



Brandon Johnson
Mayor

Department of Police · City of Chicago
3510 S. Michigan Avenue · Chicago, Illinois 60653

Larry Snelling
Superintendent of Police

November 15, 2023

Andrea Kersten
Chief Administrator
Civilian Office of Police Accountability
1615 West Chicago Avenue, 4th Floor
Chicago, IL 60622

**RE: Superintendent's Concurrence with COPA's proposed findings and penalties
Complaint Register Number #2022-0001434
Sergeant Craig Landrum #801**

Dear Chief Administrator,

After careful review of the recommendations made by the Investigator in this matter, the Superintendent concurs with the findings of COPA related to all three (3) allegations against Sergeant Craig Landrum.

STATEMENT OF FACTS AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

COPA sustained three (3) allegations against Sgt. Craig Landrum ("Sgt. Landrum"), a Chicago Police Department (CPD) member, seeking a significant suspension up to separation stemming from instances of inappropriate contact and unwanted sexual advances made toward an individual alleging police misconduct. These instances of inappropriate contact were made via telephone calls and text messages on or about February 26, 2022 through March 8, 2022.

On February 26, 2022, Sgt. Landrum completed an Initiation Report (Log #2022-0000682) regarding a complaint being made by ██████████ ("Ms. ██████████" against officers who had allegedly searched Ms. ██████████ inappropriately earlier that same day. After completing the Initiation Report, Ms. ██████████ left the 002nd District Station.

It is alleged by Ms. ██████████ that on that same day, a couple hours after leaving the 002nd District Station, Sgt. Landrum contacted her from his personal cell phone and asked if she still wished to pursue the complaint.¹ Ms. ██████████ claims she confirmed her decision to continue with the complaint at which time, Sgt. Landrum explained that he would contact her back. Ms. ██████████ then explained that Sgt. Landrum contacted her that same day via text messages from his personal cell phone.² Ms. ██████████ provided screen shots of the text message exchanges between her and Sgt. Landrum which shows that the first text sent from Sgt. Landrum's personal cell phone was on February 26, 2022 at 1704 hrs., the same day Ms. ██████████ filed the complaint with Sgt. Landrum.³

The text message exchange appears to be personal and consensual in nature with both Sgt. Landrum sending messages to Ms. ██████████ and Ms. ██████████ sending Sgt. Landrum messages at different dates and times.

¹Att. 29, ██████████ COPA Signed Transcript, p. 12, lines 12-13.

²Att. 29, p. 13, lines 23-24.

³Att. 7-16 and Att. 19, Screen Shots of Text Message Exchange.

Also, there is no discussions or references regarding the complaint Ms. ██████ filed against the officers for the inappropriate search.

In the text exchanges, Sgt. Landrum asks Ms. ██████ to send pictures multiple times to which Ms. ██████ does.⁴ At one point in their text exchanges which lasted until March 8, 2022, Sgt. Landrum texted, "I want to see the goods. Send me a picture of it. Thks" to which Ms. ██████ responds, "Why would I send Yu nudes." In response, Sgt. Landrum texts, "Why wouldn't you."⁵

In her statement to COPA, Ms. ██████ explained that she began texting Sgt. Landrum back because, "...he told me he was going to help me with my case so I kept it cute with him, you know."⁶ When asked by COPA what Sgt. Landrum meant by "help you with your case", Ms. ██████ stated, "He said he was going to keep me posted on everything."⁷

In his statement to COPA, Sgt. Landrum explained that he contacted Ms. ██████ from a department phone on the same day she made the complaint in order to supply her with the complaint log number because she insisted on leaving the district station before Sgt. Landrum had time to get the number.⁸ Sgt. Landrum went on to explain that it was during this initial phone conversation that Ms. ██████ gave Sgt. Landrum her phone number and asked him to "personally call her."⁹

When Ms. ██████ was eventually contacted and interviewed by Accountability Sgt. Yakimba Phillips ("Sgt. Phillips") regarding her initial complaint, Ms. ██████ explained that she continued to have further contact with Sgt. Landrum after he had taken her initial complaint. Ms. ██████ went on to explain that she believed Sgt. Landrum was trying to bribe her to not pursue the initial complaint and began to ask her for nude photos. At this point, Sgt. Phillips completed an Initiation Report regarding the allegations against Sgt. Landrum.¹⁰

COPA made the following determinations on the allegations:

It is alleged by ██████ that on or about February 26, 2022 through March 8, 2022, Sgt. Landrum, Star# 801, committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions:

1. Made unwanted sexual advances towards ██████ a person who reported allegations of police misconduct to him, in that he repeatedly requested photographs, including nude photographs, from her for purposes not related to his official duties. SUSTAINED.
2. Had inappropriate contact with ██████ a person who reported allegations of police misconduct to him, in that he repeatedly contacted her without legitimate justification in the fulfillment of his duties as a police officer. SUSTAINED.
3. Used his official position as a member of the Chicago Police Department for personal gain to obtain and/or utilize ██████ contact information, a person who reported allegations of police misconduct. SUSTAINED.

⁴ Att. 8 ,9, 10, 14, 15, and 19.

⁵ Att. 8.

⁶ Att. 29, lines 11-12.

⁷ Att. 29, lines 14-15

⁸ Att. 43, Sgt. Craig Landrum-COPA Signed Transcript, p. 12, lines 8-19.

⁹ Att. 43, p. 13, lines 1-4.

¹⁰Att. 1, Initiation Report.

ANALYSIS

Based on a review of the all the evidence presented by COPA, it is clear that COPA can meet its required standard of proof, preponderance, to sustain the allegations against Sgt. Landrum; inappropriate contact and unwanted sexual advances toward an individual alleging police misconduct in violation of Rules #2, #3, and #4 of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department.

In COPA's credibility assessment, they state, "Sgt. Landrum's and [REDACTED] accounts are so divergent that the variances can only be explained by either Sgt. Landrum or [REDACTED] purposefully lying and misrepresenting the facts of the incident."¹¹ COPA ultimately determined that Ms. [REDACTED] account was more credible due to the fact that Sgt. Landrum's account was so different from the evidence that was presented, namely the still images of the text exchanges.

In the Department's view, both Sgt. Landrum and Ms. [REDACTED] have made statements which are contradicted by the evidence. First off, Ms. [REDACTED] stated that Sgt. Landrum texted her the next day after she made the initial complaint.¹² But the text thread still images prove that this was a false statement. The text thread shows that they exchanged texts on the same day Ms. [REDACTED] made the complaint and it was Ms. [REDACTED] who texted Sgt. Landrum the following day, texting "Good Morning."¹³

In her statement to COPA, Ms. [REDACTED] stated, "I ain't delete nothing" and "I didn't delete none of them" when asked about the screen shots of the text messages Ms. [REDACTED] had provided to COPA.¹⁴ However, from the screen shots Ms. [REDACTED] provided, it appears that she did in fact delete portions of the text thread. In Attachment #10, which appears to be the start of the text thread exchange, Ms. [REDACTED] texted, "Me on ah decent day."¹⁵ Ms. [REDACTED] references this text message in her statement to COPA, when she stated Sgt. Landrum first asked Ms. [REDACTED] to send him pictures. Ms. [REDACTED] stated, "That's when you see, 'Me on a decent day.' He called me first and asked me to send him some pictures."¹⁶ Ms. [REDACTED] implied that she sent Sgt. Landrum a picture but there is no picture in this text thread. Also, we can assume that Ms. [REDACTED] did in fact send a picture or video because at the bottom of the text thread, Sgt. Landrum texts, "It's cool. Shoot me a pic. The video was grainy."¹⁷ Ms. [REDACTED] deleted the video before sending the screen shot to COPA.

Additional proof that Ms. [REDACTED] deleted portions of the text thread is displayed when comparing Attachments #7 and #11. At the bottom of the text thread for Attachment #7, it shows the text message sent by Ms. [REDACTED] to Sgt. Landrum on March 1, at 18:41 hrs., in which she texts, "How's work going for Yu."¹⁸ However, when compared to Attachment #11 which is a continuation of the text thread exchange from Attachment #7, Ms. [REDACTED] text, "How's work going for Yu." had been deleted from the screen shot.¹⁹ We can assume that Ms. [REDACTED] sent Sgt. Landrum additional texts that she deleted before sending the text thread to COPA because in the text thread shown in Attachment #11, Sgt. Landrum texts a "thumbs up" emoji on March 1, at 2300 hrs. and an "ok" hand gesture emoji on March 2, at 1604 hrs..²⁰ We don't know what these responses are to because Ms. [REDACTED] apparently manipulated the text thread exchange.

When presented with the still images of the text thread exchanges, Sgt. Landrum stated in his statement

¹¹ Att. 45, COPA's Final Summary Report, p. 3.

¹² Att. 29, p. 16, lines 2-4.

¹³ Att. 10, Still Image of Text Thread.

¹⁴ Att. 29, p. 26, lines 4-6.

¹⁵ Att. 10.

¹⁶ Att. 29, p. 16, lines 10-13.

¹⁷ Att. 10.

¹⁸ Att. 7, Still Image of Text Thread.

¹⁹ Att. 11, Still Image of Text Thread.

²⁰ Att. 11.

to COPA that there was "...much more in the text conversation. It's more to this than what you showing."²¹ Sgt. Landrum explained in his statement to COPA that after he called Ms. ██████ to supply her with her log number, Ms. ██████ gave him her phone number and asked Sgt. Landrum to "personally call her."²² Sgt. Landrum admitted to COPA that he and Ms. ██████ engaged in "adult conversations" over the phone.²³ Sgt. Landrum also admitted that he did in fact ask her for pictures.²⁴ However, Sgt. Landrum was not credible in his statement to COPA when asked about the type of pictures he was requesting. In the text thread provided by Ms. ██████ a text from Sgt. Landrum reads, "I want to see the goods. Send me a picture of it. Thks."²⁵ When asked what he meant by "the goods", Sgt. Landrum responds that he does not recall.²⁶ However, in that same text thread, Ms. ██████ responded to Sgt. Landrum's request, "Why would I send Yu nudes" to which Sgt. Landrum responded, "Why wouldn't you." If Sgt. Landrum did not use the term "the goods" to imply nude photos, then he would have responded differently to Ms. ██████. Sgt. Landrum's response confirms that he meant for Ms. ██████ to send him nude photos. Sgt. Landrum continued to be evasive with COPA when asked about what he meant by responding, "It means what it says" and "I don't remember. It could be anything."²⁷

There is no dispute in regards to Allegation #3 against Sgt. Landrum, in that he used his official position as a member of the Chicago Police Department for personal gain to obtain and/or utilize ██████ contact information. Sgt. Landrum drafted an Initiation Report for Ms. ██████ and contacted her after using the phone number Ms. ██████ had given on the Initiation Report. Sgt. Landrum admitted in his statement to COPA that he called Ms. ██████ from the number that she had given to him on the Initiation Report for the purpose of supplying her with the Log Investigation number.²⁸ However, he continued to use the number to text and call Ms. ██████ personally from his personal cell phone for no law enforcement purpose.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preponderance of the evidence, neither Sgt. Landrum nor Ms. ██████ are credible. The text exchanges appear to be consensual in nature as both Sgt. Landrum and Ms. ██████ initiated conversations on different dates and times. Even after Sgt. Landrum asked for nude photos, it was Ms. ██████ who initiated more consensual conversation on March 7 following Sgt. Landrum's request for nude photos.²⁹ However, regardless of whether or not their correspondence was consensual, Sgt. Landrum acted in poor judgement and while in a position of authority under his scope of employment as a Chicago Police Officer.

Recently, in Police Board findings for case No. 22 PB 3006, In the Matter of Charges Filed Against Police Officer Daniel Otero, Star No. 10058, Department of Police, City of Chicago regarding CR No. 1092474, the Police Board found that the involved officer's conduct "undermines public confidence in the judgement of CPD officers and the Department's mission. In particular, members of the public are more likely to be hesitant to call for police assistance for themselves or others if they are concerned that responding officers may later attempt to engage in a sexual relationship with them when they are frightened or may feel vulnerable."³⁰

The incident underlying Police Board Case No. 22 PB 3006 and CR No. 1092474 involved Police Officer Daniel Otero, Star #10058 engaging in a sexual relationship with the victim of a home invasion shortly after the crime occurred when the victim was still vulnerable. Officer Otero was the responding officer to the

²¹ Att. 43, p. 18, lines 1-2.

²² Att. 43, p. 13, lines 3-4.

²³ Att. 43, p. 15, line 22.

²⁴ Att. 43, p. 21, lines 1-3.

²⁵ Att. 8, Still Image of Text Thread.

²⁶ Att. 43, p. 21, lines 7-14.

²⁷ Att. 43, pp. 21-22, lines 7-19 on p. 21 and lines 5-16

²⁸ Att. 43, p. 12, lines 23-24.

²⁹ Att. 8.

³⁰ Before the Police Board of the City of Chicago, Case No. 22 PB 3006, p. 5.

home invasion and while conducting his preliminary investigation, asked the victim for her email address. During that same tour of duty, Officer Otero began to email the victim from his personal email address and after his midnight tour had concluded on that same day, Officer Otero picked the victim up from a Starbucks and relocated to her apartment where he and the victim consumed alcohol and engaged in sexual intercourse.

The Police Board ultimately found that Officer Otero displayed a profound lack of judgement by engaging in a sexual relationship with a woman hours after he responded to her 911 call. His conduct brought discredit to the Department and it undermined the public's trust of CPD officers, thereby impeding the Department's efforts to achieve the important goal of reducing crime.³¹ The Police Board handed down a suspension of two-hundred-seventy (270) days.

The Police Board agreed with the Superintendent's argument that Officer Otero abused his position of authority to seek a personal relationship with a woman in a vulnerable state who had summoned the police for help.³² The Police Board did note that although there is no specific prohibition in any CPD directive that explicitly prohibits engaging in a sexual relationship or other intimate personal conduct with a crime victim, this does not absolve a Department Member from his or her duty to not violate the Department's Rule of Conduct, including Rule 2.

Rule 2 of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department, Article V "applies to both professional and private conduct of all members. It prohibits any and all conduct which is contrary to the letter and spirit of Departmental policy or goals or which would reflect adversely upon the Department or its members. It includes not only all unlawful acts by members but also all acts, which although not unlawful in themselves, would degrade or bring disrespect upon the member or the Department...".³³

In 2019, the Chicago Police Department's Bureau of Internal Affairs completed an investigation involving very similar facts and allegations as this present case which was documented under Log No. 2019-0005208. The investigation involved a Chicago Police member who obtained a victim's phone number after she reported a domestic violence incident and then began to immediately text and call the victim in a personal manner. The accused member sent inappropriate text messages which were sexual in nature to the victim for approximately a week. During the interview with the reporting party in this case, the reporting party explained that the accused member offered to help her with her case and she felt that if she did not continue to engage in the text exchanges with him, her domestic case would not get investigated.³⁴ The accused and the reporting party never met in person.

The Bureau of Internal Affairs ultimately sustained one (1) allegation for Operation/Personnel Violations finding that accused member improperly obtained the reporting party's personal telephone number and one (1) allegation for Conduct Unbecoming finding that the accused officer sent the reporting party inappropriate text messages both of which violated Rule 2 of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department. This case was submitted to the Department Advocate for Mediation and the accused member received a penalty of a fifteen (15) day suspension.

We cite to these two cases to demonstrate the disparity in the penalty each accused officer received. Both accused officers took advantage of the vulnerability of a victim who was attempting to receive assistance from the Chicago Police Department. However, their indiscretions were contrasting in terms of egregiousness which ultimately led to the significant difference in the penalties they received.

³¹ Police Board Findings, p. 7.

³² Police Board Findings, p. 4.

³³ Rule 2 of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department, Article V, Comment to Rule 2.

³⁴ Investigative Closing Report Summary for Log No. 2019-0005208, p. 3.

Sgt. Landrum's conduct falls within Rule 2's prohibitions. He engaged in a personal relationship mere hours after Ms. [REDACTED] allegedly experienced an inappropriate search by two male officers that caused her to feel as she needed to lodge a complaint with a CPD Supervisor. Sgt. Landrum displayed a lack of judgement by failing to acknowledge the possibility that Ms. [REDACTED] may have still been in a vulnerable state after her experience with the Chicago Police Department and her belief that Sgt. Landrum was going to assist in her complaint. While not as egregious as physically engaging in sexual contact with Ms. [REDACTED] Sgt. Landrum's act of sending inappropriate text messages to Ms. [REDACTED] impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and brings discredit upon the Department.

The Superintendent concurs with the finding of COPA related to Allegation one (1), two (2), and three (3) and recommends a suspension of fifteen (15) days.

[REDACTED]

Larry Snelling
Superintendent of Police