained at a distance as the two men got out of the car and were handcuffed, and he occasionally conversed with them, explaining that they were required to exit a vehicle during a lawful traffic stop. Based on the limited information Sergeant Madison he had on scene, he had no reason to suspect the officers were acting out of policy or engaging in any unreasonable searching. Further, [REDACTED] himself said on scene that he had a criminal history involving guns, which could have contributed to Sergeant Madison thinking the search was valid. While COPA finds Sergeant Madison's conduct did not violate any stated policy, we note that he made virtually no effort to talk to the involved officers and understand the scope of the stop. The lack of any meaningful investigation into the stop does call into question what a responding sergeants reasonability is under these circumstances. Based on the information the officers had, it is unlikely Sergeant Madison would have found the officer's actions to be out of policy, however with a different set of facts COPA could easily find a similar response by a sergeant lacked reasonable attention.

Allegations 3 and **4** against **Sergeant Madison**, that he failed to take complaints from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] are **Not Sustained**. Based on BWC from the scene, neither man articulated a clear complaint aside from being upset they were stopped and handcuffed. Clearly the men were upset enough to go to the station. However, without knowing exactly what they said to Sergeant Madison, COPA does not know if they related enough information for the Sergeant to have had a basis for initiating a complaint. Therefore, these allegations are Not Sustained.

VIII. RECOMMENDED DISCIPLINE FOR SUSTAINED ALLEGATIONS

a. Officer Farias

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History

Officer Farias has the following complimentary history. Department Commendation (2), Honorable Mention (71), Police Officer of The Month Award (1), Complimentary Letter (4), Nato Summit Service Award (1), Honorable Mention Ribbon Award (1), Unit Meritorious Performance Award (1).

ii. Recommended Penalty, by Allegation

1. Allegation No. 2: Threatened to arrest [REDACTED] if he did not provide identification.

COPA recommends a penalty of 10 days. COPA found that the initial stop of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] was justified, however the officers were intent on searching the men and their car. The threat to arrest [REDACTED] the passenger of the car unnecessarily escalated the intensity of the incident. In totality, traffic stops like the one here causes more harm to police and community relationship than whatever legitimate government interest existed in the stop itself.

2. Allegation No. 5: Performed a pat down on [REDACTED] without justification.

COPA recommends a penalty of 10 days. The initial pat down of [REDACTED] as he exited the car was justified by reasonable articulable facts, however it appears the fear of a gun was likely based on the subject's presence in the community alone. In contrast, the pat down referenced in this allegation was duplicitous and unnecessary given the initial pat down revealed no weapon and no additional suspicion was developed between the searches. As stated above, COPA questions the value of these tactics in comparison to the harm they pose to the community and future policing efforts.

3. Allegation No. 6: Performed a pat down on [REDACTED] without justification

For the reasons stated above, COPA recommends a penalty of 10 days.

4. Allegation No. 8: Terminated [REDACTED] phone call without permission.

COPA recommends a penalty of 2 days. Officer Farias ending the call was clearly malicious. First, Officer Farias instructed [REDACTED] to end the call despite the fact that the call was not interfering in any way with the stop. Just as the officers have BWC, many citizens want others to bear witness to police encounters especially, as in this situation, where the subject questions the legitimacy of the police interaction. Officer Farias ended the call simply to deny [REDACTED] the ability to have his family member listen in. Officer Farias's decision

to end the call is akin to demanding others don't video police encounters. COPA finds the act troubling.

5. Allegation No. 9: Failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) for [REDACTED]

COPA recommends a penalty of 10 days. The proper documentation of street stops, and frisks is key to ensuring transparency and integrity.

6. Allegation No. 10: Failed to include all factors that supported reasonable articulable suspicion and/or probable cause in [REDACTED] ISR to justify the traffic stop and car search.

For the reasons cited above, COPA recommends a penalty of 10 days.

7. Allegation No. 12: Failed to record the incident on In Car Camera (ICC).

For the reasons cited above, COPA recommends a penalty of 10 days.

b. Officer Ali

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History

Officer Ali has the following complimentary history. Department Commendation (1), Honorable Mention (25), Complimentary Letter (1), Unit Meritorious Performance Award (1). Officer Ali has no disciplinary history.

ii. Recommended Penalty, by Allegation

1. Allegation No. 2: Threatened to arrest [REDACTED] if he did not provide identification.

For the same reasons cited for Officer Farias COPA recommends a penalty of 10 days.

2. Allegation No. 8: Failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) for [REDACTED]

See above, COPA recommends a penalty of 10 days.

3. Allegation No. 11: Failed to record the incident on In Car Camera (ICC).

See above COPA recommends a penalty of 10 days.

IX. CONCLUSION

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

Officer	Allegation	Finding / Recommendation
Officer Farias	1. Performed a traffic stop on [REDACTED] without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.	Exonerated
	2. Threatened to arrest [REDACTED] if he did not provide identification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 8.	Sustained
	3. Handcuffed [REDACTED] without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.	Exonerated
	4. Handcuffed [REDACTED] without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.	Exonerated
	5. Performed a pat down on [REDACTED] without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.	Sustained
	6. Performed a pat down on [REDACTED] without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.	Sustained
	7. Searched [REDACTED] vehicle without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.	Exonerated
	8. Terminated [REDACTED] phone call without permission, in violation of Rule 2, Rule 6, and Rule 8.	Sustained
	9. Failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) for [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 6.	Sustained
	10. Failed to include all factors that supported reasonable articulable suspicion and/or probable cause in [REDACTED] ISR to justify the traffic stop and car search, in violation of Rule 6.	Sustained
	11. Provided a false report on [REDACTED] ISR that a pat down was performed on [REDACTED] due to "a gun shaped bulge of the front pocket of the sweater [...]," in violation of Rule 14.	Unfounded

	12. Failed to record the incident on In Car Camera (ICC), in violation of Rule 6.	Sustained
Officer Ali	1. Performed a traffic stop on [REDACTED] without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.	Exonerated
	2. Threatened to arrest [REDACTED] if he did not provide identification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 8.	Sustained
	3. Handcuffed [REDACTED] without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.	Exonerated
	4. Handcuffed [REDACTED] without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.	Exonerated
	5. Performed a pat down on [REDACTED] without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.	Unfounded
	6. Performed a pat down on [REDACTED] without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.	Exonerated
	7. Searched [REDACTED] vehicle without justification, in violation of Rule 2 and Rule 6.	Exonerated
	8. Failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) for [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 6.	Sustained
	9. Failed to include all factors that supported reasonable articulable suspicion and/or probable cause in [REDACTED] ISR to justify the traffic stop and car search, in violation of Rule 6.	Unfounded
	10. Provided a false report on [REDACTED] ISR that a pat down was performed on [REDACTED] due to "a gun shaped bulge of the front pocket of the sweater [...]," in violation of Rule 14.	Unfounded
	11. Failed to record the incident on In Car Camera (ICC), in violation of Rule 6.	Sustained
Sergeant Madison	1. Failed to intervene when Officer Farias (Star #9942) and Officer Ali (Star #14112) searched [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 3 and Rule 6.	Exonerated

2. Failed to intervene when Officer Farias (Star #9942) and Officer Ali (Star #14112) searched [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 3 and Rule 6.	Exonerated
3. Failed to take a complaint from [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 3 and Rule 6.	Not Sustained
4. Failed to take a complaint from [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 3 and Rule 6.	Not Sustained

Approved:

[REDACTED]

December 16, 2019

Andrea Kersten
Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator

Date

Appendix A

Assigned Investigative Staff

Squad#:	Four
Investigator:	Kelsey Fitzpatrick, #61
Supervising Investigator:	James Murphy-Aguilu, #19
Deputy Chief Administrator:	Andrea Kersten