

SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Date of Incident:	October 30, 2018.
Time of Incident:	4:30 pm.
Location of Incident:	[REDACTED]
Date of COPA Notification:	December 4, 2018. ¹
Time of COPA Notification:	12:40 pm.

[REDACTED] and his [REDACTED] [REDACTED] were assigned to winterize and make repairs at the property of [REDACTED] by Safeguard Property Preservation Company. This property had been abandoned for over three years by the owner, Sergeant Fred Coffey. While [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were working at the property, Sergeant Coffey arrived at the scene, stopped, detained, and handcuffed [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Officers Landini and Salgado (collectively “the Officers”) arrived at the scene and attempted to determine if [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] had a right to be at the abandoned property. After several attempts, the Officers were unable to get a hold of the company that hired [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. As a result, Sergeant Coffey ordered the arrest of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] for criminal trespass. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] made several allegations against Sergeant Coffey for the manner he treated them including the fact that they were arrested without justification.

During the investigation, COPA brought allegations against Officers Landini and Salgado for Department violations. COPA further brought additional allegations against Sergeant Coffey and conducted a thorough investigation into the violations of Department policies.

II. INVOLVED PARTIES

Involved Sergeant #1:	Fred Coffey, Star #1438, Employee ID#[REDACTED], Date of Appointment: Dec. 2, 2002, Sergeant, Unit 005/189, Male, Black.
Involved Officer #1:	Joseph Landini, Star #10264, Employee ID#[REDACTED], Date of Appointment: Sep. 1, 2010, Police Officer, Unit 022, Male, White.

¹ On October 31, 2018, [REDACTED] registered complaint 1091573 against Sergeant Coffey alleging that during his arrest, Sergeant Coffey damaged his iPhone. No other allegations were made. The matter was referred to the Department for investigation. On December 4, 2018, [REDACTED] provided an interview to the Department, during which he alleged Sergeant Coffey injured to his left wrist during handcuffing. The Department then registered this complaint.

Involved Officer #2: Karina Salgado, Star #6921, Employee ID# [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: Sep. 18, 2017, Police Officer, Unit 022 / 376, Female, Hispanic.²

Involved Individual #1: [REDACTED] Male, Hispanic.

Involved Individual #2: [REDACTED] Male, Hispanic.

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Sergeant Fred Coffey	<p>It is alleged by the above ([REDACTED] and [REDACTED] that on or about October 30, 2018, at approximately 3:53 pm, at or near [REDACTED], Sgt. Coffey committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions, by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Detaining [REDACTED] without justification. 2. Detaining [REDACTED] without justification. 3. Damaging [REDACTED] cellular phone, without justification 4. Improperly handcuffing [REDACTED] 5. Having [REDACTED] arrested, without justification. 6. Having [REDACTED] arrested, without justification. 7. Leaving your duty assignment without being properly relieved or without proper authorization. 8. While on duty, used your official position for personal gain. 	<p>Sustained</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Not Sustained</p> <p>Unfounded</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Exonerated</p> <p>Sustained</p>

² Officer Salgado was a Probationary Police Officer at the time of this incident.

	<p>9. Investigating and/or arresting ██████ ██████ for an incident that you were personally involved.</p> <p>10. Investigating and/or arresting ██████ ██████ for an incident that you were personally involved.</p> <p>11. Failing to provide the Department with a current address and telephone number.</p> <p>12. Failing to report a crime or other unlawful action.</p> <p>13. Failing to notify your supervisor when you became aware of a personal interest to the above investigation.</p> <p>14. Failing to comply with Special Order S03-14, by failing to activate your body worn camera.</p> <p>15. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report after your detention of ██████ ██████</p> <p>16. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report after your detention ██████ ██████</p>	<p>Sustained</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Exonerated</p> <p>Exonerated</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Sustained</p>
<p>Officer Karina Salgado</p>	<p>It is alleged by the above (COPA) that on or about October 30, 2018, at approximately 3:50 pm, at or near ██████ ██████, that Officer Salgado committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions, by:</p> <p>1. Failure to properly conduct a preliminary investigation.</p> <p>2. Arrested ██████ without justification.</p> <p>3. Arrested ██████ without justification.</p>	<p>Unfounded</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Sustained</p>

	<p>4. Failure to call a supervisor upon learning that another police supervisor was involved in the incident.</p> <p>5. Failure to provide medical attention to [REDACTED]</p> <p>6. Failure to maintain BWC video activated during the transport of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Sustained</p> <p>Unfounded</p> <p>Sustained</p>
<p>Officers Joseph Landini</p>	<p>It is alleged by the above (COPA) that on or about October 30, 2018, at approximately 3:50 pm, at or near [REDACTED], that Officer Landini committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions, by:</p> <p>1. Failure to properly conduct a preliminary investigation.</p> <p>2. Arrested [REDACTED] without justification.</p> <p>3. Arrested [REDACTED] without justification.</p> <p>4. Failure to call a supervisor upon learning that another police supervisor was involved in the incident.</p> <p>5. Failure to provide medical attention to [REDACTED]</p> <p>6. Failure to maintain BWC video activated during the transport of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Unfounded</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Sustained</p> <p>Unfounded</p> <p>Sustained</p>

IV. INVESTIGATION

a. Interviews

In his statement to COPA, on December 4, 2018, ██████████³ who is an independent contractor, related he was hired by Halvy Property Preservation to winterize and rehab properties that had been abandoned and/or owned by banks or mortgage companies. ██████████ was contracted to do work on the property at ██████████ now identified as Sergeant Coffey's abandoned house. ██████████ and his coworker, ██████████ went to the property on October 28, 2018, knocked on the door but received no answer. They looked around and observed that the house was vacant and abandoned. One of the neighbors next to the property, a white male, informed them that the house had been abandoned for three to four years. ██████████ changed the locks and took photographs of the inside and outside of the property documenting the property's condition and everything that needed to be fixed. ██████████ sent his report and the photographs to Halvy and the bank that contracted them. ██████████ was at the property for four to five hours taking photos, fixing a hole in the roof, and talking to Halvy about the house. They were given the order to complete the work in the house, to take additional photos and make repairs where needed.

On October 30, 2018, ██████████ and ██████████ returned to the property to fix a water leak in the basement, complete the roof repair, board the windows, and mow the yards. While at the property, a black female, next door neighbor, told ██████████ that she was going to call the owner of the house and the police. After a while, a black male, Sergeant Coffey, wearing casual clothes with police equipment, arrived at the house, identified himself as the owner of the house and as a Chicago Police Officer. Sergeant Coffey began yelling at ██████████ and ██████████ refused to look at the contract and work orders from the bank, and immediately handcuffed ██████████ left wrist to ██████████ right wrist. ██████████ accused Sergeant Coffey of inappropriately handcuffing him, in that Sergeant Coffey placed the cuffs too tightly around his left wrist. ██████████ also stated that his phone was damaged by Sergeant Coffey in that the trackball was no longer functional.

After being handcuffed, Sergeant Coffey escorted them to the front of the property as two uniformed officers, Officers Joseph Landini and Karina Salgado, (collectively "the Officers") arrived at the scene. ██████████ told the Officers that the handcuffs were too tight and within a few minutes the Officers removed Sergeant Coffey's cuffs and placed their own handcuffs on ██████████ and ██████████ explained that he was handcuffed for five to eight minutes with Sergeant Coffey's handcuffs prior to the responding officers removing them. ██████████ sustained redness and pain to the left wrist. ██████████ showed the Officers the contracts, the emails and paperwork authorizing him to work at the property. Officer Landini called the banks and Halvy Property Preservation, but he was unable to reach a person since the businesses were both from out of town and were already closed. Sergeant Coffey told the Officers to arrest ██████████ and ██████████ for trespassing. Sergeant Coffey signed a complaint against them, and the Officers took them to the station for processing.

██████████ related his hand was red and he felt pain, but he did not tell the Officers of the injury or that he wanted medical treatment when at the station. However, ██████████ sought medical treatment on November 18, 2018, after he continued to feel pain to his left wrist and learned that his wrist

³ Atts. 18 (audio – Spanish) and 58 (transcript – English).

sustained a fracture. ██████ alleged that the injury was sustained from the manner Sergeant Coffey handcuffed his wrist to ██████ wrist.

In his statement to COPA, on June 11, 2019, ██████ said that he was working for ██████ winterizing properties assigned to them by banks or mortgage companies. These are houses that have a status of being abandoned or in foreclosure. On October 30, 2018, while at ██████ removed the boards that had been previously placed on the windows incorrectly and began replacing them when he was approached by Sergeant Coffey who asked him what he was doing in his house. ██████ told him that the house belonged to the bank and called out to ██████ who was fixing a leak in the basement. Sergeant Coffey told them that they were under arrest, refused to look at their work orders, threw their work phones on the yard and handcuffed them together. Sergeant Coffey requested another unit to responded. Officers Landini and Salgado arrived and arrested ██████ and ██████ phone was damaged, and the Officers re-handcuffed ██████ and him in individual handcuffs. ██████ said the neighbor next door, a white male, told the Officers that they were at the property two days prior working on the roof. ██████ was placed in the squad car as ██████ remained outside the squad car showing the Officers their work orders from the bank from his cellular phone.

When ██████ was asked if Sergeant Coffey mistreated him or if he sustained any injuries, ██████ related that Sergeant Coffey yanked him by the hand,⁵ pushed him forward but did not mistreat him in a rough manner. ██████ stated that his shoulder and back were hurting, but he did not seek medical help for four or five months after the incident and only after the attorney retained by ██████ advised him to do so. ██████ stated that he saw a therapist for back pain, however he explained that his job and work duties required him to do physical work. ██████ recalled seeing a bruise on ██████ hand days after the incident and ██████ believed, at the time, that his hand was broken because of the incident. However, ██████ did not know how ██████ hand had been injured.

In his statement to COPA, on October 6, 2020, **Lieutenant Rodney Hill**⁶ stated that he was the Tactical Lieutenant assigned to the 003rd District Tactical Unit as Sergeant Coffey's immediate supervisor at the time of the incident. He explained that there are situations where Department members must leave their tour of duty and their district due to a family emergencies, uniform malfunctions, or other personal reasons where they simply inform their supervisors, and no paperwork is required or completed by him or the member. However, the member does have to notify OEMC that they would not be available so calls and jobs can be forward to another unit. Lt. Hill also indicated that sergeants should document in their supervisor logs that they left early for the day, a reason, sometimes a location where they are going to be, and the times they were not available.

On the date of the incident, Lt. Hill received a call from Sergeant Coffey that he had an emergency at home, that someone was burglarizing his home and that he had gotten the information from a neighbor. Lt. Hill advised Sergeant Coffey to notify the 022nd District of the incident and to let them know that he was responding to the scene. Lt. Hill explained that he did

⁴ Atts. 36 (audio - Spanish), 57 (transcription - English).

⁵ Att. 57, pg. 16.

⁶ Atts. 84 (audio), and 97 (transcription).

not know if Sergeant Coffey switched radio zones to communicate with OEMC and the 022nd District as he responded to the incident at his home.

Lt. Hill asked Sergeant Coffey to keep him informed of the situation. Lt. Hill later learned that there was an arrest, but he could not recall any additional details of his conversation with Sergeant Coffey. Lt. Hill could not recall if he documented Sergeant Coffey's absence in his supervisor log and the reason for not remembering was because the log was no longer available for him to review or provide to COPA. Lt. Hill explained that Sergeant Coffey's supervisory level does not change because he was in a different district and related that Sergeant Coffey can give responding officers direction/orders on what to do or how to manage the situation. However, Lt. Hill did not know if Sergeant Coffey had directed/ordered the responding officers in the 022nd District on how to handle the call. When Lt. Hill was asked of the change of address procedures, Lt. Hill related that Department members can do it on their own by using the CLEAR system or providing the Unit Timekeeper their latest information on a Department form. If members failed to do this, they could face disciplinary action against them. Lt. Hill was not aware if Sergeant Coffey had changed his home address or not.

In his witness statement to COPA, on March 3, 2020, **Officer Landini**⁷ stated that he did not have an independent recollection of the incident and based his answers from watching his BWC video. Officer Landini responded to a criminal trespass call at [REDACTED] and heard over the radio that another unit was also responding. He later learned that the other unit was Sergeant Coffey from the 003rd District. Upon arrival to the scene, Officer Landini observed [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] handcuffed together while they were being brought to the front of the property by Sergeant Coffey. Officer Landini said that there were power tools at the property and [REDACTED] told him that he and [REDACTED] were winterizing the property from orders from a bank. [REDACTED] showed Officer Landini a work order in his phone for the residence. Sergeant Coffey told Officer Landini that his payments were up-to-date and that he had not received any calls or communication from any bank that he was losing the house. Sergeant Coffey said that no one was presently living at the house and that it has been vacant. Officer Landini called the numbers on the email; however, he was not able to speak to a person to confirm the work order or provide any reason for [REDACTED] presence at the residence. At this time, Sergeant Coffey directed/ordered that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to be placed under arrest for criminal trespass and criminal damage to property. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were placed under arrest.

Upon inquiry, Officer Landini could not recall [REDACTED] complaining about the handcuffs or his hand hurting. Officer Landini further related that Sergeant Coffey mentioned that a neighbor informed him of the two individuals at his house, and that they had being there the previous day working. Officer Landini did not obtain the neighbors' contact information and did not speak with them about [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]. Officer Landini recalled that Sergeant Coffey was on duty and did have a body worn camera on him, however he was not made aware of the BWC being activated while at the scene. Officer Landini did not recall any complaints of mistreatment, pain or injuries from [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] but later learned that [REDACTED] came into the station after he was released and complained that Sergeant Coffey dropped his cell phone and broke it.

⁷ Atts. 53 (audio), and 56 (transcription).

In a subsequent statement at COPA on October 14, 2020, Officer Landini,⁸ now identified as an accused officer in this incident, stated a similar account as he explained on March 3, 2020. However, when addressing the allegations brought against him, Officer Landini recalled seeing on his BWC video that █████ complained about his hand hurting, but he did not say anything about it and thought that it was due to the manner that he had being cuffed to █████

Officer Landini did not recall █████ complaining of the handcuffs being tight or Sergeant Coffey handcuffing him too tightly or of his hand hurt other than when he was initially brought to the front handcuffed. Officer Landini said that he removed the handcuffs and re-handcuffed █████ Officer Landini did not offer any medical assistance to █████ because he did not hear █████ complain about his hand again and did not know that █████ had any injury or pain as █████ used his phone without any problems when searching for contact information of the banks and companies that hired him.

Officer Landini did not ask Sergeant Coffey for any identification or proof of being the owner of the house, and the sergeant did not provide any. Officer Landini denied the allegation of failure to conduct a preliminary investigation as he made attempts to verify the work orders by calling the numbers provided by █████ and Googling one of the companies but did not locate a website. Officer Landini added that he was the business officer during this incident and that Officer Salgado was merely in a support role. However, Officer Landini failed to obtain the neighbor's (who identified himself as a neighbor of Sergeant Coffey and a witness to █████ and █████ being at Sergeant Coffey's house the previous day working in the house) contact information,.

Officer Landini related that he and Officer Salgado arrested █████ and █████ at the direction of Sergeant Coffey and after not being able to confirm their contract with a person from the company they claimed they had been subcontracted to do the winterization. Officer Landini admitted that he terminated his BWC video too early and failed to reactivate during transport of █████ and █████ Officer Landini stated that he did not call for a supervisor to the scene since Sergeant Coffey was present and gave them instructions on what to do.

In her statement to COPA, on September 9, 2020, and a subsequent interview on October 9, 2020, **Officer Karina Salgado**⁹ stated she responded to the property at █████ Upon arrival to the scene, Officer Salgado observed that Sergeant Coffey had handcuffed █████ and █████ While there, █████ mentioned that his hand/wrist was in pain. Officer Salgado and Officer Landini removed the handcuffs and used their own handcuffs on █████ and █████ separately. Officer Salgado could not recall seeing any visible injuries to █████ and did not hear him complain about his hand/wrist again. Further, she recalled seeing █████ using his hand without any problems and he did not request any medical treatment. Finally, Officer Salgado indicated that █████ never complained to her of any pain or injuries, and they were both taken to the station.

Officer Salgado never asked Sergeant Coffey for documentation or proof that the property was his but recalled a male white neighbor telling Sergeant Coffey that he had seen █████ and █████ at the house the day before. Officer Salgado could not recall if Sergeant Coffey identified himself as a Department member to her or Officer Landini, but she could see the

⁸ Att. 93 (audio).

⁹ Atts. 54 (audio), 55 (transcription), 89 (audio), and 95 (transcription).

Department emblems on his vest and saw an unmarked Department vehicle parked in front of the house. Officer Salgado also stated that she did not obtain the neighbor's information for the reports, and neither did Officer Landini, as they felt that it was not necessary for the case report. Officer Salgado stated that since she was in a PPO status during this incident, Officer Landini was overseeing the preliminary investigation of this incident. Officer Landini checked the work orders [REDACTED] claimed to have in his cell phone, talked with [REDACTED] and made calls to the companies and banks on the work orders. However, the banks and companies were already closed since they were all from out of town. Officer Salgado stated that neither she nor Officer Landini went inside the house to verify the damages [REDACTED] claimed the house had and that he repaired.

Officer Salgado said that Sergeant Coffey directed/ordered [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] be placed under arrest for trespassing and since he was a supervisor, they complied. Officer Salgado related that she did not call for a supervisor from her district since she was a PPO and did not have experience with such situations. Officer Salgado explained that she was trying to learn on how to oversee this type of call and did as instruct by Sergeant Coffey, who is a supervisor, and her partner, Officer Landini. She and Officer Landini picked up all the visible tools and equipment that belonged to [REDACTED] placed it in his work truck and parked the truck legally. However, they did not go in the house to check for any other tools.

Officer Salgado stated that she terminated her BWC early as she was told to do so by Officer Landini when they were picking up [REDACTED] tools and equipment and were no longer engaged in any police activity at the time. Officer Salgado said that she and Officer Landini failed to reactivate their BWC during the transport of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. She related that it was not done on purpose, but that they simply forgot to reactivate, a mistake and negligence on their part. Officer Salgado denied the other allegations made against her and Officer Landini.

In his statement to COPA, on September 15, 2020, **Sergeant Fred Coffey**¹⁰ stated that he received a call from his [REDACTED], who was called by [REDACTED], a next door neighbor, of someone breaking into their house located on [REDACTED]. Sergeant Coffey called his supervisor, Lt. Hill, informed him of the situation and that he was going to go to the property to check. Sergeant Coffey related that he did not notify OEMC that he was leaving the 003rd District to go to the 022nd District nor did he tell OEMC that there could be trespassers at his residence. Upon arrival to [REDACTED] he observed a U-Haul truck in the alley, the side rear door open, and [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] working in his property without his authorization. Sergeant Coffey brought the two individuals to the front of his property and called on the radio for a unit from the 022nd District. Sergeant Coffey related that [REDACTED] showed him something on his cell phone, but he did not see anything related to his house. The Officers responded to the scene and Sergeant Coffey informed them that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] broke into his house and that he wanted to sign a complaint against them. Sergeant Coffey indicated that his wife manages the finances, and he was not aware of any problems with the house until the incident on October 30, 2018. Sergeant Coffey stated that he did not follow up with any of the companies or phone numbers that [REDACTED] provided to the Officers. Sergeant Coffey could not recall if he identified himself to [REDACTED] or the responding Officers verbally and could not recall if [REDACTED] and/or [REDACTED] complained of any pain or injury.

¹⁰ Atts. 76 (audio), and 96 (transcription).

Upon inquiry, Sergeant Coffey never sought to verify any of the information provided by ██████. Sergeant Coffey did not inspect his home for damage during the incident. Sergeant Coffey did not take any photographs of his home for his insurance or court proceedings regarding the arrest and did not replace the locks. Sergeant Coffey did not follow up with his wife about the incident or any financial problems with the house and made no attempts to learn anymore about the incident or the court proceedings as he did not go to court or follow up with the Assistant State's Attorney. Sergeant Coffey denied using his police position while at the scene and could not recall if he handcuffed ██████ and ██████. Sergeant Coffey denied detaining or arresting ██████ and ██████ without justification. He denied damaging ██████ cellular phone or improperly handcuffing him. Sergeant ██████ denied all the other allegations and only admitted that he did fail to activate his body worn camera. Sergeant Coffey also indicated that he did not call OEMC to inform them that he was leaving his district, to initially request assistance or to have another unit at the scene and waited until after he took matters into his own hands. However, Sergeant ██████ did not believe that he needed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report for ██████ and ██████ nor any other department report. Sergeant Coffey also related that he did not complete the necessary change of address forms to have his new address added in his personnel file and did not inform his timekeeper or district secretary. Further, Sergeant Coffey also did not provide Lt. Hill any details of the incident after he arrived, during or after the arrest at his property.¹¹

b. Digital Evidence

The **Body Worn Camera (BWC)**¹² of the Officers captured Sergeant Coffey walking toward the front of the property at ██████ with ██████ and ██████ handcuffed to each other; ██████ right wrist is handcuffed to ██████ left wrist. ██████ complained about the handcuff on his right wrist.¹³ Sergeant Coffey was in plain clothes with police equipment on his person and a body worn camera on his chest. ██████ can be heard saying that Sergeant Coffey hurt his hand and complaining about the handcuffs.¹⁴ Two black colored cellular phones can be seen on the grass.¹⁵ ██████ repeatedly said he was contracted by the bank to make repairs at the home and that he has the paperwork and emails in his phone.¹⁶ Officer Landini questioned ██████ regarding what work needed to be completed and if ██████ had a contact person. ██████ uses both of his hands, without any apparent difficulty, to search his phone for numbers while talking to Officer Landini throughout the BWC recording.¹⁷ Officer Landini called one of the numbers on the email, but was not able to speak to a person.¹⁸ Officer Landini can be seen reading emails from ██████ phone, making calls, and asking Sergeant Coffey if he had any contacts.¹⁹

¹¹ Att. 96, pg. 89.

¹² Att. 25.

¹³ Att. 25, file PO Landini AXON_Body_2_Video_2018-10-30_1610 (1) from 01:00 to 01:30.

¹⁴ *Id.*, from 1:07 to 01:52.

¹⁵ *Id.*, at 02:36.

¹⁶ *Id.*, at 09:35.

¹⁷ *Id.*, at 10:10.

¹⁸ *Id.*, from 11:00 to 14:30; and 21:50 to 22:30.

¹⁹ *Id.*, at 10:45.

Another male voice, who is later identified as a neighbor, can be heard indicating that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were at the house the day before.²⁰ Officer Landini tells Sergeant Coffey that he believes [REDACTED] is authorized although he may not have the hard copies for the work.²¹ Sergeant Coffey responds by placing both hands on his vest, approaching Officer Landini while asserting that just because it appears that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] presence on the property appears to be authorized, that it does not mean they are and tells the Officers to take [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in and he will sign the complaint.²² [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were searched, placed in the squad car, and taken to the station. The Officers can be seen picking up [REDACTED] tools, making comments about Sergeant Coffey losing his house, and that he believes that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] are legitimate.

During the interaction, Officer [REDACTED] asks Sergeant Coffey if there was any reason that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] would have assumed the property was abandoned. Sergeant Coffey then recounted complaints from neighbors and the 022nd District CAPS office, that homeless individuals were living on the property and that drug sales were occurring in the area. Sergeant Coffey admitted that the property was boarded up in response to these complaints.²³

c. Documentary Evidence

An **Initiation Report**²⁴ submitted by Sergeant Jorge Rivera from BIA documented that he was assigned to investigate a complaint filed by [REDACTED] (Log #1091573) on November 6, 2018 where [REDACTED] alleged that Sergeant Coffey damaged his personal property during his arrest. On December 4, 2018, Sergeant Rivera spoke with [REDACTED] who related that he experienced pain in his left wrist area and sought medical attention where it was determined to be broken. [REDACTED] informed Sergeant Rivera that he believed the injury was related to being handcuffed during his arrest during the incident on October 30, 2018.

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] **Arrest Reports**²⁵ and **Original Incident Case Report**²⁶ detail they were arrested for Damage to Property and Criminal Trespass to property. Officers Landini and Salgado responded to [REDACTED] and learned from Sergeant Coffey that he received a call from his neighbor that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were at his property removing the boards from the windows, cutting the grass, and entering the residence causing damage to the frame of the windows. Sergeant Coffey related to the Officers that he did not give consent for [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] to enter his home, remove the boards or do any work in his property. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] informed the Officers that they worked for Halvy Property Preservation, a company that works with banks on foreclosure homes. [REDACTED] informed the Officers that they were contracted to winterize the home and cut the grass. The Officers attempted to call Halvy Properties and Asset Guard Services to verify emails and the work orders but had negative results for both numbers.

²⁰ *Id.* at 23:40.

²¹ *Id.*, at 25:00.

²² Sergeant Coffey asserts that he will use the time between the arrest and court date to determine who the owner of the property is and that if [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] presence is unauthorized, and if his assessment is correct, they will have then committed the offense of trespass and criminal damage to property and if not, the case will be dismissed. *Id.*, at 25:10 to 26:07

²³ *Id.*, from 05:45 to 06:00.

²⁴ Att. 6.

²⁵ Atts. 9 and 10.

²⁶ Att. 8.

██████████ and ██████████ were unable to provide any other numbers to verify the work orders. Sergeant Coffey signed complaints and ██████████ and ██████████ were arrested.

The **Event Query** regarding this incident documented a call from a person reporting that someone took boards off abandoned home, are cutting the grass and are in the home taking things. The caller indicated that she was a friend of the owners.

Photographs²⁷ taken by ██████████ depict the identity of Sergeant Coffey and the manner that ██████████ and ██████████ were handcuffed by Sergeant Coffey.

Medical Records²⁸ from Presence St. Joseph Hospital from November 18, 2018, document that ██████████ sought medical treatment and told hospital personnel that he was arrested a few weeks ago, and that ever since he has had pain to the left wrist. ██████████ stated that “he thinks they put the handcuffs too tight,” and was diagnosed with a fracture of distal end of left radius.

Medical Records from New Life Medical Center for ██████████ documented that he sought medical treatment on March 11, 2019, for an injury sustained on October 29, 2018. ██████████ informed medical personnel that he hurt his back because of being arrested on October 29, 2018. The final diagnosis was cervical pain, thoracic pain, muscle spasms, cervical sprain/strain, thoracic sprain/strain, and lumbar sprain/strain. ██████████ was last seen on June 17, 2019, with occasional pain in the bilateral region of the neck, mid-back and lower lumbar pain bilaterally rated mild-moderately symptomatic.

Records²⁹ were obtained from Residential Real Estate Review Inc. (RRR), who forward a letter of authorization for Safeguard Properties, Inc. to perform property preservation on behalf of Select Portfolio Servicing, Inc. (SPS). The letter indicated that SPS is the servicer of record for the property at ██████████. The beneficiary of the mortgage on this property is Town Point Mortgage Trust 2018-1, U.S. Bank National Association, Indenture Trustee. SPS contracts with RRR to act on their behalf in all aspects related to property preservation and code violations, including managing the use of third-party contractors and subcontractors to complete repairs and cure issues related to property preservation.

As of March 24, 2018, seven property inspections identified properties including ██████████ ██████████ as vacant. On April 6, 2018, Safeguard Properties conducted a weekly inspection at ██████████ and it was described as vacant, with property damage/vandalism, empty through windows, there was no For Sale sign, neglected, but in fair conditions. There were no water or gas meters, grass was overgrown, there was debris in the interior of the property and no personal property visible. Photographs were taken of the property and its condition. A sign was left at the front door providing the telephone number to Safeguard Properties, informing the owner of what to expect and to call for additional information. SPS sent a letter to the mortgagor on October 16, 2018, but there was no response. As of October 26, 2018, RRR placed an order with Safeguard to secure and winterize the property.

²⁷ Att. 35.

²⁸ Att. 22 and 101.

²⁹ Atts. 43, 46.

Personnel Suite and Watch Information³⁰ was obtained which depicts that as of September 15, 2020, Sergeant Coffey was still providing the Department with the incorrect home address of [REDACTED] Sergeant Coffey did not change his address until mid-year of 2021.

Supervisor's Management Log³¹ for Sergeant Coffey for October 30, 2018, did not document that he left his tour of duty early or that he went to [REDACTED]³²

V. 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;³³
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 evidence³⁴ 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.

VI. ANALYSIS

a. Sergeant Coffey

COPA finds **Allegations #1 and 2** against Sergeant Coffey, that he detained [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] without justification are **sustained**. Department members are permitted to detain a person when there is reasonable articulable suspicion that person is about to commit, is committing, or has committed a criminal offense.³⁵ This detention is an Investigatory

³⁰ Att. 64.

³¹ Att. 40.

³² It should be noted that there were no supervisor logs for Lt. Rodney Hill at the time of the request.

³³ A **preponderance of evidence** can be described as evidence indicating that it is **more likely than not** that the conduct reviewed complied with 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 conduct complied with Department policy than that it did not, even if by a narrow margin, then the preponderance of the evidence standard is met.

³⁴ **Clear and convincing evidence** is described a more that preponderance of the evidence but lower than beyond-a-reasonable doubt required to convict a person of a criminal offense. Clear and Convincing is described as a “degree of proof, which, considering all the evidence in the case, produces the firm and abiding belief that it is highly probable” there was no misconduct. *See People v. Coan*, 2016 IL App (2d) 151036 (2016).

³⁵ S04-13-09 II(A), Investigatory Stop System (effective July 10, 2017 to current).

Stop. Reasonable articulable suspicion is defined as “an objective legal standard that is less than probable cause but more substantial than a hunch or general suspicion.”³⁶

Here, Sergeant Coffey was in, or likely in, possession of knowledge that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] presence on the property was authorized. This was not the first instance that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were present on the property, and evidence shows that Sergeant Coffey was aware of this. Further, Sergeant Coffey knew, or should have known, that the property was at a minimum abandoned, if not in foreclosure proceedings. This knowledge would in no way lead a reasonable person and or officer to conclude that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were engaged in any potential criminal offense that warranted further investigation.³⁷ Moreover, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] informed Sergeant Coffey that they were contracted to work on the home and provided documentation to that effect. Thus, the preponderance of the evidence shows that Sergeant Coffey did not have a reasonable articulable suspicion that they were committing, about to commit, or had committed a criminal offense.

COPA finds that **Allegations #5, 6, 8 to 10** against Sergeant Coffey, that he used is official capacity as a Department supervisor, while on duty, for personal gain by directing the arrest of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in an incident where he possessed a personal and/or financial interest, are **sustained**. A Department member must have probable cause to arrest a subject.³⁸ “Probable cause to arrest exists where the police have knowledge of facts that would lead a reasonable person to believe that a crime has occurred and that the subject had committed it.”³⁹ The reasonable basis of any arrest “should be considered from the perspective of a reasonable officer at the time” of the arrest.⁴⁰ Additionally, Department members are prohibited from engaging in any conduct or action using their official position for personal gain or influence.⁴¹ Further, Department members are prohibited from investigating or arresting an person when the member has a personal or financial interest involved in the investigation.⁴² Rather, the member is required to notify their supervisor of the conflict and request an alternative unit to respond.⁴³

Here, Sergeant Coffey clearly had a personal and financial interest in the investigation but failed to allow another unit, without the interest, to investigate the matter. Although another unit was on scene to conduct an investigation, the evidence shows that Sergeant Coffey used his authority as a Department supervisor to direct the Officers’ investigating to ultimately arrest [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. This actions by Sergeant Coffey violated Department policy and Rules 2, 3, 4 and 6.

³⁶ S04-13-09 II(C).

³⁷ Even if it was possible that a reasonable officer would believe additional investigation was warranted for potential criminal activity, Sergeant Coffey’s decision to detain [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in handcuffs would have been unnecessary as neither [REDACTED] nor [REDACTED] presented any indications that they would have resisted or failed to comply with Sergeant Coffey’s authority.

³⁸ *People v. Johnson*, 408 Ill. App. 3d 107 (citing *Beck v. Ohio*, 379 U.S. 89, 91, (1964)).

³⁹ S04-13-09 II(D).

⁴⁰ S04-13-09 II(D)).

⁴¹ Article V, Rule IV of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department.

⁴² G04-01 III(C), Preliminary Investigations (effective October 15, 2017 to December 30, 2020.)

⁴³ G04-01 III(C)(1).

Additionally, Sergeant Coffey was informed that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] presence on the property was possibly authorized. This was not the first instance that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were present on the property, and evidence shows that Sergeant Coffey was aware of this. Further, Sergeant Coffey knew, or should have known, that the property was at a minimum abandoned, if not in foreclosure proceedings. Sergeant Coffey failed to take even the most basic steps to determine if [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] presence on the property was authorized. Sergeant Coffey failed to check with his wife who, by his own admission, is responsible for finances related to the property and failed to call his bank, mortgage holder, and/or the companies that had posted notices to the front door of the property. This information would have caused any reasonable officer to believe that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were authorized to be on the property.⁴⁴ When the information is viewed in the totality, Sergeant Coffey either knew [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were authorized to be on the property or willfully disregarded information indicating their authorized presence; both of which eliminated any potential probable cause for their arrest. Therefore, Sergeant Coffey's decision to use his official capacity to direct/order the Officers to arrest [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] on his signed complaint, violated Department policy and Rules 2, 3, 4, and 6.

COPA finds that **Allegation #3** against Sergeant Coffey, damaging [REDACTED] personal property, is **not sustained**. There is insufficient evidence, facts, and/or witnesses to support or refute this allegation. [REDACTED] alleged that the trackball on his phone no longer moved. Although the BWC video of Officer Landini showed two cellular phones on the grass, is not clear how they ended up on the grass and if they were previously damaged or damaged by Sergeant Coffey as [REDACTED] alleged. [REDACTED] accused Sergeant Coffey of throwing the phone on the grass causing it to get damaged. Sergeant Coffey denied the allegation and Officers Landini and Salgado were not aware of the alleged damaged to the phone.

COPA finds that **Allegations #4** against Sergeant Coffey, that he improperly handcuffed [REDACTED] is **unfounded**. [REDACTED] stated that Sergeant Coffey placed the handcuff on his left wrist too tightly causing an injury. However, [REDACTED] can be seen on the BWC footage being handcuffed on the right wrist with [REDACTED] left wrist. Also, [REDACTED] can be seen using both of his hands freely to make phone calls and search his phone without any complaints of pain or difficulty. During this time, [REDACTED] was not heard complaining of pain or requesting medical attention for either of his wrists. [REDACTED] also failed to complain of pain or any injury to Officers Landini or Salgado while at the scene or at the station. Furthermore, when [REDACTED] filed this complaint, he never made any complaints of pain or injury or that force was used when Sergeant Coffey handcuffed him. [REDACTED] complaint was initially for damage to his cellular phone. It was when the case was assigned to Sergeant Rivera, that [REDACTED] mentioned the injury to his left wrist. The BWC videos of the Officers documented that [REDACTED] was re-handcuffed by Officer Landini, who used two handcuffs for comfort, double locked them and he can be heard asking [REDACTED] if the handcuffing was okay. Although Sergeant Coffey could not recall if he handcuffed [REDACTED] he can be heard acknowledging to the responding Officers that he detained [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and that the blue handcuffs were his. Although the medical records from Presence St. Joseph Hospital noted that [REDACTED] had a fracture of the distal end of left radius,⁴⁵ the age and cause of the injury is unclear and [REDACTED] visit to the

⁴⁴ Even if it is possible that a reasonable officer was uncertain if [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] presence on the property authorized, there was still a lack of information to establish probable cause that a trespass had occurred.

⁴⁵ The distal radius fracture is when the radius breaks near the wrist, and it usually happens due to falling on an outstretched or flexed hand. It can also happen in a car or bike accident, a skiing accident, or another sports activity.

hospital was approximately 19 days after being handcuffed. Given the totality, the lack of evidence demonstrating that ██████ left wrist was handcuffed by Sergeant Coffey and/or that Sergeant Coffey made any contact with his left wrist, this allegation is unfounded.

COPA finds that **Allegations #7, 12 and 13** against Sergeant Coffey, that he left his duty assignment without being properly relieved or without proper authorization, failed to report a crime to the Department while failing to inform supervision of his personal and/or financial interest in the ensuing criminal investigation, are **exonerated**. Department members are prohibited from leaving their duty assignment without being properly relieved or without authorization.⁴⁶ Department members are required to promptly report to the Department any information concerning any crime or unlawful action.⁴⁷ Department members are prohibited from investigating or arresting an person when the member has a personal or financial interest involved in the investigation.⁴⁸ Rather the member is required to notify their supervisor of the conflict, request an alternative unit to respond.⁴⁹

Here, Sergeant Coffey reported to Lt. Hill that there was a potential emergent criminal incident occurring at the property, and Lt. Hill authorized Sergeant Coffey to leave his duty assignment. Additionally, once Sergeant Coffey was on scene, he requested assistance, via his radio, to address the potential criminal activity. While, ideally, Sergeant Coffey should have reported the incident to OEMC when he initially notified Lt. Hill, he complied with the letter of the applicable policy and Rules. Finally, when Sergeant Coffey informed Lt. Hill that his residence was being broken into, Lt. Hill reasonably knew or should have known that Sergeant Coffey possessed a personal and/or financial interest in the ensuing investigation.

COPA finds that **Allegations #11** against Sergeant Coffey, that he failed to provide the Department with a current address and telephone number, is **sustained**. Department members are required to provide updated address and telephone numbers to the Department when such information changes using the prescribed forms.⁵⁰ Here, the evidence clearly shows that at the time of the incident, Sergeant Coffey had failed to report his change of address for more than three years – the length of time the property was abandoned – and only changed the address in 2021, after his statement to COPA. Sergeant Coffey’s failure violated Department policy and Rules 2, 3, 6 and 26.

COPA finds that **Allegations #14** against Sergeant Coffey for failing to comply with Special Order S03-14, by failing to activate his body worn camera, is **sustained**. Department Members are required to activate BWC “at the beginning of” or “as soon as practical” for “all law-enforcement-related activities.”⁵¹ Here, it is undisputed that Sergeant Coffey was equipped with

⁴⁶ Article V, Rule 30 of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department.

⁴⁷ Article V, Rule 21 of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department.

⁴⁸ G04-01 III(C).

⁴⁹ G04-01 III(C)(1).

⁵⁰ Article V, Rule 26 of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department; E01-03 II(A)(1)(a-g), Personnel Records (effective June 2, 2017 to January 7, 2019).

⁵¹ “Law-enforcement-related activities include but are not limited to:” “calls for service; investigatory stops; traffic stops; traffic control; foot and vehicle pursuits; arrest; use of force incidents; seizure of evidence; interrogations; searches, including searches of people, items, vehicle, buildings, and places; statements made by individuals in the course of an investigation; requests for consent to search; emergency driving situations; emergency vehicle responses

and failed to activate his BWC while responding to reports of a possible criminal act. Therefore, Sergeant Coffey's failure violated Department policy and Rules 2, 3, and 6.

Copa finds that **Allegations #15** and **#16** against Sergeant Coffey, for failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report after the detention of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] are **sustained**. Department members who complete an investigatory stop are required to complete an Investigatory Stop Report that details "[a]ll of the factors that support" the detention of the subject.⁵² However, if the member completes a detention based on probable cause and there is any other Department report that details the probable cause for the stop, the member is not required to complete an Investigatory Stop Report.⁵³

Here, it is undisputed that Sergeant Coffey detained [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] while attempting to investigate if they had committed a criminal offense. Therefore, Sergeant Coffey was obligated to complete an Investigatory Stop Report, but failed to do so. This failure violated Department policy and Rules 2, 3, and 6.

b. Officers Landini and Salgado

COPA finds that **Allegation #1** against Officers Landini and Salgado, that they failed to properly conduct a preliminary investigation, is **Unfounded**. Department members responding to a report of a potential criminal offense, are required to conduct a thorough and accurate investigation to assist in determining if a crime has been committed.⁵⁴

Here, it is indisputable that Officers Landini and Salgado responded to reports of a potential criminal offense, specifically trespass or burglary. Upon their arrival they located Sergeant Coffey, who informed them he was owner of the property, and a detained [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] Officer Landini learned that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were asserting that they were authorized to be on the property, prompting him made several attempts to verify the information. Officer Landini called the numbers listed on [REDACTED] work orders and even a phone number he located via Google. The fact that Officer Landini was not able to verify [REDACTED] assertion does not mean he did not conduct a proper investigation. In fact, Officers Landini and Salgado reasonable attempted to investigate the claims made by [REDACTED] Therefore, COPA determined that they did not fail to properly conduct a preliminary investigation as alleged.

COPA finds that **Allegations #2** and **3** against Officers Landini and Salgado, that they arrested [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] without justification, is **sustained**. A Department member must have probable cause to arrest a subject.⁵⁵ "Probable cause to arrest exists where the police have knowledge of facts that would lead a reasonable person to believe that a crime has occurred and that the subject had committed it."⁵⁶ The reasonable basis of any arrest "should be considered from

where fleeing suspects or vehicle may be captured on video leaving the crime scene; high-risk situations; any encounter with the police that becomes adversarial after the initial contact; arrestee transports; any other instance when enforcing the law." S03-14 III(A)(2)(a-r), Body Worn Cameras (effective April 30, 2018 to current).

⁵² S04-13-09 VIII (A)(1).

⁵³ S04-13-09 VII (B)(1)(a).

⁵⁴ G04-01 III(B); IV(A)(1-3).

⁵⁵ *People v. Johnson*, 408 Ill. App. 3d 107 (citing *Beck v. Ohio*, 379 U.S. 89, 91, (1964).

⁵⁶ S04-13-09 II(D), Investigatory Stop System (effective July 10, 2017 to current).

the perspective of a reasonable officer at the time” of the arrest.⁵⁷ Additionally, Department members are required to comply with directions and/or orders issued by superior members.⁵⁸

Here, Sergeant Coffey provided a signed complaint and directed the arrest of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Although Sergeant Coffey was a supervisor, he had a personal interest in the matter, so the Officers were required to call a Lieutenant to the scene. Although the Officers may have felt they were required to heed Sergeant Coffey’s orders, they are not required to follow unlawful orders and did not have probable cause to effectuate an arrest. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] asserted that they were authorized to be at the property and provided documentation to that effect. Furthermore, neighbors saw them at the property doing work the day before, making their involvement in any criminal activity at the property highly unlikely. Thus, COPA finds there was not sufficient probable cause to arrest [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and the allegation is sustained.

COPA finds that **Allegations #4** against Officers Landini and Salgado, that they failed to notify a supervisor upon learning that another police supervisor was involved in the incident, is **sustained**. Department members are prohibited from investigating or arresting persons during an investigation in which they have a personal and/or financial interest.⁵⁹ Further, when subordinate members encounter an instance in which a supervisor is directly involved in an investigation, that they have a personal and/or financial interest in, it is in the Department’s interest that the members are to request an independent supervisor to respond to the scene.⁶⁰ Here, upon learning that Sergeant Coffey possessed a personal and/or financial interest in their investigation, Officers Landini and Salgado took no action, other than following Sergeant Coffey’s instructions to arrest [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Their failure to even attempt to request a different supervisor to scene violated Department policy and Rules 2, 3 and 6.

COPA finds that **Allegations #5** against Officers Landini and Salgado, that they failed to provide medical attention to [REDACTED] is **unfounded**. While [REDACTED] did discover a fracture to his wrist 19 days after this incident. There are no indications that he displayed signs of or complained of an injury to Officer Landini and Salgado. In fact, [REDACTED] actions would have likely caused an officer to believe he had no injury. [REDACTED] only complained about the handcuffs applied by Sergeant Coffey. Officer Landini responded to [REDACTED] complaint by re-handcuffing him. [REDACTED] made no additional complaints of injury to Officers Landini and Salgado. [REDACTED] was able to manipulate and use his cellular telephone with no visible signs of pain or injury or complaints of such. Therefore, there is no indication that Officers Landini and Salgado ever possessed any information that would cause any person to believe that [REDACTED] required medical treatment. Therefore, this allegation is unfounded.

COPA finds that **Allegations #6** against Officers Landini and Salgado, that they failed to maintain BWC video activated during the transport of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] is **sustained**. Department members will not deactivate their BWC until “law-enforcement-related

⁵⁷ S04-13-09 II(D), Investigatory Stop System (effective July 10, 2017 to current).

⁵⁸ Article V, Rule 6 of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department.

⁵⁹ G04-01 III(C).

⁶⁰ See G04-04 III(B), Domestic Incidents (effective December 28, 2012 to current). (Speaking for the need to ensure a proper ranked authority is involved in an investigation.)

activity”⁶¹ has concluded; or when requested by a victim of or witness to a crime or a member of the community wishing to report a crime; or interacting with a confidential informant.⁶² When a Department member deactivates a BWC while still engaged in law-enforcement-related activity they “will verbally justify [the deactivation] on the BWC [recording.]”⁶³

Here, both Officers Landini and Salgado were actively engaged in law-enforcement-related activity when they deactivate their BWCs. Specifically, Officers Landini and Salgado were searching for and securing [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] personal property and transporting them to the district station. Therefore, Officers Landini’s and Salgado’s early deactivation of the BWC was in violation of Department policy and Rules 2, 3, and 6.

VII. RECOMMENDED DISCIPLINE FOR SUSTAINED ALLEGATIONS

a. Sergeant Fred Coffey

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History

1. Complimentary: 3 Crime Reduction Awards, (2004, 2009, 2019), 2 Attendance Recognition Awards, 3 Complimentary Letters, 8 Department Commendations, 1 Field Training Service Award, 17 Honorable Mentions, 1 Life Saving Award, 1 NATO Summit Service Award, 1 Other Award, 1 Presidential Election Deployment Award, 1 Unit Meritorious Award

2. Disciplinary: None

ii. Recommended Penalty

Here, COPA found that while on duty Sergeant Coffey used his authority as a Department member to detain two citizens he knew or should have known were properly authorized to be on the abandoned residential property that he had a personal and/or financial interest in. This action is highly concerning and negatively impacts the reputation and credibility of the Department. Furthermore, Sergeant Coffey used his position as a sergeant to direct responding officers to unlawfully arrest two civilians for a matter he had a personal and/or financial interest in. Additionally, Sergeant Coffey failed to properly activate his BWC, complete Investigatory Stop Reports, and failed to provide his current address as required by policy. This behavior is highly unbecoming of a member of the Chicago Police Department and specifically, a supervisory member with nearly 16 years in the Department at the time of the incident. His behavior diminishes public trust in the Department. It is for these reasons, after considering his complimentary and

⁶¹ “Law-enforcement-related activity” concludes when “the member has cleared the assignment; the member leaves the scene of the incident;” an arrested subject is “is secured in the processing room and the member is only conducting administrative functions...” or “custody has been transferred to another Department member ...”; or deactivation is instructed to by the “highest-ranking on-scene Bureau of Patrol supervisor...” S03-14 III(B)(10).

⁶² S03-14 III(B)(1)(a-d).

⁶³ S03-14 III(B)(4).

disciplinary history, that COPA recommends Sergeant Coffey receive a suspension of 180 days up to separation from the Department.

b. Officer Joseph Landini

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History

- 1. Complimentary:** 1 Crime Reduction Award (2019), 3 Attendance Recognition Awards, 3 Complimentary Letters, 4 Department Commendations, 8 Physical Fitness Awards, 45 Honorable Mentions, 1 NATO Summit Service Award
- 2. Disciplinary:** None

ii. Recommended Penalty

Officer Landini was a member of the Department for nearly eight years at the time of this incident. During this incident, he arrested two civilians without probable cause and in violation of Department policy. It appears that Officer Landini took this action at the direction of Sergeant Coffey despite evidence that the civilians were lawfully at the property and despite Sergeant Coffey's personal involvement in the incident. Furthermore, Officer Landini made no attempts to request a higher-ranking member to the scene. His actions negatively impact public trust in the Department's ability to act justly and without deference to other members of the public with a personal interest in an investigation. Thus, COPA recommends a 30-day Suspension and Training.

c. Officer Karina Salgado

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History

- 1. Complimentary:** 1 Crime Reduction Awards (2019), 1 Physical Fitness Award, 3 Honorable Mentions
- 2. Disciplinary:** 1 Sustained Complaint 2022 – Crime Misconduct Damage/Trespassing to Property – 60-day Suspension

ii. Recommended Penalty

Officer Salgado was a probationary police officer at the time of this incident. Like Officer Landini, she also arrested two civilians without probable cause and in violation of Department policy and failed to call a higher-ranking member to the scene. Although her status as a probationary police officer is a strong mitigating factor, her disciplinary history given her short time with the Department is an aggravating factor. Thus, COPA recommends a 90-day Suspension and Training.

Approved:

[Redacted Signature]

Sharday Jackson
Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator

October 31, 2022

Date

[Redacted Signature]

Andrea Kersten
Chief Administrator

October 31, 2022

Date