



Log # 2022-3060

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On July 22, 2022, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received a referral complaint from Sergeant (Sgt.) Salvador Serrano, Jr., Star #827, of the Chicago Police Department (CPD) reporting alleged misconduct by a member of the CPD, which alleged that on July 17, 2020, at approximately 8:00 p.m., at or near Buckingham Fountain, Chicago, IL 60605, Officer Luis A. Laurenzana, Star #19637, used excessive force when he struck [REDACTED] on her hand with his expandable baton. Upon review of the evidence, COPA served additional allegations that Officer Todd E. Witulski, Star #15592, failed to intervene in and /or report misconduct in the situation. Following its investigation, COPA reached sustained findings regarding certain of the allegations in this investigation.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE²

BWC Evidence:

BWC of Officer Luis A. Laurenzana, Star #19637:³ The pertinent part of the BWC involving the interaction between Officer Laurenzana and the Complainant, [REDACTED] began at approximately (43:14) when [REDACTED] wearing a white tee-shirt and a protective mask, moved her bike up from a crowd of protestors to a line where the police were attempting to move people back. Officers were commanding the protestors to stay back. [REDACTED] was observed with her bike near the police line (43:17). [REDACTED] was holding her bike with both of her hands when Officer Laurenzana approached and commanded people to move back (43:18). Officer Laurenzana was waving his baton in the air and then he struck [REDACTED] who was holding her bike, on her left hand (43:24). [REDACTED] then moved her bike back into the crowd of protestors (43:24). Officer Laurenzana then proceeded to a different area of the incident.

BWC of Todd E. Witulski, Star #15592:⁴ This BWC reflects that Officer Witulski was directly behind Officer Luis A. Laurenzana, Star #19637, as they approached a group of protestors with bicycles (01:54). Officer Laurenzana was holding a baton in his right hand (01:57). He was

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 The following is a summary of what COPA finds most likely occurred during this incident. This summary utilized information from several different sources, including BWC footage, police reports, and officer interviews, and a civil lawsuit file by the Complainant.

³ Att. #2

⁴ Att. #4

attempting to restrain the crowd from advancing. [REDACTED] moved her bike forward and toward Officer Laurenzana (02:14). Officer Laurenzana moved forward and kicked [REDACTED] bike into her body, first with his left foot and then with his right foot (02:16). He then struck her bike with his baton. [REDACTED] recoiled but then moved her bike forward again (02:19). Officer Laurenzana then exerted three baton strikes at [REDACTED] at least one of which appeared to strike her flush on her left hand (02:24). Officer Laurenzana grabbed her bike by its handle, but [REDACTED] pulled it away (02:24). She picked up her bike and remained where she was standing, refusing police orders to move back, and Officer Laurenzana struck her with his baton on her left hand (02:28). Officer Laurenzana then kicked at her bicycle. She then moved her bike back to where the protesters were being restrained. Officer Laurenzana then moved to a different area where the protest was taking place.

Interviews:

Officer Luis A. Laurenzana, Star #19637:⁵ In his interview with COPA on May 3, 2023, Officer Laurenzana stated that he was on duty on July 17, 2020, during the protest / riot near Buckingham Fountain, Chicago, IL 60605. Prior to this event, the officers had been dealing with no days off and extended work schedules.⁶ On the date of the incident, he did not get a lunch break, and had not had a full night sleep cycle, but had been assigned to protect the statue near Buckingham Fountain (10:55).⁷ There were hundreds of protestors there (11:03).⁸ Some of the protestors were wearing black masks, goggles, face shields, and other protective gear (11:08). Some of them had pipes with sharpened ends, which were concealed by banners (11:17).⁹ This crowd then began surrounding the officers in a tactical position (11:24).¹⁰ He was then struck in the head by an unknown object (11:34).¹¹ The area near his left eye went numb (12:35). At that time, he was not seen by paramedics, nor did he leave the scene (13:01). This occurred before his interaction with [REDACTED] (13:34).¹² As a result, he could not see out of his left eye, and he had difficulty walking straight (13:51).¹³ At that time, he was equipped with a baton (14:10). He had been trained in the use of the baton (14:18); however, during the incident his baton had been stolen from him by the crowd, but he had obtained another baton, an expandable baton, that was available on the scene (14:38).¹⁴ After reviewing Officer Witulski's BWC of the incident, he stated that he performed baton strikes against [REDACTED] bicycle, which he described as a weapon (14:49).¹⁵ There were numerous protestors with bicycles (15:03). He stated that the officers were outnumbered because hundreds of protestors were involved in the incident, but only approximately 40 police officers (15:18). He had told [REDACTED] to move her bicycle back (15:29).¹⁶ [REDACTED] did not

⁵ Att. #23; For transcript see Att. #26.

⁶ Att. #26; Pg. 11, Lns. 22-23.

⁷ Att. #26, Pg. 12, Lns. 1-2.

⁸ Att. #26, Pg. 12, Lns. 7-8.

⁹ Att. #26, Pg. 12, Lns. 9-10.

¹⁰ Att. #26, Pg. 12, Lns. 12-13.

¹¹ Att. #26, Pg. 12, Ln. 16.

¹² Att. #26, Pg. 14, Lns. 21-23.

¹³ Att. #26, Pg. 15, Lns. 3-5.

¹⁴ Att. #26, Pg. 15, Lns. 15-19.

¹⁵ Att. #26, Pg. 16, Lns. 2-4.

¹⁶ Att. #26, Pg. 16, Lns. 19-21.

comply with his order (15:34).¹⁷ In fact, she moved her bicycle forward (15:37). As a result, he kicked [REDACTED] bicycle in order to create space (15:53).¹⁸ It was not done to injure [REDACTED] (15:57).¹⁹ [REDACTED] did not appear injured from him kicking her bike (16:13). With his baton strikes, he was attempting to move her bicycle away from her, and not to intentionally strike her (15:57).²⁰ He classified [REDACTED] as an assailant (17:37). He believed her bicycle could be used as a weapon (17:51). He did not recall if [REDACTED] eventually moved back into the crowd. After that, there was no other interaction between himself and [REDACTED] during this event (18:09). He was eventually treated for a concussion (18:44).²¹ He subsequently went on IOD.²² Finally, he stated that he had been hit with a mortar on his shoulder (21:33).²³ The protestors had used their bikes as defensive weapons (23:23). He denied both allegations in this matter.

Officer Todd E. Witulski, Star #15592:²⁴ In his interview with COPA on May 3, 2023, Officer Witulski stated that he was on duty on July 17, 2020, during the protest / riot near Buckingham Fountain, Chicago, IL 60605. This was a BWC incident, and his BWC footage recorded Officer Luis A. Laurenzana, Star #1937, interacting with the Complainant, [REDACTED] in order to maintain security. At that time, he was assigned to the 1st District TAC Team and had responded to the incident with several members of his TAC Team. Officer Laurenzana was not his partner at the time; however, his BWC captured some of Officer Laurenzana's actions. Because the overall event was so chaotic and violent, Officer Witulski did not recall the particular interaction that occurred between [REDACTED] and Officer Laurenzana (13:09). He did, however, before this interview review his BWC relative to that interaction and provided the following information during his statement.

When they arrived on the scene the statue was already surrounded by rioters. Objects and explosives²⁵ were being thrown and the officers were attempting to keep the rioters away from the statue. During that time, he was struck on his right shoulder by an unknown object and thrown by an unknown assailant (08:40).²⁶ Eventually, he had to have surgery for the injury that resulted. At that point during the riot, he was not equipped with any protective gear. He then returned to the 1st District to get his gear but when he returned to the scene, the rioters had already taken over the statue (09:23). Orders were then given for the officers to form lines and then the crowd of rioters was ordered to disperse (09:54). After several orders were given to the crowd to disperse, the order to disperse the tear gas was then given and then the officers were ordered to push forward and remove the rioters from the park (10:20).²⁷ As the officers moved forward, they encountered multiple barricades from the rioters' bicycles (10:31). They were interlocking their bicycles to

¹⁷ Att. #26, Pg. 16, Lns. 22-23.

¹⁸ Att. #26, Pg. 17, Lns. 3-7.

¹⁹ Att. #26, Pg. 17, Lns. 8-9.

²⁰ Att. #26, Pg. 17, Lns. 23-24.

²¹ Att. #26, Pg. 20, Lns. 8-9.

²² Injured on Duty Status

²³ Att. #26, Pg. 23, Lns. 16-17.

²⁴ Att. #25; See Att. #27 for transcript.

²⁵ Att. #27, Pg. 9, Lns. 16-18.

²⁶ Att. #27, Pg. 9, Lns. 20-21.

²⁷ Att. #27, Pg. 10, Lns. 16-17.

prevent the officers from advancing (10:41).²⁸ An order was eventually given to stop; however, he does not know long the officers were on the scene (11:23). Relative to his injury, he eventually was placed on IOD status. He had a torn bicep muscle and sustained damage to his rotator cuff, which required surgery (12:08).²⁹ He was not treated on the scene for any injuries, nor did he know if Officer Laurenzana was injured during the riot (12:35).

After reviewing his BWC, at approximately 2:10 to 2:32, he acknowledged that Officer Laurenzana had interacted with ██████ (13:51).³⁰ He stated that he believed Officer Laurenzana's actions were appropriate (14:09).³¹ He believed that it was an attempt to get ██████ to vacate the area with her bicycle (14:36). The rioters were using their bicycles as weapons against the officers (14:56).³² He also acknowledged that certain force was applied against ██████ in this incident (15:04).³³ He considered that amount of force proportional to the threat from the rioters (15:11).³⁴ He did not consider it excessive force (15:26). He considered Officer Laurenzana's use of the baton proportional to the incident (15:36). He did not consider Officer Laurenzana's actions as misconduct (15:46).³⁵ Further, because he did not observe misconduct, he had no duty to report the incident (16:06). With respect to his BWC, which recorded the incident, it does not necessarily mean that he was observing what was recorded. He could have been moving his head from left to right and may not have even observed the interaction between Officer Laurenzana and ██████ (16:50).³⁶ He denied the allegation in this matter.

Documentary Evidence: Civil Lawsuit; ██████ v. Luis Laurenzana and the City of Chicago, 22-cv-3563; USDC NDI, July 11, 2022.³⁷

This lawsuit alleged that on July 17, 2020, in the area of Buckingham Fountain, Chicago, IL, 60605, during a civil protest, CPD officer Luis Laurenzana, Star #19637, repeatedly kicked ██████ bicycle into her body, and repeatedly struck ██████ with his baton on her left hand, and that ██████ had not committed any unlawful act.³⁸ This lawsuit also alleged that Officer Todd Witulski, Star #15592, was standing nearby when Officer Laurenzana physically abused ██████ and that he had the duty and opportunity to intervene to protect ██████ from harm, and that he failed to do so.³⁹ The lawsuit also alleged that ██████ had been treated after the incident at The University of Chicago Hospital, 5841 South Maryland Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637, and had been diagnosed with a broken hand in several places.⁴⁰

²⁸ Att. #27, Pg. 10, Lns. 20-21.

²⁹ Att. #27, Pg. 11, Lns. 12-16.

³⁰ Att. #27, Pg. 12, Lns. 8-12; Pg. 13, Lns. 3-7.

³¹ Att. #27, Pg. 13, Lns. 10-12.

³² Att. #27, Pg. 14, Lns. 1-2.

³³ Att. #27, Pg. 14, Lns. 3-5.

³⁴ Att. #27, Pg. 14, Lns. 6-8; Pg. 14, Lns. 15-18.

³⁵ Att. #27, Pg. 14, Lns. 19-21.

³⁶ Att. #27, Pg. 15, Lns. 19-23.

³⁷ Att. #1

³⁸ Att. #1, Pg. 3, Bullet Points 13-16.

³⁹ Att. #1, Pg. 3, Bullet Point 17.

⁴⁰ Att. #1, Pg. 3, Bullet Point 18.

Medical Records for [REDACTED] As stated above, Civil Lawsuit 22-cv-3563 alleged that [REDACTED] had been treated after the incident at The University of Chicago Hospital, 5841 South Maryland Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637, and had been diagnosed with a broken hand in several places. Efforts were made to obtain [REDACTED] medical records from her three attorneys and from [REDACTED] personally, but no medical records were provided to COPA.⁴¹ As a result, a subpoena was issued to the University of Chicago Hospital on May 1, 2023, for the records.⁴² As of the date of the submission of this report, no medical records have been obtained for [REDACTED]

Tactical Response Report (TRR), July 17, 2020, Event No. 10149, of Officer Luis A. Laurenzana, Star #19637:⁴³ This report reflects that during the riot at Columbus Drive, Chicago, IL 60605, on July 17, 2020, Officer Laurenzana was injured. He was struck in the left cheek with a frozen aluminum beverage, which caused him to lose vision in his left eye. This narrative was created by Sgt. Kevin Gleeson, Star #2098, due to Officer Laurenzana's injury. Further, the narrative of Lt. Godfrey T. Cronin, Star #625, added that Officer Laurenzana should be commended for his proactive leadership during the riot. The narrative further states that Officer Laurenzana was ordered to form a bike line because the protesters were using their bicycles as impact weapons. Officer Laurenzana struck an assailant with a closed fist, and another assailant with an open fist. Both assailants were attempting to defeat an arrest.

The incident involving [REDACTED] was not addressed in the TTR; nor, was the incident captured on Officer Laurenzana's BWC at 42:01, where Officer Laurenzana can be seen striking a protester 4 times on his legs while the protester was lying secured on the ground.

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer Luis A. Laurenzana, Star #19637:

1. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that on July 17, 2020, at or near Buckingham Fountain, Chicago IL 60605, at approximately 8:00 p.m., that Officer Luis A. Laurenzana, Star #19637, committed misconduct through the following acts or omissions by:

1. kicking [REDACTED] bicycle into her body, without justification; **Finding: Sustained; Rule: 2, 3, 6, and 10.**

2. striking [REDACTED] left hand with a baton, without justification. **Finding: Sustained; Rule: 2, 3, 6, 10, and 38.**

Officer Todd E. Witulski, Star #15592:

1. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that on July 17, 2020, at or near Buckingham Fountain, Chicago IL 60605, at approximately 8:00 p.m., that Officer Todd E. Witulski, Star #15592, committed misconduct through the following act or omission by:

⁴¹ See Notes in the Case File.

⁴² Att. #19

⁴³ Att. #7

1. failing to intervene in and/or report Officer Luis A. Laurenzana's, unjustified use of force against ██████████ **Finding: Not Sustained**

IV. CREDIBILITY ASSESSMENT

Officer Luis A. Laurenzana, Star #19637: As noted below, COPA found several aspects of Officer Laurenzana's statement not credible. COPA appreciates the difficult situation officers faced. However, several of Officer Laurenzana's purported beliefs about his actions and those of ██████████ are not supported by the evidence.

Officer Todd E. Witulski, Star #15592: COPA has no concerns regarding Officer Witulski's credibility.

V. ANALYSIS⁴⁴

A. Officer Laurenzana's use of force and baton strikes violated CPD policy.

CPD policy in effect at the time of this incident authorized the use of a baton against passive resisters, active resisters, and assailants.⁴⁵ The policy permitted baton use "against passive and active resisters only as a control instrument placed mainly on the sensors of the skin covering bone or applied to joints and pressure sensitive areas of the body with non-impact pressure."⁴⁶

BWC evidence shows that Officer Luis A. Laurenzana, Star #19637, pushed ██████████ bike into her body, as alleged. It also shows that Officer Laurenzana struck ██████████ on her left hand twice with his baton. Officer Laurenzana told COPA that he believed ██████████ was an assailant because she could have used her bicycle as a weapon.⁴⁷ But there is no objective evidence that ██████████ intended to use the bicycle as a weapon. In fact, in BWC she is seen standing or moving back from the officers.⁴⁸ At most she appears to be using the bicycle as a shield against officers, making her possibly a passive resister. Under those circumstances, Officer Laurenzana was permitted only to use non-impact pressure.

Similarly, CPD use of force policy provides that officers confronted with passive resisters may use only the following force options: (1) holding techniques; (2) compliance techniques; control instruments (non-impact pressure); and pepper spray.⁴⁹ CPD policy authorized kicking only when

⁴⁴ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, *see* Appendix B.

⁴⁵ G03-02-07 (Eff. Feb. 29, 2020).

⁴⁶ G03-02-07.II.C.2 (emphasis added).

⁴⁷ Officer Laurenzana's assertion that ██████████ was an assailant is further undermined by his failure to complete a TRR for the incident. See G03-020-02(III)(A)(1).

⁴⁸ COPA notes that ██████████ can be seen taking several steps back. It is arguable, therefore, that she was complying with the officers' unspecified commands to "move back." It is unclear where officers expected civilians to move.

⁴⁹ See G03-02-01(IV)(B)(1).

officers faced an assailant.⁵⁰ For the reasons explained above, ██████ was at most a passive resister. Officer Laurenzana was therefore not authorized to kick ██████ bicycle in a way that caused it to strike her body.

COPA recognizes the difficult situation officers faced during this incident. However, Officer Laurenzana's improper use of force exacerbated the situation rather than de-escalating it. His statements regarding what other protesters may have been doing to him did not authorize his use of force against ██████ in this instance. Officers are required to continually assess the need for use of force and modify their use of force accordingly.⁵¹ His failure to do so violated CPD policy. For these reasons, Allegation 1 and 2 against Officer Laurenzana are **SUSTAINED**.

Failed to Intervene.

B. COPA does not have sufficient evidence to show Officer Witulski failed to intervene or report misconduct.

CPD policy in effect at the time required officers who observed an improper use of force to intervene.⁵² Officers could intervene verbally or use other means.⁵³ Policy also required officers to report the misconduct immediately notify their supervisor.⁵⁴ CPD rule 22 also require officers to report misconduct.

Furthermore, an officer who fails to intervene to prevent the unconstitutional use of excessive force by another officer may be held liable for violating the 4th Amendment.⁵⁵ Also, to establish a 4th Amendment violation for failure to intervene, a plaintiff must establish that: (1) the officer failed, or refused, to intervene when a constitutional violation took place in his or her presence, or with his or her knowledge; and (2) there was a realistic and reasonable opportunity to intervene.⁵⁶

COPA finds it hard to believe that Officer Witulski did not witness Officer Laurenzana's improper use of force. BWC evidence shows Officer Witulski in very close proximity to Officer Laurenzana during the incident. There is also nothing to suggest he could not have told Officer Laurenzana to stop his actions. After reviewing the BWC evidence at COPA, Officer Witulski acknowledged Officer Laurenzana used force against ██████ although he believed it was proper. His belief does not conform with CPD policy on the use of baton strikes and kicks. However, COPA realizes it is more likely than not that an officer will not be held liable for failing to intervene or report

⁵⁰ G03-02-01(IV)(C)(1)(a)(1). COPA believes Officer Laurenzana kicked ██████ bike to compel her compliance. See G03-02(III)(A) (defining "force" as "any physical contact by a Department member, either directly or through use of equipment, to compel a subject's compliance.")

⁵¹ G03-02-01(II)(F).

⁵² G03-02((V)(B).

⁵³ Id.

⁵⁴ Id.

⁵⁵ See *Nance v. Sammis*, 586 F.3d 604, 612 (8th Cir., 2009); *Krout v. Goemmer*, 583 F.3d 557, 565 (8th Cir., 2009).

⁵⁶ See, e.g., *Yang v Hardin*, 37 F.3d 282, 285 (7th Cir. 1994); *Lanigan v. Village of E. Hazel Crest*, 110 F.3d 467, 476 (7th Cir. 1996).

misconduct if the officer does not believe misconduct has occurred. For these reasons, COPA finds the allegation against Officer Witulski is **NOT SUSTAINED**.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Officer Luis A. Laurenzana, Star #19637

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History⁵⁷

Officer Laurenzana has received 51 various awards and does not have a disciplinary or SPAR history.

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officer Laurenzana violated rules 2,3,6,10,and 38 when he kicked [REDACTED] bicycle into her body, without justification and struck [REDACTED] left hand with a baton, without justification. In his statement to COPA, Officer Laurenzana contends that he believed [REDACTED] was an assailant because she could have used her bicycle as a weapon, however BWC evidence proves otherwise. COPA understands the intensity of the moment that both Officer Laurenzana and [REDACTED] faced, however it remains Officer Laurenzana's duty to maintain his duty to protect even in intense moments as protest, which he violated. It is for these reasons, combined with the officer's complimentary history and lack of disciplinary history, that COPA recommends a **5-day suspension**.

Approved:

[REDACTED]

1/25/2024

Matthew Haynam
Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator

Date

⁵⁷ Att. 30.

Appendix A

Case Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	July 17, 2020 / 8:00 p.m. / Buckingham Fountain, Chicago, IL 60605
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	July 22, 2022 / 1:21 p.m.
Involved Officer #1:	Luis A. Laurenzana, Star #19637, Employee ID# [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: July 17, 2022, Unit of Assignment: 006 – Detailed to 124, Male, White
Involved Officer #2:	Todd E. Witulski, Star #15592, Employee ID# [REDACTED]7, Date of Appointment: December 2, 2002, Unit of Assignment: 001 – Detailed to 163, Male, White
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] Female, White

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 (**expandable baton**)
- Rule __:**

Applicable Policies and Laws

State Laws

1. Illinois Constitution 1970, Art. I, § 6
2. 720 ILCS 5/25-1⁵⁸

Federal Laws

⁵⁸ Mob Action.

1. 4th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution

General Orders

1. G03-02⁵⁹

2. G03-02-02⁶⁰

⁵⁹ De-Escalation, Response to Resistance, and Use of Force; Effective Date: April 15, 2021-June 28, 2023

⁶⁰ Incidents Requiring the Completion of a Tactical Response Report; Effective Date: April 15, 2021-June 28, 2023

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.⁶¹ 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.”⁶²

⁶¹ 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).

⁶² *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