



Brandon Johnson
Mayor

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

Larry B. Snelling
Superintendent

July 28, 2025

Lakenya White
Interim Chief Administrator
Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA)
1615 West Chicago Avenue, 4th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60622

Re: Superintendent's Partial Non-Concurrence with Findings and with Penalty Recommendations
Complaint Log No. 2023-0005234
Officer Carlos Gutierrez # 4528
Officer Charles Villanueva #13412
Officer Christopher Schickel #18204
Sergeant Eric Ruhnke #1964

Dear Interim Chief Administrator White:

After a careful review of the above referenced complaint log number investigation, the Chicago Police Department (Department) partially concurs with the recommended sustained findings and with the penalty recommendations as they pertain to Officer Carlos Gutierrez # 4528, Officer Charles Villanueva #13412, Officer Christopher Schickel #18204 and Sergeant Eric Ruhnke #1964.

The COPA investigation recommended a penalty of a Reprimand for Officer Charles Villanueva #13412, Officer Christopher Schickel #18204 and Sergeant Eric Ruhnke #1964 after concluding that they:

1. Failed to activate their Body Worn Camera.

The COPA investigation also recommended a penalty of a Reprimand for Officer Carlos Gutierrez after concluding that he:

1. Failed to record the entire incident on Body Worn Camera.

Regarding Sergeant Ruhnke and Officer Schickel, the the Department concurs with the sustained finding as well as the penalty recommendation. As such, a Reprimand will be given to both members.

However, regarding Officer Villanueva and Officer Gutierrez, the Department does not concur with the sustained findings and recommends an alternate finding of Unfounded. Officer Gutierrez and Officer Villanova both activated their body worn camera as they approached the citizen walking on the street.

The Body Worn Cameras must be activated at the beginning of any law enforcement related activity. COPA states that when Ruhnke ordered the officers he was supervising to exit the vehicle and stop

██████████ all of them were obligated to active their BWC's. The Department disagrees with this interpretation. The fact that the officers received an order was not a law enforcement related activity. The law enforcement related activity was what they were ordered to do, in this case make an investigatory stop of ██████████ and the requirement to activate their BWC began when they began to do that task. The directive in effect at the time of the incident did not clarify when the law enforcement activity began for an investigatory stop. However, the directive was modified and the current version of the directive states that " For the purposes of the activation of BWCs, the Department has identified the following circumstances as the beginning of a law-enforcement-related activity: **b.** for investigatory stops, when approaching the member of the public to initiate the stop." S03-14-V-A-2-b.

The Department looks forward to discussing the matter with you pursuant to MCC 2-78-130(a)(iii).

Sincerely,

██
Larry D. Shelling
Superintendent
Chicago Police Department