

SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Date of Incident:	October 27, 2018
Time of Incident:	7:00 AM
Location of Incident:	10301 S. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Dr.
Date of COPA Notification:	October 29, 2018
Time of COPA Notification:	10:39 AM

On October 27, 2018 [REDACTED] (“[REDACTED]”) was the subject of a traffic stop by Chicago Police officers, who arrested [REDACTED] on an erroneous warrant. [REDACTED] alleged that he was arrested without justification and that Officer Zachary Scott (“Officer Scott”) lost his wallet. Officer Scott also allegedly refused to provide his name and star number to [REDACTED] wife, and did not report [REDACTED] lost wallet. When [REDACTED] spoke to Sergeant Susan Kenny (“Sergeant Kenny”), she did not take a complaint against the accused officer. [REDACTED] was also repeatedly referred to as a “loser” in an Original Incident Case Report.

Body Worn Camera (“BWC”) and officer interviews exonerated [REDACTED] claim he was arrested without justification, but confirmed the wallet was lost due to officer error. COPA could not determine if Officer Scott refused to provide his name and star number. Sergeant Kenny’s interview verified that she spoke with [REDACTED] and approved the missing property report, but she did not initiate a complaint. Lastly, the references to [REDACTED] being a “loser” were determined to be within CPD policy. COPA’s findings are further discussed in the Analysis portion of this report.

II. INVOLVED PARTIES

Involved Officer #1:	Zachary Scott, Star #6187, Employee ID # [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: May 2, 1994, Police Officer, 5 th District, Date of Birth: [REDACTED], 1960, Male, Black
Involved Officer #2:	Susan Kenny, Star #1993, Employee ID # [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: August 31, 1998, Sergeant of Police, 5 th District, Date of Birth: [REDACTED], 1975, Female, White
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] Date of Birth: [REDACTED], 1966, Male, Black

III. ALLEGATIONS ¹

Officer	Allegation	Finding / Recommendation
Officer Scott	<p>It is alleged that on October 27, 2018, at or near 10301 S. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Dr., at about 7:00 AM, you:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Arrested [REDACTED] without justification, 2. Failed to inventory and secure [REDACTED] wallet, 3. Failed to provide [REDACTED] wife with your name and badge number when asked, 4. Failed to report that you lost [REDACTED] wallet, 	<p>Exonerated</p> <p>Sustained / 10 Day Suspension</p> <p>Not Sustained</p> <p>Sustained / 10 Day Suspension</p>
Sergeant Kenny	<p>It is alleged that on October 27, 2018, sat or near the 5th District Police Station located at 727 E. 111th St., at about 8:55 AM, you:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Failed to initiate a complainant when [REDACTED] complained about Officer Zachary Scott, Star #6187, 2. Wrote in the Original Case Incident Report for RD #JB491994 that "[REDACTED] (loser) came into district 005 [...]," 3. Wrote in the Original Case Incident Report for RD #JB491994 that "[REDACTED] (loser) stated that he was pulled over by CPD [...]," 4. Wrote in the Original Case Incident Report for RD #JB491994 that "[REDACTED] (loser) was instructed to place his wallet on top of the vehicle," 5. Wrote in the Original Case Incident Report for RD #JB491994 that "the loser placed his items 	<p>Sustained / 5 Day Suspension</p> <p>Unfounded</p> <p>Unfounded</p> <p>Unfounded</p> <p>Unfounded</p>

¹ Allegations were not brought against Officer Scott's partner, Officer Juan Salgado Star, #3173, as Officer Salgado was a probationary police officer (PPO) during the incident and Body Worn Camera (BWC) indicated that Officer Scott was the one making decisions and guiding Officer Salgado.

on the vehicle [...]," in violation of Rule 3 and Rule 8.	Unfounded
6. Wrote in the Original Case Incident Report for RD #JB491994 that "[REDACTED] (loser) realized that the police officers did not have his wallet [...]"	Unfounded
7. Wrote in the Original Case Incident Report for RD #JB491994 that "[REDACTED] (loser) alleges that the officer left his wallet on top of his vehicle."	Unfounded
8. Wrote in the Original Case Incident Report for RD #JB491994 that "[REDACTED] (loser) went back to the location of the traffic stop [...]"	Unfounded
9. Wrote in the Original Case Incident Report for RD #JB491994 that "the loser was given a VIN."	Unfounded

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 22:** Prohibits failure to report to the Department any violation of Rules and Regulations or any other improper conduct which is contrary to the policy, orders or directives of the Department.
 6. **Rule 37:** Prohibits 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.
 7. **Rule 40:** Prohibits failure to inventory and process recovered property in conformance with Department orders.
-

General Orders

1. **G07-01:** Processing Property Under Department Control.
2. **G08-01-02:** Specific Responsibilities Regarding Allegations of Misconduct.

Special Orders

1. **S04-13-06:** Automated Incident Reporting Application (AIRA) Pilot Program.
2. **S06-01-04:** Arrestee Identification Process.
3. **S06-12-02:** Non-Traffic Arrest Warrant Procedures.
4. **S07-01:** Processing Property Under Department Control.

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.
-

V. INVESTIGATION²

a. Interviews

██████████

COPA interviewed ██████████ on November 9, 2018.³ ██████████ told investigators that on October 27, 2018, ██████████ was driving west on 103rd St when he was pulled over for running a red light. ██████████ told the officers that they would find a warrant in his name for the person who stole his identity, which they did. ██████████ told the officers he had the clearance letter in his bag but was having trouble finding it. Officer Scott asked ██████████ out of the car and said he was going to take ██████████ to the police station. ██████████ removed everything from his pockets, at the officers' request, and put his wallet on his car's roof. Officer Scott ordered ██████████ to put his hands on top of the car and ██████████ complied. Officer Scott performed a pat-down on ██████████ handcuffed him, and put him in the police car. ██████████ was transported by Officer Scott, and Officer Salgado drove ██████████ car to the station. ██████████ forgot about his wallet and assumed the officers had it.

Once at the station, the officers gave ██████████ his bag and he found his clearance letter. ██████████ explained the identity theft confusion to the arresting officers and the officers did

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

³ Att. 3

additional research. The officers gave [REDACTED] a ticket, returned his driver's license, and he asked for his wallet, but the officers did not know what [REDACTED] was talking about. [REDACTED] then got upset because he had followed the officers' instructions in putting his wallet on top of the car. [REDACTED] asked the officers to return and see if the wallet fell off the car, and the officers agreed. [REDACTED] and his wife, [REDACTED] ("Z. [REDACTED] met the officers near the scene of his arrest, but his wallet was not located. Z. [REDACTED] asked Officer Scott for his badge number and he questioned why she needed it. Officer Scott told her not to worry about it because he had not behaved maliciously. [REDACTED] did not believe Officer Scott ever provided his star number. Officer Scott and his partner never advised the [REDACTED] on what to do next.

[REDACTED] then went to the police station and filed a police report for his missing wallet. A female officer, who was approximately 6'1", African American, and approximately 50 years old, took [REDACTED] report.⁴ [REDACTED] also spoke to a supervisor, who had to address an urgent matter and could not help the [REDACTED].⁵ The supervisor gave [REDACTED] information to file a complaint. The supervisor was a white female who was approximately 50 years old. [REDACTED] wallet was eventually returned via mail.

Officer Zachary Scott

COPA interviewed Officer Scott on December 12, 2018.⁶ Officer Scott told investigators that on October 27, 2018, Officer Scott was partnered with Officer Juan Salgado ("Officer Salgado") and they performed a traffic stop on [REDACTED]. Officer Scott related that [REDACTED] broke a traffic law, but he could not specifically recall which law. Officer Scott recalled that he performed a namecheck on [REDACTED] during the stop, which revealed [REDACTED] had a warrant that was not serviceable in Illinois. Officer Scott also recalled that he brought [REDACTED] to the police station for driving on a revoked or suspended license, and he did not believe he brought [REDACTED] in on a warrant. Officer Scott did not recall [REDACTED] telling him his identity had been stolen.

After watching his Body Worn Camera (BWC) from the incident, Officer Scott still did not recall what precipitated [REDACTED] traffic stop. However, Officer Scott realized that he did identify a warrant for [REDACTED] through a name check. When asked about the description on the warrant stating the target had tattoos and scars, Officer Scott did not believe he looked to see if [REDACTED] had those markings. Once at the police station, Officer Scott believed [REDACTED] was able to provide paperwork that clarified [REDACTED] was not the target. Officer Scott believed he wrote [REDACTED] citations and [REDACTED] asked for his wallet. The officers returned to their squad car, but the wallet was not there. Officer Scott told [REDACTED] they did not have his wallet and agreed to return to the location of the traffic stop. After about 10 minutes on scene, the officers could not find the wallet. Officer Scott advised [REDACTED] to go to the station and file a police report. Officer Scott recalled that Mrs. [REDACTED] also came to the scene of the stop to look for the wallet. Officer Scott did not recall Mrs. [REDACTED] asking for his name and star number, and he denied that he refused to provide this information. Officer Scott did not remember if he told any supervisors about the lost wallet and stated he did not document the lost wallet himself. Officer Scott did not know

⁴ This was identified as CPD civilian employee Angela Wilson-Davis, Employee # [REDACTED].

⁵ COPA identified this supervisor a Sergeant Susan Kenny, Star #1993.

⁶ Atts. 17, 18, 19

if [REDACTED] wallet was ever returned. Officer Scott acknowledged it was unfortunate [REDACTED] wallet was lost, but believed he made good-faith efforts to recover it.

Sergeant Susan Kenny

COPA interviewed Sergeant Kenny on July 30, 2019.⁷ Sergeant Kenny reported that on October 27, 2019, she was working as the 5th District Desk Sergeant. After reviewing the Original Case Incident Report, Sergeant Kenny vaguely recalled [REDACTED].⁸ Sergeant Kenny related that [REDACTED] approached her, upset about his wallet, and wanted to make a report. Sergeant Kenny denied authoring the case report and did not know who did, but she acknowledged she remembered logging into her computer to approve it. Sergeant Kenny related that [REDACTED] was referred to as a loser in the case report because of the computer system that generates case report. She elaborated that subjects in the reports automatically display along with their role in the incident. Sergeant Kenny related that a desk aide or an officer may have also spoken to [REDACTED] but she was unsure. Sergeant Kenny could not remember what [REDACTED] said about the accused officer.

Sergeant Kenny related that she did not initiate a complaint register for Officer Scott because “at the time, [...] I was gone from the desk, after I spoke with [REDACTED] so [...] they left. I don’t know what happened after that.”⁹ When asked if she, upon reading and approving the case report, identified [REDACTED] statements as misconduct allegations against Officer Scott, Sergeant Kenny stated, “To me it looked, when I read this, it’s an accident. He place [*sic*] the wallet on top of vehicle and then he lost his wallet.”¹⁰ COPA then referenced the case report, which states in part, “[REDACTED] alleges that the officer left his wallet on top of his vehicle, and then when [REDACTED] went back to the location of the traffic stop, his wallet was not there,” and asked Sergeant Kenny if she thought this was misconduct.¹¹ Sergeant Kenny responded that she was not on the street and did not know what occurred, aside from [REDACTED] filing a report. Sergeant Kenny asserted she did not know the details of what occurred. As COPA continued to ask Sergeant Kenny regarding requirements for initiating a complaint and for inventorying property, Sergeant Kenny stated, “Listen, he came in the station. He lost his wallet. Someone made a report [...] and I approved it.”¹² Sergeant Kenny finally stated that she did not believe there was any misconduct on the part of the accused officer.¹³

Officer Juan Salgado

On September 26, 2019, COPA interviewed Officer Salgado.¹⁴ Officer Salgado explained that on October 27, 2019, he was probationary police officer (PPO) and working with Officer Scott, when the officers performed a traffic stop after [REDACTED] ran a red light. Officer Salgado believed that they learned, via in-car computer and dispatch, that [REDACTED] had a warrant in his name. Officer Salgado did not recall [REDACTED] putting a wallet on top of his car. The officers

⁷ Att. 24

⁸ Att. 5

⁹ Approximately 6:10 minute mark of Att. 24.

¹⁰ Approximately 7:00 minute mark of Att. 24

¹¹ Approximately 8:51 minute mark of Att. 24.

¹² Approximately 11:31 minute mark of Att. 24.

¹³ Approximately 11:56 minute mark of Att. 24.

¹⁴ Att. 31

brought ██████ to the station for further investigation, since ██████ told the officers he had paperwork proving his innocence. Once at the station, the officers performed additional computer searches and ██████ provided his paperwork. ██████ asked for his wallet, but the officers did not know where it was. Officer Salgado did not recall ever seeing ██████ with a wallet. The officers retraced their steps with ██████ but did not find the wallet. Officer Salgado recalled Mrs. ██████ arriving at the scene of arrest while they were looking for the wallet. Officer Salgado did not remember Mrs. ██████ asking for Officer Scott's name and star number, or Officer Scott refusing to provide this information. The officers told ██████ they could provide a report for the lost wallet, but Officer Salgado believed ██████ went to the station to file the report.

b. Digital Evidence

Officer Scott BWC¹⁵

Officer Scott's BWC began at approximately 7:02 AM. Dispatch told the officers that ██████ license was valid, and he had a serviceable warrant. ██████ told that officers that he had a warrant in his name because someone stole his identification. ██████ stated he had never been arrested and has a clearance letter. At roughly 7:09 AM, Officer Scott told ██████ he was under arrest and asked him to exit the vehicle. At about 7:10 AM, Officer Scott told ██████ "You can show me all the paperwork you want in the world, right. But you know what, in our LEADS system, it says that you have a warrant. So, you're gonna have to return back to court [...]. Obviously somebody dropped the ball." ██████ exited his car and put his hands on his car roof. Officer Scott told ██████ to take his hands off his wallet and put his hand behind his back. ██████ was then handcuffed and placed in the back of the police car. Officer Scott told ██████ that once at the police station, he was going to make additional phone calls to verify if ██████ had a warrant. At about 7:20 AM, ██████ related that his name cannot be cleared from the warrant until the actual offender is arrested. Per ██████ the actual offender has tattoos and ██████ does not.

The officers brought ██████ into the police station at approximately 7:27 AM. Once in a holding cell, ██████ was allowed to look through his bag. At about 7:34 AM, he handed papers to Officer Scott. Officer Scott reviewed the documents, then told ██████ it looked like ██████ was correct. Officer Scott related he needed to confirm the information, but ██████ documents seemed valid and he apologized to ██████ stated that previously when he was pulled over, officers pulled up the offender's mugshot and saw it was not ██████. At about 7:51 AM, Officer Salgado produced a picture of the actual offender and Officer Scott stated that was sufficient evidence to release ██████. At about 8:04 AM, Officer Salgado brought ██████ his ticket and ██████ was allowed to leave. At roughly 8:05 AM, ██████ stood up and asked where his wallet was. The officers stated they would return the scene of ██████ arrest to look for it.

Beat 512 ICC

ICC for Beat 512 (Officers Scott and Salgado) began at roughly 6:57 AM. The officers stopped ██████ vehicle at about 6:58 AM, after ██████ drove through a red-light. Officer Salgado approached on the driver's side, and Officer Scott on the passenger's side. At

¹⁵ Att. 13

approximately 7:00 PM, ██████ related that his identity had been stolen and the officers would see a warrant in his name that was actually for the identify thief. Officer Scott confirmed the date of birth on ██████ ID was the same as on the warrant. At roughly 7:08 AM, Dispatch related that ██████ driver's license was valid and he had a serviceable arrest warrant. At approximately 7:11 AM, Officer Scott told ██████ he was being arrested and that the warrant was not cleared. ██████ exited the vehicle and Officer Scott told him to let go of his wallet. ██████ then left his wallet on his car's hood and was escorted to the squad car. Officer Salgado got into ██████ vehicle at about 7:16 AM and drove off, while Officer Scott followed with ██████ in the squad car.

At roughly 7:21 AM, Officer Salgado accelerated after waiting at a red light, and at least two small items were seen blowing off ██████ car roof. Seconds later, still at 7:21 AM, Officer Salgado started driving after another red light, when something was again seen coming off the car roof. They arrived at the police station at approximately 7:26 AM and ICC terminated at roughly 7:29 AM.

c. Documentary Evidence

On October 27, 2018, ██████ filed an Original Case Incident Report with RD #JB491994 for his missing wallet.¹⁶ The narrative states ██████ came into the 5th District "to report that his wallet was lost." ██████ related that CPD pulled him over and told him to put his wallet on his car. ██████ was arrested and ticketed before realizing the officers did not have his wallet. ██████ reported the officers left the wallet on top of his car and it was not present when he returned. The report refers to ██████ as a "loser" six times. The approving supervisor was Sergeant Susan Kenny. No attesting officer was provided.

A **Case Supplementary Report** was also found for **RD #JB491991**.¹⁷ Per this report, a civilian employee named Angela Wilson-Davis took ██████ complaint at the police station.

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

¹⁶ Att. 5

¹⁷ Att. 14

4. Exonerated - where it is determined by clear and convincing evidence that the conduct described in the allegation occurred, but it is lawful and proper.

A preponderance of evidence can be described as evidence indicating that it is more likely than not that the conduct occurred and violated Department policy. See *Avery v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co.*, 216 Ill. 2d 100, 191 (2005), (a proposition is proved by a preponderance of the evidence when it has found to be more probably true than not). If the evidence gathered in an investigation establishes that it is more likely that the misconduct occurred, even if by a narrow margin, then the preponderance of the evidence standard is met.

Clear and convincing evidence is a higher standard than a preponderance of the evidence but lower than the "beyond-a-reasonable doubt" standard required to convict a person of a criminal offense. See e.g., *People v. Coan*, 2016 IL App (2d) 151036 (2016). Clear and Convincing can be defined as a "degree of proof, which, considering all the evidence in the case, produces the firm and abiding belief that it is highly probable that the proposition . . . is true." *Id.* at ¶ 28.

VII. ANALYSIS

Officer Scott

Allegation 1 against Officer Scott, that he arrested ██████████ without justification, is exonerated. Officer Scott related that he brought ██████████ to the station for further investigation and ██████████ did not receive criminal charges. However, based on the duration of time, the fact that ██████████ was handcuffed, and the fact that ██████████ was transported to the police station, this detention constituted an arrest. When the officers researched ██████████ name in the field, they had sufficient basis to believe that he had a valid warrant. Additionally, ██████████ was unable to provide insurance. While it would have been possible to further investigate on the street, COPA acknowledges that the police station is a more controlled, safer environment with a greater access to police resources, and Officer Scott was reasonable in relocating. Once they were at the police station, ██████████ provided Officer Scott with paperwork clarifying that the warrant was actually for someone else. Officer Scott issued ██████████ citations and ██████████ was allowed to leave. Based on the lack of insurance and the questions about the warrant, Officer Scott had sufficient probable cause to justify taking ██████████ to the police station for further investigations and this allegation is exonerated.

Allegation 2 against Officer Scott, in that he failed to inventory and secure ██████████ wallet, is sustained. Per General Order G07-01, "All property which is seized, recovered, found, or otherwise taken into custody by Department members will be inventoried as soon as it is practical to do so." By all accounts, including Officer Scott's, Officer Scott failed to secure ██████████ wallet, which resulted in lost property for ██████████ and this allegation is sustained.

Allegation 3, that Officer Scott failed to provide ██████████ wife with his name and badge number when asked, is not sustained. We find that there is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove whether this allegation occurred. Accordingly, this allegation is not sustained.

Allegation 4 against Officer Scott, that he failed to report that he lost [REDACTED] wallet, is sustained. As detailed in Allegation 2, there is no question as to whether Officer Scott caused [REDACTED] property to go missing, in violation of General Order G07-01. Because Officer Scott violated a CPD General Order but failed to report it, he was in violation of Rule 22 which prohibits, "Failure to report to the Department any violation of Rules and Regulations or any other improper conduct which is contrary to the policy, orders or directives of the Department." As such, this allegation is sustained.

Sergeant Kenny

Allegation 1 against Sergeant Kenny, that she Failed to initiate a complainant when [REDACTED] complained about Officer Scott is sustained. Per Special Order G08-01-02, supervisors who receive "information of the alleged misconduct will [...] report the information to COPA," and "record all information available at the time of the allegation was received in a written report and forward the original report to COPA and a copy to BIA without unnecessary delay." The Incident Report for [REDACTED] missing wallet was approved by Sergeant Kenny and specifically stated, in part, that [REDACTED] "stated he was pulled over by CPD for a traffic violation," when he was "instructed to place his wallet on top of the vehicle," before he was arrested. After receiving citations, [REDACTED] "realized that the police officers did not have his wallet," and he "*alleges that the officer left his wallet on top of his vehicle.*" Since Sergeant Kenny spoke to [REDACTED] at the station and approved the report, she had knowledge that [REDACTED] was accusing Officer Scott of misconduct, but she failed to initiate a complaint. Accordingly, this allegation is sustained.

Allegations 2 – 9 against Sergeant Kenny, that she referred to [REDACTED] as a "loser" eight different times in the Incident Report for RD#JB491994, are Exonerated. COPA served these allegations against Sergeant Kenny as she was the ranking Department member listed on this report as approving it. While COPA understands that word "loser" can have a negative connotation, in this context we find the word "loser" referred to [REDACTED] as someone who had lost property. Therefore, Allegations 2 – 9 are exonerated.

VIII. RECOMMENDED DISCIPLINE FOR SUSTAINED ALLEGATIONS

a. Officer Scott

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History: Democratic National Convention Award, 1; Presidential Election Deployment Award, 2008, 1; Attendance Recognition Award, 2; Emblem of Recognition – Physical Fitness, 5; Traffic Stop of the month Award, 1; Honorable Mention, 32; 2004 Crime Reduction Ribbon, 1; Complementary Letter, 5; NATO Summit Service Award, 1; Unit Meritorious Performance Award, 1;

ii. Recommended Penalty, by Allegation

1. Allegation No. 2: Failed to inventory and secure [REDACTED] wallet.
Penalty: 10 Day Suspension.

- 2. **Allegation No. 4:** Failed to report that you lost [REDACTED] wallet.
Penalty: 10 Day Suspension.

b. Sergeant Kenny

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History: Emblem of Recognition – Physical Fitness, 15; Presidential Election Deployment Award 2008, 1; Attendance Recognition Award, 4; 2004 Crime Reduction Ribbon, 1; Department Commendation, 1; Honorable Mention, 27; Complimentary Letter, 8; Life Saving Award, 8; Life Saving Award, 1; NATO Summit Service Award, 1; 2009 Crime Reduction Award, 1.

ii. Recommended Penalty, by Allegation

- 1. **Allegation No. 1:** Failed to initiate a complainant when [REDACTED] complained about Officer Zachary Scott, Star #6187. **Penalty:** 5 Day Suspension.

IX. CONCLUSION

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

Officer Scott	<p>It is alleged that on October 27, 2018, at or near 10301 S. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Dr., at about 7:00 AM, you:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Arrested [REDACTED] without justification, 2. Failed to inventory and secure [REDACTED] wallet, 3. Failed to provide [REDACTED] wife with your name and badge number when asked, 4. Failed to report that you lost [REDACTED] wallet, 	<p>Exonerated</p> <p>Sustained / 10 Day Suspension</p> <p>Not Sustained</p> <p>Sustained / 10 Day Suspension</p>
Sergeant Kenny	<p>It is alleged that on October 27, 2018, sat or near the 5th District Police Station located at 727 E. 111th St., at about 8:55 AM, you:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Failed to initiate a complainant when [REDACTED] complained about Officer Zachary Scott, Star #6187, 	<p>Sustained 5 Day / Suspension</p>

2. Wrote in the Original Case Incident Report for RD #JB491994 that "[REDACTED] (loser) came into district 005 [...],"	Exonerated
3. Wrote in the Original Case Incident Report for RD #JB491994 that "[REDACTED] (loser) stated that he was pulled over by CPD [...],"	Exonerated
4. Wrote in the Original Case Incident Report for RD #JB491994 that "[REDACTED] (loser) was instructed to place his wallet on top of the vehicle,"	Exonerated
5. Wrote in the Original Case Incident Report for RD #JB491994 that "the loser placed his items on the vehicle [...],"	Exonerated
6. Wrote in the Original Case Incident Report for RD #JB491994 that "[REDACTED] (loser) realized that the police officers did not have his wallet [...]"	Exonerated
7. Wrote in the Original Case Incident Report for RD #JB491994 that "[REDACTED] (loser) alleges that the officer left his wallet on top of his vehicle."	Exonerated
8. Wrote in the Original Case Incident Report for RD #JB491994 that "[REDACTED] (loser) went back to the location of the traffic stop [...]"	Exonerated
9. Wrote in the Original Case Incident Report for RD #JB491994 that "the loser was given a VIN."	Exonerated

Approved

[REDACTED]
Andréa Kersten
Deputy Chief Investigator

Date

2/24/20

Appendix A

Assigned Investigative Staff

Squad#:	Three
Investigator:	Kelsey Fitzpatrick
Supervising Investigator:	Matthew Haynam
Deputy Chief Administrator:	Andrea Kersten