



Log # 2020-3671

## FINAL SUMMARY REPORT<sup>1</sup>

### I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On August 10, 2020, 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 June 7, 2018, ██████████ Sergeant (Sgt.) Javier Alonso #1717<sup>2</sup> physically restrained her from defending herself while she was receiving a battery from his wife, Chicago Fire Department (CFD) Firefighter Karina Alonso.<sup>3</sup> Upon review of the evidence, COPA served additional allegations that Sgt. Alonso failed to report the physical altercation between his wife and ██████████ and that he gave false report to COPA during the ensuing investigation. Furthermore, COPA served allegations against both of the CPD members who responded to the incident, Sgt. Matthew Shea #2121 and Detective (Det.) David Ivankovich #20521, that they each failed to conduct a thorough investigation, failed to complete an accurate case report, failed to notify a supervisor that a CPD member had been involved in a domestic-related incident, and failed to report a that City of Chicago employee had been involved in a domestic-related incident.<sup>4</sup>

Following its investigation, COPA reached sustained findings regarding the allegations of Sgt. Alonso failing to report the battery committed by his wife against ██████████. With regard to Sgt. Shea and Officer Ivankovich, COPA sustained the allegations that they failed to conduct a thorough investigation, failed to complete an accurate case report of the incident, and failed to notify a supervisor of CPD member's involvement in a domestic-related incident.

### II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE<sup>5</sup>

The relevant body-worn camera (BWC) videos show Sgt. Shea and Det. Ivankovich responding to ██████████ call for service on June 7, 2018.<sup>6</sup> ██████████ came

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> At the time of this incident, Sgt. Alonso held the rank of Police Officer. His promotion to Sergeant was effective March 1, 2019. This report references his current rank.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> Sgt. Shea held the rank of Police Officer at the time of the occurrence. His promotion to Sergeant was effective July 1, 2019. Det. Ivankovich held the rank of Police Officer at the time of the occurrence. His promotion to Detective was effective June 1, 2023. This report references their current ranks.

<sup>5</sup> 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, injury photos, police reports, court documents, civilian interviews, and officer interviews.

<sup>6</sup> Atts. 12 and 13.

outside and stood on her porch while telling the CPD members that [REDACTED] and her [REDACTED] had visited her that day, that they had been in a verbal argument, and that her [REDACTED] had physically attacked her by striking her.<sup>7</sup> [REDACTED] husband and [REDACTED] tried to separate the two women from each other, but in spite of this her [REDACTED] had struck her multiple times in her head.<sup>8</sup> The complainant affirmed that she wished to file a police report against her [REDACTED], and temporarily returned inside her residence while the CPD members returned to their vehicle.<sup>9</sup> On the recording, Det. Ivankovich and Sgt. Shea discussed whether this battery should be considered a domestic-related incident, but they were not sure of the answer.<sup>10</sup>

[REDACTED] approached the CPD vehicle at that point and informed them that her [REDACTED] had been an employee of the Chicago Fire Department.<sup>11</sup> Sgt. Shea began completing the police report while the officers obtained the details from [REDACTED].<sup>12</sup> When the officers asked if [REDACTED] had participated in the battery, [REDACTED] voice was barely audible as she seemed to answer that she did not think so.<sup>13</sup> At some point, Sgt. Shea asked Det. Ivankovich if he had to call in a notification due to the involvement of City of Chicago employees, saying, “She’s a fireman, uh, the guy who was here with her, her husband’s a cop. But she said that he was trying to restrain her, so...”<sup>14</sup> Det. Ivankovich responded by saying, “But he’s not gonna be a main offender, so...”<sup>15</sup>

The interview in the vehicle continued,<sup>16</sup> and Det. Ivankovich asked the complainant if she wanted an Evidence Technician to photograph her face, advising her that to do so would provide evidence to support her case during a court proceeding.<sup>17</sup> He summarized the account of the incident that he intended to include in the report, and asked her to confirm that her [REDACTED] had struck her about the head with closed fists and pulled her hair.<sup>18</sup> When she seemed to want to clarify a point about how the incident had begun, Det. Ivankovich told her, “...the substance of the argument is irrelevant to me.”<sup>19</sup> After the interview concluded, Sgt. Shea walked [REDACTED] to her front door, gave her instructions on how to obtain an order of protection, and offered to answer any questions she might have, although she had none to ask him.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Att. 12 at 0:58 to 2:02; also Att. 13 at 0:57 to 2:01.

<sup>8</sup> Att. 12 at 2:02 to 2:12; also Att. 13 at 2:01 to 2:11.

<sup>9</sup> Att. 12 at 2:12 to 2:48; also Att. 13 at 2:11 to 2:47.

<sup>10</sup> Att. 12 at 2:48 to 3:23; also Att. 13 at 2:47 to 3:21.

<sup>11</sup> Att. 12 at 3:23 to 3:26; also Att. 13 at 3:21 to 3:25.

<sup>12</sup> Att. 12 at 3:26 to 16:22; also Att. 13 at 3:25 to 16:21. [REDACTED] moved to sit in the rear seat of the police vehicle as the officers spoke with her, which made some of her answers to their questions difficult to hear.

<sup>13</sup> Att. 12 at 16:22 to 16:48; also Att. 13 at 16:21 to 16:47.

<sup>14</sup> Att. 12 at 18:10 to 18:22; also Att. 13 at 18:09 to 18:21.

<sup>15</sup> Att. 12 at 18:22 to 18:27; also Att. 13 at 18:21 to 18:26. (COPA notes that this exchange demonstrates the reasoning by which Sgt. Shea and Det. Ivankovich avoided their responsibilities to notify a supervisor of a CPD members’ involvement in this incident, and to report the involvement of another City of Chicago employee.)

<sup>16</sup> Att. 12 at 18:27 to 19:01; also Att. 13 at 18:26 to 19:00.

<sup>17</sup> Att. 12 at 19:01 to 19:14; also Att. 13 at 19:00 to 19:13.

<sup>18</sup> Att. 12 at 19:14 to 19:57; also Att. 13 at 19:13 to 19:56.

<sup>19</sup> Att. 12 at 19:57 to 20:28; also Att. 13 at 19:56 to 20:27.

<sup>20</sup> Att. 12 at 20:28 to 23:29; also Att. 13 at 20:27 to 23:31.

The complainant, [REDACTED] participated in an audio-recorded interview with COPA via telephone.<sup>21</sup> She explained that in the past [REDACTED] Sgt. Alonso, had experienced recurring problems in his household resulting from his wife, Karina Alonso,<sup>22</sup> physically attacking him on multiple occasions.<sup>23</sup> She said she had never gotten along well with Karina Alonso due to her having a very short temper<sup>24</sup> and further stated that during a family gathering some years earlier Karina Alonso had suddenly attacked her and pulled her hair.<sup>25</sup> Afterward, Sgt. Alonso had urged her not to call the police to report this incident, and told her it would be her word against his if she reported his wife.<sup>26</sup> She said she had decided then that she did not want to have any further interactions with Sgt. Alonso or Karina Alonso.<sup>27</sup>

[REDACTED] stated that the argument which caused the initiation of this investigation began because Karina Alonso had an expectation that [REDACTED] family would help to pay the cost for an expensive party dress meant for Sgt. and Karina Alonso's [REDACTED].<sup>28</sup> She said on the date of this incident, she had been in her kitchen with her family friend, [REDACTED]<sup>29</sup> when Sgt. and Karina Alonso unexpectedly arrived at her house and initiated an argument about her refusal to pay for the party dress.<sup>30</sup> [REDACTED] stated that she repeatedly told Sgt. and Karina Alonso to leave and threatened to call the police on them.<sup>31</sup> [REDACTED] came home early and was present as the situation continued to unfold.<sup>32</sup>

Eventually, Sgt. Alonso moved to leave by opening the door to the backyard, but as the door opened, [REDACTED] dog immediately run outside.<sup>33</sup> She stated that when she went outside to get her dog, Karina Alonso grabbed her, after which Sgt. Alonso also grabbed her by her arm in a manner similar to a bear hug.<sup>34</sup> [REDACTED] related that Sgt. Alonso yelled at her to "stop it."<sup>35</sup> She stated that she had not been actively doing anything as he shouted this, but was only trying to defend her face because her [REDACTED] was "pounding" on her face and head.<sup>36</sup> [REDACTED] noted that if Sgt. Alonso was not holding her arm, she would have been able to protect herself from this attack.<sup>37</sup> [REDACTED] ran out to the backyard to aid [REDACTED]

<sup>21</sup> Atts. 7 and 8.

<sup>22</sup> [REDACTED] also explained that Karina Alonso goes by the name "Laura" within their family. See Att. 8, pg. 7, lns. 16 to 18.

<sup>23</sup> Att. 8, pg. 5, lns. 19-24.

<sup>24</sup> Att. 8, pg. 6, lns. 4-5.

<sup>25</sup> Att. 8, pg. 10, lns. 4-7.

<sup>26</sup> Att. 8, pg. 10, lns. 11-14.

<sup>27</sup> Att. 8, pg. 10, lns. 22-24.

<sup>28</sup> Att. 8, pgs. 12-13. The complainant explained that the dress was intended for a "cotillion" party that Sgt. and Karina Alonso were throwing for their daughter. She further stated that the amount Karina Alonso was asking for the purchase of the dress was approximately \$900.00.

<sup>29</sup> [REDACTED] said [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] and referred to her as "[REDACTED]" throughout this interview. See Att. 8, pg. 34, lns. 16-20.

<sup>30</sup> Att. 8, pgs. 16-17.

<sup>31</sup> Att. 8, pg. 18, lns. 12-16.

<sup>32</sup> Att. 8, pgs. 19-20.

<sup>33</sup> Att. 8, pg. 20, lns. 19-24.

<sup>34</sup> Att. 8, pg. 21, lns. 21-24, pg. 37, lns. 7-19.

<sup>35</sup> Att. 8, pg. 22, lns. 6-8.

<sup>36</sup> Att. 8, pg. 22, lns. 8-11.

<sup>37</sup> Att. 8, pg. 29, lns. 20-22.

██████████ when he heard her yelling for the others to let go of her.<sup>38</sup> ██████████ reported that Sgt. Alonso repeatedly asked her, “Why did you do that?”<sup>39</sup> She said she had felt confusion upon hearing this, because she had not done anything to warrant him asking that question.<sup>40</sup> Finally, after they were ordered to leave several more times, Sgt. Alonso and Karina Alonso left the property and ██████████ called the police to report the incident.<sup>41</sup> Sgt. Alonso called ██████████ several times asking her not to get the police involved. ██████████ also learned that Sgt. Alonso called their mother and told her that ██████████ had actually attacked Karina Alonso.<sup>42</sup>

Police arrived and ██████████ spoke to two officers about the incident.<sup>43</sup> She said after she identified Sgt. Alonso as a CPD member and Karina Alonso as a CFD Firefighter,<sup>44</sup> the police officer who was taking her information asked the officer next to him if Sgt. Alonso’s name should be included in the report.<sup>45</sup> The other officer had then answered that only Karina Alonso’s name should be recorded, and when ██████████ asked them why they did not give her an answer.<sup>46</sup>

The day after the incident, ██████████ went to 555 West Harrison and obtained a temporary order of protection against Karina Alonso, but she said she was not able to get a similar order against Sgt. Alonso because he had not been named on the police report.<sup>47</sup> Karina Alonso was subsequently arrested and later found not guilty at a trial ██████████ participated in.<sup>48</sup> She also explained that she had not initially attempted to bring a complaint directly against Sgt. Alonso because he had told her that no one would believe her word over his.<sup>49</sup>

██████████ the complainant’s ██████████ provided an interview to COPA in which he stated that he had not seen exactly where Sgt. Alonso was or what he was doing at the time when Karina Alonso was battering ██████████<sup>50</sup> Consequently, he was not able to confirm his wife’s claim that Sgt. Alonso had been actively restraining her during the conflict.

During his interview with COPA, Sgt. Shea related that he possessed no independent recollection of this incident, and he therefore relied heavily on the case report and his BWC footage while discussing this event.<sup>51</sup> When he was asked to explain why he had not spoken to ██████████ during his investigation, he answered that he could not remember why he had

<sup>38</sup> Att. 8, pg. 22, lns. 11-14.

<sup>39</sup> Att. 8, pg. 22, lns. 15-17.

<sup>40</sup> Att. 8, pg. 22, lns. 17-19.

<sup>41</sup> Att. 8, pgs. 22-23.

<sup>42</sup> Att. 8, pg. 23, lns. 17-21.

<sup>43</sup> Att. 8, pg. 25, lns. 3-7.

<sup>44</sup> Att. 8, pg. 25, lns. 12-14.

<sup>45</sup> Att. 8, pg. 25, lns. 14-16.

<sup>46</sup> Att. 8, pg. 25, lns. 16-19.

<sup>47</sup> Att. 8, pgs. 40-43.

<sup>48</sup> Att. 8, pgs. 48-49. See also Att. 24, pg. 86, lns. 6-7. The CFD also investigated Karina Alonso for her involvement in this incident, but the allegations were Unfounded.

<sup>49</sup> Att. 8, pg. 53, lns. 6-14.

<sup>50</sup> Att. 11, pg. 17; also Att. 11, pg. 24. (Translation of the Spanish-language interview conducted with ██████████)

<sup>51</sup> Att. 19, pg. 7, lns. 12-18.

not made an effort to communicate with him.<sup>52</sup> When pressed again for a reason why he would not have obtained information from all the witnesses from the encounter, he repeatedly stated he could not remember the incident due to the passage of time since its occurrence.<sup>53</sup> With regard to his reason for not notifying a CPD supervisor that Sgt. Alonso was involved in this incident, he asserted that at the time he and his partner had not believed Sgt. Alonso was involved in misconduct,<sup>54</sup> and further stated that [REDACTED] only told them that Sgt. Alonso's role in the encounter had been in breaking up the fight.<sup>55</sup> He also explained that he and his partner had conferred about whether or not they should notify their superiors that two City of Chicago employees had been involved in this incident, and said he had believed that they made the correct decision when they chose not to do so.<sup>56</sup>

When asked to respond directly to his allegations, Sgt. Shea denied Allegation 1, that he had failed to conduct a thorough investigation of a domestic-related incident.<sup>57</sup> He also denied Allegation 2, that he had failed to complete an accurate case report.<sup>58</sup> In response to Allegation 3, that he had failed to notify a CPD supervisor of a CPD member's involvement in a domestic-related incident, he defended his actions by stating that at the time he had not believed that a CPD member had committed a domestic battery.<sup>59</sup> His response to Allegation 4, that he had failed to report a City of Chicago employee's involvement in a domestic-related incident, was to explain that at the time he had not believed that a notification was necessary because a city employee had not been taken into custody, but he further stated that he later came to understand that this was incorrect and that he should have made a notification.<sup>60</sup>

Det. Ivankovich gave an account to COPA which was substantially similar to that of Sgt. Shea. He stated that he did not independently recall the incident and consequently he relied upon his BWC video during his interview.<sup>61</sup> After being shown the video, he acknowledged that he and his partner had been aware that this domestic-related incident involved a CFD member and a CPD member.<sup>62</sup> When asked why he did not make any further inquiries about the CPD member, Det. Ivankovich answered that he understood they were investigating a battery involving only a victim and an offender, with no other parties involved.<sup>63</sup> After further questioning about what he and his partner had learned at the scene, he explained that [REDACTED] had informed them that both [REDACTED] and Karina Alonso's husband had been at the scene, and had been involved in breaking up the battery.<sup>64</sup> When asked why his investigation did not include acquiring personal contact information for those two witnesses, Det. Ivankovich said he and his partner had been focused on getting the facts from [REDACTED] and when they asked her if she was okay with

---

<sup>52</sup> Att. 19, pgs. 13-14.

<sup>53</sup> Att. 19, pgs. 15-16.

<sup>54</sup> Att. 19, pg. 35, lns. 3-9.

<sup>55</sup> Att. 19, pg. 35, lns. 10-20.

<sup>56</sup> Att. 19, pgs. 37-38.

<sup>57</sup> Att. 19, pg. 48, lns. 19-24.

<sup>58</sup> Att. 19, pg. 49, lns. 1-7.

<sup>59</sup> Att. 19, pg. 49, lns. 8-14.

<sup>60</sup> Att. 19, pg. 49, lns. 15-24.

<sup>61</sup> Att. 16, pg. 6, lns. 17-23; also Att. 16, pg. 10, lns. 18-21.

<sup>62</sup> Att. 16, pgs. 13-15.

<sup>63</sup> Att. 16, pg. 15, lns. 12-20.

<sup>64</sup> Att. 16, pgs. 16-17.

what they had recorded, she had told them yes.<sup>65</sup> When questioned about his understanding of the requirement for giving official notification when a City of Chicago employee is found to be involved in an incident such as this one, he answered that he believed he would be required make notifications to the Inspector General if a city employee had been placed under arrest and taken into custody.<sup>66</sup> When asked to either admit or deny his allegations, Det. Ivankovich flatly denied all four of the allegations served to him.<sup>67</sup>

Sgt. Alonso participated in two separate recorded interviews, with the second interview being necessary to address a new allegation that he had not been completely truthful in the statements he had given to COPA.

During the first interview, Sgt. Alonso stated that he had not observed his wife and ██████ engaging in a physical altercation.<sup>68</sup> When asked this question again, he repeated he had not noticed the struggle occurring between the two women, and further explained that he had been walking away when he heard his ██████ scream, after which he “grabbed” ██████ and they both left.<sup>69</sup> Sgt. Alonso was again asked when he had learned that the verbal altercation between the women had shifted to a physical altercation.<sup>70</sup> This time, Sgt. Alonso answered, “When the sheriffs came to my house.”<sup>71</sup> He went on to firmly state that he had seen no indication that there had been a physical altercation between his wife and ██████<sup>72</sup> When asked if he wanted to clarify the answer he had given, he responded by saying that he had not found out about the physical altercation until he and his wife had begun to go through the court proceedings that came afterward.<sup>73</sup> Sgt. Alonso further stated that he did not know why ██████ was alleging that he had held her down during her struggle with his wife.<sup>74</sup> When directly asked if he had made any physical contact with ██████ on the date of this incident, he answered that he had no contact at all with her.<sup>75</sup> When asked to formally accept or deny the two allegations that had been served to him at that time, Sgt. Alonso denied them both.<sup>76</sup>

After completing the first interview, Sgt. Alonso was served with a third allegation: that he had provided false, misleading, incomplete, and/or inaccurate statements to COPA. To address this allegation, Sgt. Alonso participated in a second interview in which he expressed his intention to amend three statements he had made in the earlier interview. Firstly, he wanted to explain that during the first interview, when he had been asked if he had seen anything during the struggle between his wife and ██████ the reason he had answered “no” was because when the conflict began he had been turned away from them, and had not looked toward them until after hearing his

---

<sup>65</sup> Att. 16, pgs. 17-18.

<sup>66</sup> Att. 16, pgs. 18-19.

<sup>67</sup> Att. 16, pgs. 39-40.

<sup>68</sup> Att. 31, pg. 21, lns. 1-4.

<sup>69</sup> Att. 31, pg. 21, lns. 5-11.

<sup>70</sup> Att. 31, pgs. 21-22.

<sup>71</sup> Att. 31, pg. 22, ln. 3.

<sup>72</sup> Att. 31, pgs. 22-23.

<sup>73</sup> Att. 31, pgs. 23-24.

<sup>74</sup> Att. 31, pgs. 27-28.

<sup>75</sup> Att. 31, pgs. 28-29.

<sup>76</sup> Att. 31, pgs. 36-37.

brother-in-law yell out loud.<sup>77</sup> Secondly, he said when he had been asked about when he had become aware that the altercation between the women had become physical, he had misunderstood the intended meaning of the word “physical” in the question; consequently, he had given an answer that referred to the later time when the Sheriff’s Department had served his wife with an Order of Protection.<sup>78</sup> Thirdly, he said that when he had been asked if he had ever been physical with [REDACTED] he answered “no” because in this instance he had misunderstood the word “physical” to refer to fighting.<sup>79</sup> According to his account, he had not fought with [REDACTED] and said the only physical action he had taken with her was to forcibly open her hand to make her release her hold on Karina Alonso’s hair.<sup>80</sup> At the conclusion of the second interview, Sgt. Alonso asserted that all of the statements he had made in his prior interview had been truthful, and he apologized for having misinterpreted some of the questions he had been asked.<sup>81</sup>

In the course of conducting this investigation, COPA also examined the photos of [REDACTED] injuries taken by the CPD Evidence Technician called to the scene,<sup>82</sup> the injury photos obtained by the Cook County State’s Attorney’s Office,<sup>83</sup> a trial transcript from *People of the State of Illinois vs. Karina Alonso* detailing the Court’s finding of Not Guilty against Karina Alonso,<sup>84</sup> and the CFD Internal Affairs Division Case Report from the investigation of Karina Alonso, which did not sustain the allegation made against her.<sup>85</sup>

### III. ALLEGATIONS

#### **Sgt. Javier Alonso:**

1. It is alleged that on or about June 7, 2018, at or near the location of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] the accused physically restrained [REDACTED] as she was being battered.
  - *Not sustained.*
2. It is alleged that on or about June 7, 2018, at or near the location of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] the accused failed to report a battery between Corina Alonso<sup>86</sup> against [REDACTED].
  - *Sustained, in Violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6 and 10.*
3. On or about June 12, 2023, at approximately 6:30 am, at the COPA offices located at 1615 W. Chicago Ave., Chicago, Illinois, you provided false, misleading, incomplete, and/or

<sup>77</sup> Att. 34, pgs. 9-10.

<sup>78</sup> Att. 34, pg. 10, lns. 3-7. This explanation from Sgt. Alonso was not expressed eloquently, and on its face it seems lacking in logic, but COPA’s interpretation is that in this instance he may have mistakenly conflated the meaning of the word “physical” with another word such as “serious” or “consequential,” and therefore had referred to the time when the Sheriff’s Department came looking for his wife as the first time he became aware of the situation’s severity. See Att. 34, pg. 15, lns. 2-17.; also Att. 34, pgs. 17-18.

<sup>79</sup> Att. 34, pg. 10, lns. 8-11.

<sup>80</sup> Att. 34, pg. 10, lns. 11-13.

<sup>81</sup> Att. 34, pg. 21, lns. 16-22.

<sup>82</sup> Att. 5.

<sup>83</sup> Att. 27.

<sup>84</sup> Att. 24, pg. 86, lns. 6-7.

<sup>85</sup> Att. 23.

<sup>86</sup> Karina Alonso’s first name was misspelled as “Corina” in this allegation on the paperwork served to Sgt. Alonso.

inaccurate statements to COPA relative to your knowledge of and/or observing a physical altercation between Laura " Karina" Alonso and [REDACTED] on or about June 7, 2018, at or near the location of [REDACTED] at approximately 2:25 pm.

- *Not sustained.*

**Sgt. Matthew Shea:**

1. It is alleged that on or about June 7, 2018 at or near [REDACTED] the accused failed to conduct a thorough investigation regarding a domestic related incident related to RD#JB297021.
  - *Sustained*, in Violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6 and 10.
2. It is alleged that on or about June 7, 2018 at or near [REDACTED] the accused failed to complete an accurate case report regarding a domestic related incident related to RD#JB297021.
  - *Sustained*, in Violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6 and 10.
3. It is alleged that on or about June 7, 2018 at or near [REDACTED] the accused failed to notify a supervisor of a CPD member's involvement in a domestic related incident.
  - *Sustained*, in Violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6 and 10.
4. It is alleged that on or about June 7, 2018 at or near [REDACTED] the accused failed to report a City of Chicago employee's involvement in a domestic related incident related to RD#JB297021.
  - *Not sustained.*

**Det. David Ivankovich:**

1. It is alleged that on or about June 7, 2018 at or near [REDACTED] the accused failed to conduct a thorough investigation regarding a domestic related incident related to RD#JB297021.
  - *Sustained*, in Violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6 and 10.
2. It is alleged that on or about June 7, 2018 at or near [REDACTED] the accused failed to complete an accurate case report regarding a domestic related incident related to RD#JB297021.
  - *Sustained*, in Violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6 and 10.
3. It is alleged that on or about June 7, 2018 at or near [REDACTED] the accused failed to notify a supervisor of a CPD member's involvement in a domestic related incident.
  - *Sustained*, in Violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6 and 10



4. It is alleged that on or about June 7, 2018 at or near ██████████ the accused failed to report a City of Chicago employee's involvement in a domestic related incident related to RD#JB297021.
- *Not sustained.*

#### IV. CREDIBILITY ASSESSMENT

COPA notes that two of the individuals who were interviewed during this investigation provided testimony which negatively impacted their overall credibility. During ██████████ interview, she claimed that when the accused CPD members met with her outside her home, she had reported Sgt. Alonso as a participant in the battery she had received. However, the relevant BWC videos do not support this. The audio track from the recordings did not capture her voice at an adequate volume to understand everything she said, but the voices of the CPD members are audible, and they may be heard asking her several times whether Sgt. Alonso had been involved in actively attacking her. Based on their responses and the context of their conversation, it is evident that ██████████ had answered negatively each time she was asked about Sgt. Alonso's potential misconduct, which contradicts the account she gave in this complaint. Additionally, it must be noted that following Sgt. Alonso's first recorded interview with COPA, an allegation was served to him for having provided false, misleading, incomplete, and/or inaccurate statements during that interview. However, after further investigation, insufficient evidence was found to sustain this allegation. Nevertheless, the inconsistencies in the accounts of these individuals factored into COPA's assessment of their credibility.

#### V. ANALYSIS<sup>87</sup>

##### a. CPD Policy regarding preliminary investigations of domestic incidents and required notifications

Recognizing domestic violence as a serious crime against the individual and against society, CPD seeks to reduce the incidence and severity of domestic violence through a coordinated partnership involving law enforcement, domestic violence service providers, prosecutors, and the community.<sup>88</sup> When a CPD member responds to a domestic incident, the member will use all reasonable means to prevent further abuse, neglect, or exploitation, including: 1) restoring order by gaining control of the situation, 2) identifying and securing any weapons or objects that can be used as weapons, and 3) determining if medical assistance is needed; if it is, the member must call for an ambulance or arrange transportation to a hospital for treatment.<sup>89</sup> The preliminary investigation shall be conducted by members from the Bureau of Patrol, and will include: 1) identifying and interviewing all involved parties separately, 2) determining whether or not a valid order of protection exists, and 3) identifying the crime scene and determining whether there is any evidence present; if there is evidence requiring processing, or if the victim has a visible

<sup>87</sup> For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, see Appendix B.

<sup>88</sup> Att. 42, G04-04(II), Domestic Incidents (effective December 28, 2012 to November 20, 2023).

<sup>89</sup> Att. 42, G04-04(III)(A)(1-3).

injury, the member will notify their supervisor and request an evidence technician.<sup>90</sup> If the situation is determined to be a criminal incident, the CPD member will provide the victim with a completed Domestic Incident Notice (DIN), explain its contents, and ensure that it includes the associated police report RD number and the involved members' names and star numbers.<sup>91</sup>

**b. CPD Policy regarding City of Chicago employee arrest notifications**

When a City of Chicago Employee is charged with “a felony, misdemeanor or ordinance violation, including traffic offenses returnable to a major or minor court room at the Traffic Court or city vehicle sticker and state license plate violations,” the officer making the arrest is required to give immediate notification to the station supervisor at the district of arrest and to the Crime Prevention and Information Center (CPIC).<sup>92</sup> Additionally, the officer will enter the name of the person notified and the date and time the notification was made in the narrative of any applicable CPD reports.<sup>93</sup>

**c. Concerning the allegations of misconduct**

**i. Sgt. Alonso’s role in the physical altercation and his responsibility as a CPD member**

COPA finds that Allegation 1 against Sgt. Alonso, that he physically restrained ██████████ ██████████ as she was being battered, is **not sustained**. The fact that ██████████ did not immediately make this allegation when Sgt. Shea and Det. Ivankovich responded to the scene and only claimed it later once she reported the incident to COPA significantly diminished the credibility of her claim. Additionally, her husband, ██████████ specifically stated that he had not been looking at Sgt. Alonso during the physical encounter, and therefore could not support ██████████ claim. Finally, ██████████ the other potential witness at the scene, was inside the house during the conflict and had no view of the event. Consequently, Sgt. Alonso’s potential misconduct in this matter can be neither proven nor disproven. COPA therefore finds that Allegation 1 is **not sustained** by a preponderance of the evidence due to the absence of any objective verifiable evidence of wrongdoing.

However, as a CPD member, Sgt. Alonso had a responsibility to report the discovery of any criminal activity. COPA finds that Allegation 2 against him, that he failed to report the battery between Karina Alonso and ██████████ is **sustained**. Sworn members are required to: 1) render the highest order of police service to all citizens, whether or not during specifically assigned hours, 2) obey all laws and promptly execute all lawful orders, 3) know and conform to CPD’s Policy, Rules, Regulations, Orders, Procedures and Directives, 4) receive, record, and service immediately all complaints and requests for service in accordance with CPD Orders, 5) provide security and care for all persons and property coming into their custody, 6) maintain a military

<sup>90</sup> Att. 42, G04-04(IV)(A)(1-3).

<sup>91</sup> Att. 43, G04-04-02(IV)(B)(1-3).

<sup>92</sup> Att. 44, S06-09-01(II)(A-B), City of Chicago Employee Arrest Notification (effective December 28, 2012 to present).

<sup>93</sup> Att. 44, S06-09-01(II)(C).

bearing and render military courtesy when in uniform, and 7) maintain a courteous and respectful attitude toward all persons.<sup>94</sup> During Sgt. Alonso's COPA interviews, he initially insisted that he had not been aware that a physical altercation had occurred between his wife and ██████████ and if this had indeed been the case then he may not have borne the responsibility for reporting the incident. However, during his second interview he stated that he had been personally involved in the conflict to the extent that he had forcibly opened ██████████ hand to release her grasp on Karina Alonso's hair.<sup>95</sup> This amounts to a tacit admission that he had knowledge of the physical altercation, and was therefore required to follow established procedures by reporting the incident and by taking measures to restore order. Therefore, COPA finds that Allegation 2 against Sgt. Alonso, that he failed to report the battery between his wife and ██████████ is **sustained** in violation of Rule 2 by a preponderance of the evidence.

### ii. The veracity of Sgt. Alonso's statements to COPA

COPA finds Allegation 3 against Sgt. Alonso, that he provided false, misleading, incomplete, and/or inaccurate statements to COPA relative to his knowledge of the battery incident involving Karina Alonso and ██████████ is **not sustained**. CPD's Rules of Conduct establish a list of acts which are expressly prohibited for all members, including Rule 14 which forbids members from knowingly making a false report, whether it be written or oral.<sup>96</sup> Sgt. Alonso's first interview with COPA was marked by multiple instances of him insisting that he had no knowledge of the physical altercation that occurred in his presence until after legal proceedings against his wife later began. He also claimed that he had not been in physical contact with ██████████ at any time during this incident. As his assertions of being uninformed and uninvolved were not supported by the preponderance of evidence, COPA noted that his statements may have constituted a Rule 14 violation, and therefore extended its investigation to include this allegation. When Sgt. Alonso participated in a second interview to address this issue, he amended his earlier responses by stating that he had made several misunderstandings with regard to the meaning of the questions that had been posed to him in the first interview. He acknowledged that he had been involved in the incident insofar as he had forced ██████████ to release her hold on Karina Alonso's hair,<sup>97</sup> and by this admission he proved that he had necessarily been aware that a conflict had been underway between the two women. However, he asserted that he was innocent of having made a false report to COPA and attempted to justify himself by stating that his prior answers had been given in good faith but with an incomplete understanding of the questions. As Sgt. Alonso amended his earlier statements, and as there is insufficient evidence to prove that he intentionally provided false, misleading, incomplete, and/or inaccurate information, COPA finds that Allegation 3 against him is **not sustained** by a preponderance of the evidence.

### iii. Allegations arising from the investigation conducted by Sgt. Shea and Det. Ivankovich

<sup>94</sup> Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department, (IV)(C)(1-7), Sworn Members, pg.6 (effective April 16, 2015 to present).

<sup>95</sup> Att. 34, pg. 10, Ins. 11-13.

<sup>96</sup> Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department, (V), Rules of Conduct, Rule 14, pg. 7.

<sup>97</sup> Att. 34, pg. 10, Ins. 11-13.

COPA finds Allegations 1, 2, and 3 against Sgt. Shea and Det. Ivankovich, that they had both failed to conduct a thorough investigation of the incident, that they both failed to accurately report a domestic incident, and that they both failed to notify a supervisor of a CPD member's involvement in a domestic-related incident are all **sustained**. Both Sgt. Shea and Det. Ivankovich failed to conduct a thorough preliminary investigation, and through the faults of their investigation they also failed to accurately report the incident in this case. During their COPA interviews, each of these members admitted that they had not attempted to contact or interview [REDACTED] or Sgt. Alonso and had not even obtained any personal information for them or the other potential witnesses named by [REDACTED]. Additionally, the BWC videos showed that while they were in the process of taking [REDACTED] report, they became aware that a CPD member had been present during the battery, and nevertheless ultimately dismissed the idea of notifying a sergeant of this involvement. Both Sgt. Shea and Det. Ivankovich bear equal responsibility for the inadequacies of their preliminary investigation, and consequently COPA finds that Allegations 1, 2, and 3 against both members are all **sustained** in violation of Rule 6 by a preponderance of the evidence.

With regard to Allegation 4 against Sgt. Shea and Det. Ivankovich, that they had both failed to give notification that a City of Chicago employee (Karina Alonso) had been involved in a domestic-related incident, COPA finds that this allegation is **not sustained**. As outlined in Special Order S06-09-01, when CPD members place a City of Chicago employee under arrest they are required to give immediate notification to the station supervisor at the district of arrest and to CPIC,<sup>98</sup> and must also enter the name of the person notified and the date and time the notification was made in the narrative of any applicable CPD reports.<sup>99</sup> However, the Special Order does not specify that a notification would be required in circumstances not involving an arrest. As Sgt. Shea and Det. Ivankovich had not arrested CFD employee Karina Alonso in the course of conducting their investigation, and as COPA has not discovered any directive which addresses a non-arrest situation such as this, it follows that there may not have been an enforceable requirement to give official notice that a City of Chicago employee was involved in this incident. COPA therefore finds that Allegation 4 against both Sgt. Shea and Det. Ivankovich is **not sustained** by a preponderance of the evidence due to insufficient evidence of misconduct.

## VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

### a. Sgt. Javier Alonso

#### i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History<sup>100</sup>

Sgt. Alonso's complimentary history is comprised of 187 awards, the highlights of which include four Unit Meritorious Performance Awards, two Superintendent's Award of Valor, one Superintendent's Honorable Mention, one Police Blue Star Award, three Honorable Mention Ribbon Awards, and four Department Commendations. He has no disciplinary history.

<sup>98</sup> Att. 44, S06-09-01(II)(A-B).

<sup>99</sup> Att. 44, S06-09-01(II)(C).

<sup>100</sup> Att. 39.

**ii. Recommended Discipline**

COPA has found that Sgt. Alonso violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6 and 10 when he failed to report a battery between his wife and [REDACTED]. COPA acknowledges that this incident occurred while Sgt. Alonso was off-duty and between two of his immediate family members. However, this did not relieve him of his duty to report what happened between his family members. In light of Sgt. Alonso’s extensive complimentary history, as well as his lack of disciplinary history, COPA recommends a penalty of a suspension of 5-10 days and retraining on CPD’s policies on Domestic Violence investigations.

**b. Sgt. Matthew Shea and Det. Ivankovich**

**i. Sgt. Shea’s Complimentary and Disciplinary History<sup>101</sup>**

Sgt. Shea’s complimentary history is comprised of 56 awards, the highlights of which include four Department Commendations and 43 Honorable Mentions. He has no disciplinary history.

**ii. Det. Ivankovich’s Complimentary and Disciplinary History<sup>102</sup>**

Det. Ivankovich’s complimentary history is comprised of 50 awards, the highlights of which include one Department Commendation and 40 Honorable Mentions. He has no disciplinary history.

**iii. Recommended Discipline**

COPA has found that Sgt. Shea and Det. Ivankovich violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6 and 10 when they failed to conduct a thorough investigation regarding a domestic incident, complete an accurate case report or notify a supervisor of a CPD member’s involvement in a domestic related incident. Considering their complimentary histories and lack of disciplinary histories, COPA recommends a suspension of 5-10 days and retraining on CPD’s policies on Domestic Violence investigations.

Approved:

[REDACTED]

May 28, 2024

\_\_\_\_\_  
Shannon Hayes  
*Director of Investigations*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

<sup>101</sup> Att. 41.

<sup>102</sup> Att. 40.



Appendix ACase Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	June 7, 2018 / 2:00 pm / [REDACTED] / [REDACTED]
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	August 10, 2020 / 10:58 am
Involved Officer #1:	Sgt. Javier Alonso / Star #1717 / Employee ID # [REDACTED] / Date of Appointment: February 25, 2002 / Unit of Assignment: 009 <sup>th</sup> District, male, Hispanic
Involved Officer #2:	Sgt. Matthew Shea / Star #2121 / Employee ID # [REDACTED] / Date of Appointment: October 31, 2005 / Unit of Assignment: 004 <sup>th</sup> District, male, White
Involved Officer #3:	Det. David Ivankovich / Star # 20521 / Employee ID # [REDACTED] / Date of Appointment: July 9, 2007 / Unit of Assignment: Unit 610, male, White
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] female, Hispanic

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.

Applicable Policies and Laws

- G04-04: Domestic Incidents (effective December 28, 2012 to November 20, 2023).
- G04-04-02: Domestic Incident Notice (effective December 28, 2012 to November 20, 2023).
- S06-09-01: City of Chicago Employee Arrest Notification (effective December 28, 2012 to present).

## 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.<sup>103</sup> 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.”<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup> 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).

<sup>104</sup> *People v. Coan*, 2016 IL App (2d) 151036, ¶ 28 (quoting Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions, Criminal, No. 4.19 (4<sup>th</sup> 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