



Log # 2022-0001434

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On April 7, 2022, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received an Initiation Report from the Chicago Police Department (CPD) alleging misconduct by a member of CPD. It is alleged that on February 26, 2022, through March 8, 2022, Sergeant Craig Landrum (Sgt. Landrum) made unwanted sexual advances towards ██████████ and requested photographs, including nude photographs from her; had inappropriate contact with ██████████ without legitimate justification in relation to the fulfillment of his duties; and used his official position as a member of CPD for personal gain to obtain and/or utilize ██████████ contact information.² Following its investigation of Sgt. Landrum, COPA reached sustained findings regarding the allegations of making unwanted sexual advances towards ██████████ and requesting photographs including nude photographs; having inappropriate contact with ██████████ without legitimacy relative to his duties; and using his official position for personal gain.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE³

On February 26, 2022, at approximately 2:50 p.m., ██████████ filed a complaint with Sgt. Landrum regarding an incident that occurred earlier that day. In ██████████ complaint to Sgt. Landrum, she alleged that on February 26, 2022, while being pulled over for a traffic violation, the officers conducting the stop searched her inappropriately. This complaint was subsequently registered under Log # 2022-0000682.⁴ On April 7, 2022, at approximately 11:51 a.m., Sergeant Yakimba Phillips (Sgt. Phillips) had a scheduled interview with ██████████ relative to Log# 2022-0000682. Sgt. Phillips was the assigned accountability sergeant assigned to investigate allegations of misconduct made by ██████████ relative to Log# 2022-0000682.⁵ Upon meeting with ██████████ regarding that log number, ██████████ informed Sgt. Phillips of her contact with Sgt. Landrum and that she felt Sgt. Landrum was attempting to bribe her to not moving forward with Log# 2022-0000682. During that interview, ██████████ informed Sgt. Phillips that ██████████ continued to have further contact with Sgt. Landrum following him registering her initial complaint. ██████████ alleged that in the conversations with Sgt. Landrum, Sgt. Landrum asked her for nude photos, as well as making the comment “I want to see the goods”.⁶ ██████████ related that all communication following him registering her complaint occurred from his personal cell phone.

¹ Appendix A includes case identifiers such as the date, time, and location of the incident, the involved parties and their demographics, and the applicable rules and policies.

² One or more of these allegations fall within COPA’s jurisdiction pursuant unto Chicago Municipal Code 2-78-120. Therefore, COPA determined it would be the primary investigative agency in this matter.

³ The following is a summary of what COPA finds most likely occurred during this incident. This summary utilized information from several different sources, including initiation reports, cell phone records, Sgt. Landrum, Sgt. Phillips, and ██████████

⁴ Att. 6

⁵ Accountability sergeants are sergeants assigned by CPD’s Bureau of Internal Affairs (BIA) to investigate log complaints.

⁶ Att. 1

During COPA's interview with ██████ she informed COPA that she met Sgt. Landrum when she filed a complaint at the 002nd district.⁷ ██████ further explained that after Sgt. Landrum took ██████ complaint, he provided ██████ with the complaint number before she left the district.⁸ According to ██████ a few hours after she left the district, Sgt. Landrum called her from his personal cell phone to follow up with her and inquiring if an investigator had contacted her. ██████ related that she believed Sgt. Landrum got her phone number from the complaint she filed. ██████ informed COPA that Sgt. Landrum kept pressuring her to answer questions regarding if she was continuing with the investigation.⁹ Following their initial phone conversation, the text messages from Sgt. Landrum began.¹⁰ ██████ indicated that she continued communicating with him because he told her he would help keep her informed about the status of her case.¹¹

In text messages supplied by ██████ to COPA, text messages indicate that Sgt. Landrum asked ██████ for a picture approximately three times. On one of these occasions, Sgt. Landrum said, "I want to see the goods. Send me a picture of it. Thnks."¹² When ██████ asked Sgt. Landrum why she would send nude photos, Sgt. Landrum responded by asking "Why wouldn't you?"¹³ Other texts sent by Sgt. Landrum include Sgt. Landrum informing ██████ that he was home with a foot injury and asking her come to his home.¹⁴ Furthermore, COPA subpoenaed phone records of ██████ and records showed that Sgt. Landrum and ██████ communicated both via text messages and telephone calls.¹⁵ Phone records also indicate that the first personal contact between ██████ and Sgt. Landrum occurred at 5:04 p.m., and was initiated by Sgt. Landrum via text message.¹⁶

In COPA's interview with Sgt. Landrum, he informed COPA that after taking ██████ complaint, she left the district. Sgt. Landrum further explained that shortly thereafter, he called her from a department phone to provide her with the log number. Sgt. Landrum further informed COPA that during this conversation, ██████ expressed that she wanted Sgt. Landrum to call her personally, which Sgt. Landrum did from his personal cell phone.¹⁷ Sgt. Landrum informed COPA that the nature of his conversation with ██████ were "adult conversations" about getting to know each other personally as well as dating each other.¹⁸ When asked if he ever asked ██████ for photos, Sgt. Landrum admitted that he did ask ██████ for photos. However, Sgt. Landrum prefaced

⁷ This complaint was registered under Log 2022-0000682.

⁸ Att. 29 Page 11 Line 21-24 & Page 12 Line 1-11

⁹ Att. 29 Page 13 Line 9-20

¹⁰ ██████ provided COPA with screenshots of her and Sgt. Landrum conversations. Per these screenshots, these conversations took place between February 26, 2022, through March 8, 2022.

¹¹ Att.29, page 14

¹² Att. 8

¹³ Att. 8

¹⁴ Att. 8

¹⁵ Att. 37

¹⁶ Att. 34 Page 8-13 & Page 53. Phone records from ██████ phone provider indicates that there were 2 calls from the 002nd district Chicago Police Department phone number (██████████) prior to Sgt. Landrum texting ██████ at 5:04 p.m. on February 26, 2022. One call was approximately 45 secs, and the other call was approximately 6 minutes long. Sgt. Landrum texted ██████ nearly one hour following him calling her the second time from the 002nd district phone number. Phone records timestamps also corroborate screenshots ██████ provided to COPA which shows that at 5:04 p.m., Sgt. Landrum texted ██████ stating "Sgt. Landrum".

¹⁷ Att. 43, Page 12 Line 8-24 & Page 13 Line 1-22

¹⁸ Att.43 Page 15 Line 19-24 & Page 16 Line 1-16

this by stating that ██████ volunteered photos of herself.¹⁹ When asked if he asked ██████ for nude photos, Sgt. Landrum denied asking ██████ for nude photos.²⁰

III. ALLEGATIONS

Sergeant Craig Landrum:

It is alleged that on or about February 26, 2022, at approximately 11:08 p.m., through on or about March 8, 2022, at approximately 1:52 p.m., the accused

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, Violation of Rule 2, 3, and 4.
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, Violation of Rule 2, 3 and 4.
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, Violation of Rule 2, 3, and 4.

IV. CREDIBILITY ASSESSMENT

While some facts are consistent among the accounts of ██████ and Sgt. Landrum (e.g., they began communication through their personal cell phones following filing her initial complaint, and that Sgt. Landrum asked ██████ for photos), other material facts are entirely divergent. Sgt. Landrum stated that he did not ask ██████ for nude photos. In contrast, ██████ stated that he did ask her for nude photos.

The credibility of an individual relies primarily on two factors: 1) the individual's truthfulness and 2) the reliability of the individual's account. The first factor addresses the honesty of the individual making the statement, while the second factor speaks to the individual's ability to accurately perceive the event at the time of the incident and then accurately recall the event from memory. In this case, Sgt. Landrum's and ██████ accounts are so divergent that the variances can only be explained by either Sgt. Landrum or ██████ purposefully lying and misrepresenting the facts of the incident. In this case, Sgt. Landrum's account is so divergent from the evidence (i.e. text messages) that his account simply cannot be accurate. COPA finds that a preponderance of the evidence demonstrates ██████ account of the evidence is more credible than Sgt. Landrum.

¹⁹ Att. 39 at 20:12-21:34

²⁰ Att. 43 Page 22 Line 10-12

V. ANALYSIS²¹

Sgt. Craig Landrum:

COPA finds that Allegations #1 and 2 against Sgt. Landrum, in that (1) he 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, and (2) he 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, are **sustained**.

During COPA's interview with Sgt. Landrum, he informed COPA that after he took ██████████ complaint, he engaged in a personal encounter with ██████████. At his own admission, Sgt. Landrum informed COPA that he continued to have contact with ██████████ through his personal cell phone for purposes of dating ██████████²² Sgt. Landrum also admitted that at some point in the conversation with ██████████ he did ask ██████████ for a photo of herself. However, when asked by COPA if he ever asked ██████████ for nude photos, Sgt. Landrum denied ever asking ██████████ for nude photos.

According to screenshots provided by ██████████ Sgt. Landrum sent ██████████ a text message stating, "I want to see the goods. Send me a picture of it. Thnks."²³ When asked what he meant by this text message, Sgt. Landrum was unable to recall what he meant by this text message. Specifically, when confronted with what he meant by seeing "goods" from ██████████ Sgt. Landrum could not explain what he meant by this term and was evasive in his answer to COPA.²⁴ When COPA confronted Sgt. Landrum with the fact that ██████████ took this text to mean that he wanted her to send him nude photographs, Sgt. Landrum denied that he wanted ██████████ to send him nude photos. However, it should be noted that in the text messages between ██████████ and Sgt. Landrum, when ██████████ explicitly questioned why she would send Sgt. Landrum nude photos, Sgt. Landrum's response was, "Why wouldn't you?"²⁵ If Sgt. Landrum did not intend for ██████████ to send him nude photos, he had every opportunity to respond differently to ██████████. However, in his response to ██████████ he reiterated that she should in fact send nude photos to him by responding "Why wouldn't you?" Here, it is undisputed that Sgt. Landrum continued to have a personal encounter with ██████████ following taking her complaint. Additionally, Sgt. Landrum asked ██████████ for a photo of herself approximately 3 times during their communication for reasons not related to his duty as a police officer. For these reasons, COPA finds that Sgt. Landrum actions violated Department Rules 2, 3, and 4.

COPA finds Allegations # 3 against Sgt. Landrum, that he 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, is **sustained**. Sgt. Landrum met ██████████ while in his official capacity as a Chicago Police Officer while registering a

²¹ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, see Appendix B.

²² Att. 43 Page 29 Line 3-9

²³ Att. 8

²⁴ Att. 39 at 21:47-23:30

²⁵ Att. 8

complaint against other members of CPD. Sgt. Landrum obtained ██████ personal contact information in the course of his official duties when taking her complaint. While still on duty, Sgt. Landrum initiated personal contact with ██████ via text through his personal cell phone.²⁶ The logged complaint he registered for ██████ was ongoing and pending assignment to an investigator. ██████ had already reported being victimized earlier that morning from the search and arrest, making her particularly vulnerable.²⁷ Sgt. Landrum was in a position of authority as a police officer registering a log complaint and he used his position to seek a personal relationship. His position, her vulnerability, coupled with the ongoing complaint investigation into ██████ being inappropriately searched made his conduct improper. As a Chicago Police officer this conduct is unbecoming and violates Rules 2, 3, and 4.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Sergeant Craig Landrum

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History²⁸

Sgt. Landrum has no recent disciplinary history and has received 59 awards and recognitions.

ii. Recommended Discipline

Mere hours after taking ██████ complaint against fellow officers for misconduct, Sgt. Landrum utilized the information he obtained during the course of his official duties to begin personal communication with ██████ Sgt. Landrum utilized this information to have improper contact with ██████ and make sexual advances towards a member of the public he is sworn to protect. Furthermore, as a sergeant and leader within the Department, Sgt. Landrum's conduct is all the more concerning. At a minimum, Sgt. Landrum's actions show extremely poor judgement, a lack of self-control, significant unprofessionalism, and bring discredit upon the Department. Such conduct warrants **significant suspension up to separation** from the Department.

²⁶ Time and attendance sheets (Att. 20) and Watch information (Att. 41) from February 26, 2022, depicts that at 5:04 p.m., Sgt. Landrum was still on-duty.

²⁷ Att. 43 Page 10 Line 22-24 & Att. 29 Page 8 Line 4-22

²⁸ Attachment 44.

Approved:

[Redacted Signature]

Sharday Jackson
Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator

August 31, 2023
Date

[Redacted Signature]

Andrea Kersten
Chief Administrator

August 31, 2023
Date

Appendix ACase Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	February 26, 2022/ 5:04 pm/5101 S. Wentworth Ave. Chicago, IL 60609
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	April 7, 2022, 1:07 p.m.
Involved Officer #1:	Sergeant Craig Landrum, star #801, employee ID# [REDACTED], Unit of Assignment:005
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] Female, Black or African American

Applicable Rules

- Rule 2:** Any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department.
- Rule 3:** Any failure to promote the Department's efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals.
- Rule 5:** Failure to perform any duty.
- Rule 6:** Disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.
- Rule 8:** Disrespect to or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty.
- Rule 9:** Engaging in any unjustified verbal or physical altercation with any person, while on or off duty.
- Rule 10:** Inattention to duty.
- Rule 14:** Making a false report, written or oral.
- Rule 38:** Unlawful or unnecessary use or display of a weapon.
- Rule 4:** Any conduct or action taken to use the official position for personal gain or influence.

Applicable Policies and Laws

Appendix B

Definition of COPA’s Findings and Standards of Proof

For each Allegation, COPA must make one of the following findings:

1. Sustained – where it is determined the allegation is supported by a preponderance of the evidence;
2. Not Sustained – where it is determined there is insufficient evidence to prove the allegations by a preponderance of the evidence;
3. Unfounded – where it is determined by clear and convincing evidence that an allegation is false or not factual; or
4. Exonerated – where it is determined by clear and convincing evidence that the conduct described in the allegation occurred, but it is lawful and proper.

A **preponderance of evidence** can be described as evidence indicating that it is **more likely than not** that a proposition is proved.²⁹ For example, 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.

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.”³⁰

²⁹ 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 is found to be more probably true than not).

³⁰ *People v. Coan*, 2016 IL App (2d) 151036, ¶ 28 (quoting Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions, Criminal, No. 4.19 (4th ed. 2000)).

Appendix C

Transparency and Publication Categories

Check all that apply:

- Abuse of Authority
- Body Worn Camera Violation
- Coercion
- Death or Serious Bodily Injury in Custody
- Domestic Violence
- Excessive Force
- Failure to Report Misconduct
- False Statement
- Firearm Discharge
- Firearm Discharge – Animal
- Firearm Discharge – Suicide
- Firearm Discharge – Unintentional
- First Amendment
- Improper Search and Seizure – Fourth Amendment Violation
- Incidents in Lockup
- Motor Vehicle Incidents
- OC Spray Discharge
- Search Warrants
- Sexual Misconduct
- Taser Discharge
- Unlawful Denial of Access to Counsel
- Unnecessary Display of a Weapon
- Use of Deadly Force – other
- Verbal Abuse
- Other Investigation