

SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

Date of Incident:	May 30, 2020
Time of Incident:	12:10 a.m.
Location of Incident:	600 South State Street, Chicago, Illinois 60605
Date of COPA Notification:	June 23, 2021
Time of COPA Notification:	11:45 a.m.

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On June 2, 2021, the Independent Monitoring Team (IMT) referred this case to COPA for investigation. The IMT reviewed body worn camera (BWC) video from a protest on May 30, 2020, and observed an unknown Department member use what appeared to be excessive force on an unknown individual. Through its investigation, COPA identified the unknown individual as 15-year-old [REDACTED] and the accused Department member as Sergeant (Sgt.) Daniel Cravens. [REDACTED] provided a statement to COPA in which she alleged that Sgt. Cravens pulled her by the hair and arrested her without justification.

II. INVOLVED PARTIES

Involved Officer #1:	Daniel L. Cravens, Star #973, Employee ID# [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: November 24, 2003, Rank: Sergeant, Unit of Assignment: 001 – Detailed: 606, DOB: [REDACTED], 1979, Gender: Male, Race: White
Involved Individual #1	[REDACTED] DOB: [REDACTED] 2005, Gender: Female, Race: Black

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Sergeant Daniel Cravens	It is alleged by [REDACTED] that Sergeant Daniel L. Cravens, Star #973, committed misconduct on or about May 30, 2020, at approximately 12:10 a.m., in the vicinity of 600 South State Street, Chicago, Illinois 60605, through the following acts or omissions, by:	
	1. arresting [REDACTED] without justification.	Exonerated
	2. using excessive force by pulling [REDACTED] [REDACTED] hair during her arrest.	Sustained

officers grabbed her by her feet and other officers grabbed her aggressively and pulled her braids. She was raised to a standing position and taken to the rear of the police line, where she lost one of her shoes. ██████ stated she was not pulled down to the ground by the officers. She did not see the officer who had pulled her hair but, later in the interview, she described him as a white male who was bald. She sustained no injuries, other than discomfort from her hair being pulled and her handcuffs being too tight.

Accused Sgt. Cravens provided a statement to COPA on July 19, 2022.² Sgt. Cravens stated he was on duty as a tactical sergeant in the 1st District as a protest was taking place in the area, and he was monitoring the Protest Radio Zone. He became aware that a crowd in the area was becoming combative toward the police, so he and his tactical team relocated to the area to assist with crowd control. A police line was formed and a large crowd gathered that was combative and outnumbered the police. Sgt. Cravens stated that protesters threw bottles at the police, and the crowd was yelling and screaming and continued to block the street. At that time, Sgt. Cravens observed two officers pulling ██████ away from the police line. ██████ was an active resister and had fallen to the ground as she was being picked up by the officers. Sgt. Cravens assisted the officers and helped escort ██████ to the rear of the police line, where she was handcuffed. Sgt. Cravens did not give the order to arrest ██████

Sgt. Cravens stated that he first encountered ██████ when she was being held by the other two officers. His involvement with the incident terminated when other officers secured ██████ in handcuffs at the rear of the police line. Sgt. Cravens denied the allegations against him, stating that he placed his hands upon ██████ by grabbing her arm and the back of her jacket. As Sgt. Cravens led ██████ to the back of the police line, she dropped to the ground and his hands were on her back and shoulder. Sgt. Cravens then gained control of ██████ arm, and other officers assisted. He did not recall if he placed his hands in ██████ hair. Further, after reviewing his BWC, Sgt. Cravens stated he did not observe his hands in her hair. He also denied pulling ██████ by her hair and to the ground.

Officer George Kourtev, Star #8095, was not interviewed in this matter, as he resigned from the Department effective November 15, 2021.³

b. Digital Evidence:

BWC of Sgt. Christoph Vacek:⁴ At 12:17, ██████ is observed on the ground, wearing black and blonde dreadlocks. At 12:30, two uniformed, male white officers drag ██████ through the police line by her arms.

BWC of Sgt. Daniel Cravens:⁵ At 2:56, officers drag ██████ through the police line on the ground. ██████ struggles with the officers and attempts to pull her arms away from them. Sgt. Cravens helps pull ██████ to her feet, then holds her by her right arm as he

² Attachment 19.

³ Attachment 22.

⁴ Attachment 20.

⁵ Attachment 15.

escorts her away from the police line. At 3:14, Sgt. Cravens appears to pull [REDACTED] head back by her dreadlocks, and she falls to the ground.

BWC of Officer Kourtev:⁶ At 1:17:34, Sgt. Cravens and Officer Kourtev are observed escorting [REDACTED] by her arms. PO Kourtev is holding [REDACTED] right arm, while Sgt. Cravens is holding [REDACTED] left side. As [REDACTED] is being escorted, Sgt. Cravens grabs her by her dreadlocks and she falls to the ground. Sgt. Cravens then takes hold of [REDACTED] left arm and the back of her jacket as he and Officer Kourtev pull her on the ground, handcuff her, and pull her to her feet. Afterwards, while being escorted by PO Kourtev, [REDACTED] is heard complaining that her hair was pulled and that one of her shoes is missing. At 1:23:05, PO Kourtev escorts [REDACTED] toward a squad car, where a female officer conducts a pat down of [REDACTED] before placing her inside the vehicle.

BWC (Still Images) of the Arrest of [REDACTED]⁷ These images clearly show the arrest of [REDACTED] including Sgt. Cravens grasping [REDACTED] hair during her arrest.

c. Documentary Evidence:

CPD Arrest Report; CB# 19964388; IR# [REDACTED]:⁸ This report reflects that [REDACTED] was arrested by CPD officers on May 30, 2020, at approximately 12:10 a.m., in the vicinity of 600 South State Street, Chicago, Illinois 60605. [REDACTED] was arrested for intentionally refusing lawful orders to disperse by Sgt. Cravens, who gave the order because three or more persons were committing acts of disorderly conduct in the immediate vicinity. [REDACTED] was 15-years old at the time and her guardian / mother, [REDACTED], was notified by phone. The First Arresting Officer is listed as Orlando Varelas, Star #19626, and the Second Arresting Officer is listed as John T. Boegen, Star #11028.

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.

⁶ Attachment 14.

⁷ Attachment 12 (9 Images).

⁸ Attachment 1.

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.⁹ 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. 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.”¹⁰

VII. ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

a. [REDACTED] Arrest Was Justified

COPA finds Allegation #1, that Sgt. Cravens arrested [REDACTED] without justification, is exonerated. CPD members can make a lawful arrest consistent with the 4th Amendment, without an arrest warrant, if there is probable cause to believe that a crime has been committed.¹¹ Here, it is undisputed that [REDACTED] was part of a mass protest at the time of her arrest. She was in a crowd that was unruly and potentially violent, and not responding to police orders to disperse. The BWC evidence is clear and consistent with the relative police report of the incident.¹² The footage also reflects that [REDACTED] was an active resister who struggled with officers and attempted to pull away from them. Probable cause to arrest her existed, as she did not respond to police orders to disperse. COPA recognizes that Sgt. Cravens’s involvement with [REDACTED] arrest primarily included escorting [REDACTED] away from the police line; nonetheless, [REDACTED] arrest was lawful. For these reasons, COPA finds Allegation #1 is **exonerated**.

b. Sgt. Cravens Pulled [REDACTED] Hair Without Justification.

COPA finds Allegation #2, that Sgt. Cravens pulled [REDACTED] hair during her arrest without justification, is sustained. It is clear from the BWC evidence that Sgt. Cravens grasped [REDACTED] by the hair as she fell to the ground.¹³ Further, the video captured [REDACTED] repeatedly yelling that her hair was pulled,¹⁴ and she subsequently reiterated the same complaint to COPA. Sgt. Cravens, however, denied that he pulled [REDACTED] hair during her arrest. When asked if his hands were ever in her hair, Sgt. Cravens told COPA he did not recall. Given the video evidence, COPA finds it is more likely than not that Sgt. Cravens pulled [REDACTED] hair during her arrest, forcing her to the ground.

⁹ 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).

¹⁰ *People v. Coan*, 2016 IL App (2d) 151036 (2016).

¹¹ *United States v. Daniels*, 803 F.3d 335, 354 (7th Cir. 2015) (quoting *Washington v. Haupert*, 481 F.3d 543, 547 (7th Cir. 2007)).

¹² Attachment 1.

¹³ Attachment 14 at 1:17:34 and Attachment 15 at 3:15.

¹⁴ Attachment 14 at 1:19:13 to 1:19:35.

Under General Order G03-02-01, CPD members may only use force that is objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional to the threat, actions, and level of resistance offered by a subject.¹⁵ The policy mandates that members use the least amount of force required under the circumstances to serve a lawful purpose.¹⁶ In this case, it was objectively unreasonably and unnecessary for Sgt. Cravens to pull [REDACTED] by the hair, as he could have grabbed her arms, hands, or body to safely escort her from the crowd. For these reasons, COPA finds Sgt. Cravens pulled [REDACTED] by the hair without justification, and allegation #2 is **sustained** as a violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, and 8.

VIII. RECOMMENDED DISCIPLINE FOR SUSTAINED ALLEGATIONS

d. Sgt. Daniel Cravens

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History¹⁷

Sgt. Cravens has received 225 various awards, including two Superintendent’s awards of valor, one life saving award, three Department commendations, four complimentary letters, and 180 honorable mentions. He has no sustained disciplinary history in the past five years.

ii. Recommended Penalty

COPA has found that Sgt. Cravens violated Rules 2, 3, 6, and 8 when he pulled [REDACTED] hair during her arrest. COPA recognizes that Sgt. Cravens may not have intended to pull [REDACTED] by her hair; however, the preponderance of the evidence shows he did. Sgt. Cravens’s actions—whether intentional or negligent— were contrary to the rules, directives, and values of the Chicago Police Department. It is for these reasons, combined with Sgt. Cravens’s extensive complimentary history and lack of disciplinary history, that COPA recommends he receive a **5-day suspension**.

Approved:

[REDACTED]

Steffany Hreno
Director of Investigations

11/28/2022

Date

¹⁵ G03-02-01 (II)(C).

¹⁶ G03-02 (III)(B)(2).

¹⁷ Attachment 23