



Log # 2021-0004151

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On October 20, 2021, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received a telephone complaint from ██████████ reporting alleged misconduct by a member of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). ██████████ alleged that on multiple occasions, Officer Daniel Jones, ██████████ former boyfriend, was harassing her via electronic means.² Following its investigation, COPA reached sustained findings based on a preponderance of the evidence.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE³

Officer Daniel Jones and ██████████ were in a dating relationship for approximately three years, starting in 2009. Their relationship ended in 2012, prior to Officer Jones becoming a police officer. ██████████ related that Officer Jones has contacted her a few times each year after their relationship ended. He used various methods of communication to reach out to her, including messages on social media, phone calls, and text messages. ██████████ would either ignore the contact or block his method of communication.⁴ She related she even changed her phone number to attempt to avoid Officer Jones' ability to contact her, and she is unaware of how he obtained her new phone number.⁵ ██████████ felt that Officer Jones started contacting her more often starting in the fall of 2019, when she began a new relationship with another individual.

Officer Jones related the opposite, stating that ██████████ did not have boundaries and would contact him at all times of the day. In approximately 2015 or 2016 he started lessening the contact with her, and he eventually blocked her phone number. He then would initiate contact with ██████████ through an application on his phone that generated a phone number other than his own. Officer Jones stated that he would contact ██████████ through the application on his phone to check and see how she was doing. This was contradictory, as he stated that he blocked her phone number to stop

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 to 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 civilian interviews, officer interviews, phone records, an original case incident report, and photographic evidence provided by complainant.

⁴ ██████████ related in her statement that she believes she responded to one of multiple Facebook messages from Officer Jones, asking him why he cannot simply leave her alone. She no longer has the messages because she blocked his account that messaged her, and the messages subsequently deleted. Att. 2, pg. 67.

⁵ ██████████ related she believed she changed her phone number in approximately 2013, and she changed it because of the contact from Officer Jones. Att. 2, pgs. 29 to 30. COPA did not have sufficient evidence or a specific time frame with which to serve an allegation for improper use of Department resources.

her from contacting him, but he then initiated contact with her using the unknown phone numbers through the application.⁶ When asked how long he has been using the application to contact her, he estimated it being within the previous two years, meaning approximately 2020 through 2022.⁷ He admitted that he had contacted her “a few times” throughout the previous two years, and ██████ did not respond to most of them.⁸ He related she responded to one message asking who it was. Officer Jones stated that he did not identify himself when sending messages using the phone numbers through the application.⁹ When asked his reasoning for reaching out to her after so much time had passed, he stated that he wanted to share information that he had learned regarding her medical condition.¹⁰

██████ related that on October 4, 2021, Officer Jones called her from an unknown number and identified himself as “Daniel,” stating he wanted to “check on her.” ██████ told Officer Jones to stop calling him, and she terminated the call.¹¹ A few minutes later, ██████ received multiple text messages from a phone number that she believed to be utilized by Officer Jones.¹² ██████ provided a screenshot of these messages to COPA.¹³ ██████ phone records confirm the call from Officer Jones on October 4, 2021, and show that he sent a total of eight text messages to ██████ from the same number between October 2, 2021 and October 19, 2021.¹⁴ The phone records reflect that all the messages were incoming, and there were no outgoing messages from ██████ to Officer Jones using that phone number.¹⁵ ██████ also provided a screenshot of the message she received from him on October 19, 2021, where he texted her stating, “You free to go out?”¹⁶ When asked if he has ever requested to meet up with ██████ or see her, Officer Jones stated, “Not to my knowledge.”¹⁷

██████ informed COPA that on January 15, 2022, she received text messages from another unknown number that she believed to be Officer Jones.¹⁸ A screenshot of the messages show ██████ received three messages, starting at 8:26 am.¹⁹ ██████ responded with a message asking, “Who is this?” ██████ then received a message stating “None of your business just checking on you. (emoji)” ██████ responded, stating “Stop contacting me.” ██████ then received two more messages and did not respond. ██████ related that her brother John called the phone number on her behalf to

⁶ Att. 19 pgs. 19 to 20.

⁷ Att. 19 pg. 20.

⁸ Att. 19 pg. 27 lns. 3 to 9.

⁹ Att. 19 pg. 24 lns. 15-19; pg. 25 lns. 10 to 13.

¹⁰ Att. 19 pg. 24. and pgs. 27 to 30.

¹¹ Att. 2 pg. 64 lns. 9-15. This information is consistent with what is documented in the Original Case Incident Report (RD# JE425264). Att. 3.

¹² ██████ related that when she received calls from Officer Jones at an unknown phone number, her phone screen showed “Unknown, Chicago, Illinois.” She further related that the phone number he used was visible when he sent text messages. Att. 2, pgs. 36 to 37.

¹³ Att. 16

¹⁴ COPA received ██████ phone records for October 1, 2021 through October 20, 2021 through a subpoena to Comcast. Atts. 13 and 14.

¹⁵ Att. 14.

¹⁶ Att. 17.

¹⁷ Att. 19, pg. 31, lns. 6-10.

¹⁸ Atts. 10 and 11.

¹⁹ Att. 12.

attempt to tell Officer Jones to leave her alone. At 11:49 am the same day, ██████ received another message from the same number stating, “Stop contacting me.” She then received a final message stating, “You called John lol (emoji) common.” ██████ related that Officer Jones made it seem like she was contacting him, which was false.²⁰



Officer Jones related in his statement that he could not recall if ██████ ever asked him to stop contacting her in any way.²¹ He later admitted to reaching out to ██████ on the day that her brother, ██████, contacted him. Officer Jones stated that John left him a voicemail stating that ██████ did not want him contacting her anymore.²² He then admitted to sending her a message about her contacting ██████.²³

²⁰ ██████ stated in an email, “But, this is scary and disturbing, and he is trying to make it seem like I’m contacting him. That’s not the case at all.” Att. 11 pg. 3.

²¹ Att. 19 pg. 14 lns. 1 to 6.

²² Att. 19 pg. 26 lns. 7 to 20.

²³ Att. 19 pg. 26 lns. 1 to 4.

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer Daniel Jones:

1. On numerous dates and times between October 2, 2021 and October 19, 2021, Officer Daniel Jones contacted [REDACTED] via phone call and/or text messages after being asked to not contact her.
 - Sustained, Violation of Rules 2 and 8
2. On or about January 15, 2022, at multiple times between approximately 8:26 AM, and 11:49 AM, Officer Daniel Jones contacted [REDACTED] via text message after being asked to not contact her.
 - Sustained, Violation of Rules 2 and 8

IV. CREDIBILITY ASSESSMENT

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, COPA finds parts of Officer Jones' account not reliable. Officer Jones could not provide a plausible explanation for using an application that concealed his identity and failing to identify himself when reaching out to [REDACTED]. Officer Jones' explanation for initiating contact with [REDACTED] after blocking her phone number was not reasonable. He stated that his purpose of contacting her was to ask how she was doing and share information he learned about her medical condition with her. The screenshots of text messages clearly depict that Officer Jones contacted [REDACTED] about things other than her medical condition as well. The text messages show that he texted her about random subjects, including cooking, skiing, [REDACTED] work, and her book. Furthermore, when asked if he has ever requested to meet up with [REDACTED] or see her, Officer Jones stated, "Not to my knowledge." However, a screenshot of a text message from him confirms he did.

By contrast, [REDACTED] statement was reliable. She did not overstate the allegations she made against him, and she conceded when she was speculating as opposed to making concrete allegations. For example, she acknowledged that her belief that he knew she was living in Lincoln Park was based on her reading into the timing and context of his messages, and she did not attempt to inflate his comments, despite there being no basis to prove or disprove that conversation. Similarly, her explanation for why she had no record of any prior Facebook or Instagram communications was plausible. Moreover, her statement throughout was consistent with the phone records and police report. As a result, COPA finds that [REDACTED] statement is generally credible, and Officer Jones' account is not.

V. ANALYSIS²⁴

COPA finds Allegation #1 that on numerous dates and times between October 2, 2021 and October 19, 2021, Officer Daniel Jones contacted ██████████ via phone call and/or text messages after being asked to not contact her is **sustained**. CPD Rules 2 and 8 prohibit members from committing any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department,²⁵ as well as disrespecting or maltreating any personal while on or off duty.²⁶

Officer Jones admitted to calling and texting ██████████ using phone numbers through an application so it did not show his personal phone number. ██████████ related that when Officer Jones called her on October 4, 2021, he identified himself as "Daniel", and she told him to stop calling her before terminating the call. Prior to this call, she had also told him via Facebook to leave her alone. She also changed her phone number.

Despite these requests, phone records show that the same phone number he used to call her on October 4, 2021, sent her eight text messages between October 2, 2021, to October 19, 2021. A reasonable person in Officer Jones' situation would know that ██████████ did not want him to contact her, and that the continued messages in this time period were harassing. ██████████ related she had taken multiple steps to attempt to get Officer Jones to stop contacting her, including changing her phone number and previously responding to one of multiple Facebook messages from him, asking him why he cannot simply leave her alone. The phone records show that she did not respond to any of the text messages he sent in October 2021. Her lack of response further portrays that she did not wish to communicate with him, as their relationship had been over for approximately nine years. Additionally, his use of an app which disguised his calls demonstrates that he was aware that calls from him were unwanted. Based on a preponderance of the evidence, COPA finds the communication from Officer Jones to be harassing in nature. Therefore, Officer Jones' actions violated CPD Rules 2 and 8.

COPA finds Allegation #2 that on or about January 15, 2022, at multiple times between approximately 8:26 AM, and 11:49 AM, Officer Daniel Jones contacted ██████████ via text message after being asked to not contact her is **sustained**. CPD Rules 2 and 8 prohibit members from committing any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department,²⁷ as well as disrespecting or maltreating any personal while on or off duty.²⁸

As discussed above, Officer Jones was told multiple times to not call ██████████ and to leave her alone and he reasonably should have known that his contact was unwanted. Nonetheless, Officer Jones admitted to reaching out to ██████████ via text message on the day that her brother ██████████ called him, January 15, 2022. A screenshot of the text messages clearly shows three messages sent from

²⁴ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, *see* Appendix B.

²⁵ Section V, Rule 2 of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department.

²⁶ Section V, Rule 8 of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department.

²⁷ Section V, Rule 2 of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department.

²⁸ Section V, Rule 8 of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department.

Officer Jones to [REDACTED] and her response stating, “Who is this?” After Officer Jones sent another message and failed to identify himself, [REDACTED] responded again stating, “Stop contacting me.” Officer Jones did the opposite and continued to send texts to [REDACTED]. He admitted in his statement that he recalled her brother [REDACTED] leaving him a voicemail that day, telling him [REDACTED] did not want him contacting her anymore. He also admitted to texting her about her calling [REDACTED], after [REDACTED] had called him. It is clear he continued to contact her after being asked to stop contacting her. Therefore, based on a preponderance of the evidence, COPA finds the allegation is sustained, and Officer Jones’ actions violated CPD Rules 2 and 8.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Officer Daniel Jones

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History²⁹

Officer Jones has a total of 15 awards and recognitions. He received a 3-day suspension for operational/personnel violations neglect of duty, a 1-day suspension for operational/personnel violations neglect of duty, and 2 spars for failure to perform assigned tasks.

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has considered Officer Jones’ complimentary history and disciplinary history. As previously mentioned, Officer Jones was less than forthcoming about his conduct in this case and did not take accountability for his actions. COPA has considered the harassing nature of his continued contact with the complainant and the context of his messages and communication with her. This conduct is not in line with Department policies and undermines public trust in the Department. COPA recommends a 25-day Suspension.

Approved:

[REDACTED]

Sharday Jackson
Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator

October 30, 2023

Date

²⁹ Attachment __.

Appendix A

Case Details

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Date/Time/Location of Incident: | October 2, 2021 through January 15, 2022 / various times / unknown locations |
| Date/Time of COPA Notification: | October 20, 2021 at 4:51 PM |
| Involved Officer #1: | Daniel Jones, Star #16641, Employee ID# [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: November 30, 2012, Unit of Assignment: 004, Male, Black |
| Involved Individual #1: | [REDACTED] Female, Black |

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 __:** *[Insert text of any additional rule(s) violated]*

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.³⁰ 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.”³¹

³⁰ 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).

³¹ *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