



Log # 2024-0007728

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On October 12, 2024, the Chicago Police Department's (CPD) Crime Prevention and Information Center (CPIC) notified the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) of an officer-involved shooting that occurred at approximately 12:24 am, inside of El Zapotlan Bar, which is located at 3925 S. Kedzie Avenue, Chicago, IL. COPA learned that Officer Tyler Humbles discharged his firearm at [REDACTED] after [REDACTED] discharged a firearm at officers.²

Upon review of the evidence, COPA served allegations that Officer Andrzej Kozlowski failed to use time, distance or positioning to prevent or reduce the need for deadly force, and that he directed derogatory language at a member of the public. Following its investigation, COPA determined that Officer Humbles's use of deadly force complied with CPD policy. COPA reached not sustained and sustained findings regarding the allegations against Officer Kozlowski.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE³

On Saturday, October 12, 2024, at 12:19 am, [REDACTED] called 911 and reported that a man had threatened him with a firearm, then entered El Zapotlan Bar. [REDACTED] described the man as wearing a work vest and a baseball cap turned to the right.⁴ Officers Bryant Chow and Ryan Schickel (Beat 911) were dispatched to El Zapotlan Bar. Officers Kozlowski, Humbles, Conor Strauss, and David Suarez also responded to the location. Officers Kozlowski and Strauss arrived first, and upon their arrival, they observed and then approached [REDACTED] who was standing

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 Pursuant to § 2-78-120 of the Chicago Municipal Code, COPA has a duty to investigate all incidents in which a CPD member discharges their firearm in a manner that potentially could strike an individual. Therefore, COPA determined it would be the primary administrative 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 BWC footage, third-party videos, police reports (Arrest Report, Case Report, Case Supplementary Reports), Event Queries, OEMC radio transmission and 911 calls, civilian interviews, officer interviews, ET photos, and ISP lab results.

⁴ Att. 3 and Att. 9 at 19:40 to 19:59. Note: Surveillance camera video from outside of El Zapotlan Bar captured the incident that occurred between [REDACTED] and the unknown subject who pointed a firearm at him. [REDACTED] was with the unknown subject but did not point a firearm at [REDACTED]. Both [REDACTED] and the unknown subject matched the physical description that [REDACTED] provided to the 911 call taker. The unknown subject entered El Zapotlan Bar with [REDACTED] but he left approximately three minutes before CPD arrived. See Att. 52 at 14:44 to 16:28, Att. 65 at 1:00:20 to 1:01:15, Att. 55 at 31:05 to 31:19 and Att. 58 at 21:05 to 21:38.

at the bar wearing a neon work vest and a baseball cap turned to the right.⁵ Officer Strauss later told COPA that he and Officer Kozlowski did not attempt to evacuate the bar prior to confronting ██████ because they had not verified that ██████ possessed a firearm, they did not have time to do so, and they did not believe ██████ would shoot at them.⁶

Officer Kozlowski asked ██████ whether he had pulled a firearm on someone, but ██████ denied it.⁷ Officer Kozlowski then asked ██████ if he had a firearm, and ██████ replied with words to effect of, “No. I ain’t going to jail, bro.”⁸ Officer Kozlowski ordered ██████ to keep his hands up, but ██████ moved his right hand towards his waist.⁹ Officer Kozlowski grabbed ██████ then Officer Strauss yelled, “He’s got a gun,” referring to ██████¹⁰ While Officer Kozlowski struggled to disarm ██████ the other officers ordered ██████ to drop the firearm.¹¹ Officer Kozlowski explained that during the struggle, ██████ firearm was pointed towards his head.¹² Despite the officers’ orders, ██████ ignored their commands.¹³ Officer Humbles warned ██████ that he would be shot. In response, ██████ said, “Go ahead, do it.”¹⁴

As Officer Kozlowski struggled with ██████ in the small space between the bar and an adjacent wall, ██████ firearm discharged once near Officer Kozlowski’s head.¹⁵ A gunshot residue test administered to ██████ following the shooting indicated that both of his hands were in the vicinity of the firearm when it discharged.¹⁶ In response, Officer Humbles returned fire one time, striking ██████ in the head.¹⁷ ██████ fell to the floor and his firearm slid near Officer Humbles’s foot.¹⁸

After the shooting, Officer Kozlowski checked a room adjacent to the bar area, and then he exited the building. While Officer Kozlowski was standing outside the entrance to the bar, in front of a mixed crowd of CPD officers, bar patrons and bar security staff, he commented that the bar security needed to do a better job of searching patrons. A member of the bar’s security team, who was standing nearby, replied that he does search people but he had not been working the door that night. Officer Kozlowski then retorted, “Whoever fucking searched him is a retard.”¹⁹ Officer Kozlowski stated that he did not recall making the statement, but after reviewing body-worn

⁵ Att. 4 at 4:19 to 4:22; Att. 6 at 4:17 to 4:23; Att. 7 at 2:14 to 2:17; Att. 8 at 2:08 to 2:15.

⁶ Att. 84, pg. 32, lns. 6 to 17, pg. 32, ln. 23 to pg. 33, ln. 7.

⁷ Att. 4 at 4:22 to 4:25.

⁸ Att. 4 at 4:26 to 4:29; Att. 116, pg. 18, lns. 14 to 18.

⁹ Att. 4 at 4:29 to 4:33.

¹⁰ Att. 6 at 4:33 to 4:37.

¹¹ Att. 5 at 2:22 to 2:28.

¹² Att. 116, pg. 20, lns. 14 to 15.

¹³ Att. 5 at 2:24 to 2:27; Att. 6 at 4:39 to 4:43.

¹⁴ Att. 5 at 2:24 to 2:29; Att. 128, pg. 11, lns. 4 to 7.

¹⁵ Att. 116, pg. 21, lns. 15 to 16.

¹⁶ Att. 74.

¹⁷ Att. 5 at 2:29 to 2:31; Att. 128, pg. 11, lns. 8 to 10.

¹⁸ Att. 5 at 2:29 to 2:33.

¹⁹ Att. 4 at 6:42 to 6:47.

camera (BWC) video, he acknowledged that he made the statement.²⁰ Officer Kozlowski explained that he does not normally use such language, but he was upset because he had almost been shot. He added that he was frustrated with the bar's security, who had assured him that they searched every patron before granting them entry into the bar; however, someone had neglected to properly do their job.²¹

Officer Kozlowski also stated that he is well-versed in the duties and responsibilities of bar security officers, because prior to joining CPD, he was a certified security officer who worked as a bouncer at various nightclubs.²² He explained that in a bar setting, the combination of people drinking, physical altercations, and weapons can become dangerous. Therefore, as a bouncer he searched everyone, including women, to ensure that no weapons entered the bar.²³ Officer Kozlowski further stated that this incident also elicited memories of a recent and stressful officer-involved traffic collision that resulted in the death of the vehicle's occupant.²⁴

Immediately after the shooting, Officers Strauss and Humbles radioed "10-1" and "shots fired."²⁵ Officer Humbles requested an ambulance while Officer Strauss rendered aid to ██████████²⁶ Officer Strauss searched ██████████ and began to administer chest compressions. ██████████ then opened his eyes and moved around.²⁷ When ██████████ attempted to sit up, Officer Strauss placed him in handcuffs.²⁸ With the assistance of Officer Strauss, ██████████ walked from the bar to an awaiting ambulance, where he was transferred to the care of Chicago Fire Department (CFD) Emergency Medical Technicians (EMTs).²⁹ ██████████ was treated on the scene, then transported to Mt. Sinai Hospital where he received further treatment for a gunshot wound to the head.³⁰

EMTs also assessed Officer Kozlowski on scene, but he declined further treatment.³¹ Additionally, Officer Humbles was transported to an area hospital where he was treated and released. In accordance with CPD policy, the Bureau of Internal Affairs (BIA) administered drug and alcohol testing to Officer Humbles.³² The results of both tests were negative.³³

²⁰ Att. 116, pg. 29, lns. 13 to 18.

²¹ Att. 116, pg. 34, lns. 1 to 8.

²² Att. 116, pg. 35, lns. 2 to 4, lns. 16 to 20.

²³ Att. 116, pg. 35, lns. 4 to 9, lns. 12 to 14.

²⁴ Att. 116, pg. 30, lns. 14 to 18, pg. 31, lns. 11 to 24. Note: This case was investigated by COPA under Log 2024-0007497.

²⁵ Att. 5 at 3:07 to 3:09, Att. 6 at 4:48 to 4:50, and Att. 9 at 23:29 to 23:50.

²⁶ Att. 5 at 3:10 to 3:11, Att. 6 at 5:33 to 5:55, and Att. 9 at 24:04 to 24:08.

²⁷ Att. 6 at 5:56 to 7:32.

²⁸ Att. 6 at 9:15 to 10:05.

²⁹ Att. 6 at 11:25 to 12:30.

³⁰ Att. 95, pg. 12.

³¹ Att. 73.

³² Att. 134, G03-02-03(V)(A) Firearm Discharge Incidents - Authorized Use and Post-Discharge Administrative Procedures (effective June 28, 2023 to present).

³³ Att. 132, pg. 1 and 16.

██████ survived his injuries and was indicted on seven felony counts related to this incident, including three counts of attempted murder.³⁴ On November 13, 2025, a jury found ██████ not guilty of attempted murder and discharging a firearm toward a peace officer, but guilty of the aggravated unlawful use of a weapon.³⁵ He was sentenced to three years of incarceration in the Illinois Department of Corrections. COPA's attempts to contact and interview ██████ were unsuccessful.³⁶

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer Andrzej Kozlowski:

1. Failing to use time, distance, or positioning to prevent or reduce the need for the use of deadly force, without justification.
 - **Not Sustained.**
2. Directing derogatory language at a member of the public by stating words to the effect of "whoever fucking searched him is a retard," without justification.
 - **Sustained**, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.

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.

This investigation did not reveal any evidence that caused COPA to doubt the credibility of any of the individuals who provided statements. COPA found Officers Humbles, Suarez, Strauss, and Schickel to be credible in their statements. The officers did not have any difficulty recalling important details of the incident and their accounts were materially consistent with the available evidence.

COPA also found that Officer Kozlowski was forthright and credible in his statement. While Officer Kozlowski did not have an issue recalling what happened before the shooting occurred, he did not remember making the disparaging statement about the person(s) responsible for searching the bar patrons.³⁷ However, after reviewing his BWC video, he acknowledged that he did make the statement.³⁸ Officer Kozlowski expressed remorse for making the inappropriate comment, and he apologized, adding that the conduct captured on video is not characteristic of

³⁴ Atts. 120 and 121.

³⁵ Att. 139.

³⁶ CMS Notes CO-1419172, CO-1419300, and CO-1419839.

³⁷ Att. 116, pg. 29, lns. 13 to 16.

³⁸ Att. 116, pg. 29, lns. 17 to 18.

how he normally conducts himself. Given his honesty and acknowledgment regarding his use of inappropriate language, COPA finds Officer Kozlowski's statement to be credible.

COPA was unable to interview [REDACTED] As such, COPA was unable to assess [REDACTED] credibility.

V. ANALYSIS³⁹

a. Officer Humbles's Use of Deadly Force Complied with CPD Policy⁴⁰

COPA finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the use of deadly force by Officer Humbles was objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional to the circumstances he faced. COPA further finds that Officer Humbles engaged in de-escalation tactics as required by CPD policy prior to using deadly force. Specifically, Officer Humbles communicated extensively with [REDACTED] and he attempted to stabilize the situation by using time, distance, and tactical positioning. COPA further finds that Officer Humbles used deadly force as an option of last resort. COPA thus concludes, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Officer Humbles's use of deadly force complied with CPD policy.

CPD's stated highest priority is the sanctity of human life. In all aspects of their conduct, CPD expects that its members act with the foremost regard for the preservation of human life and the safety of all persons involved.⁴¹ CPD members are only authorized to use force that is objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional, under the totality of the circumstances, in order to provide for the safety of any person or CPD member, stop an attack, make an arrest, bring a person or situation safely under control, or prevent escape.⁴² This means that CPD members will only resort to the use of force when required under the circumstances to serve a lawful purpose.⁴³ CPD members will use only the force that is proportional to the threat, actions, and level of resistance offered by a person.⁴⁴

The use of deadly force is permitted only as a last resort when necessary to protect against an imminent threat to life or to prevent great bodily harm to the CPD member or another person.⁴⁵ A CPD member may use deadly force in only two situations: (1) to prevent "death or great bodily harm from an imminent threat posed to the sworn member or to another person;" or (2) to prevent "an arrest from being defeated by resistance or escape, where the person to be arrested poses an

³⁹ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, *see* Appendix B.

⁴⁰ Att. 87, G03-02, De-escalation, Response to Resistance, and Use of Force (effective June 28, 2023 to present).

⁴¹ Att. 87, G03-02(II)(A).

⁴² Att. 87, G03-02(III)(B).

⁴³ Att. 87, G03-02(II)(C).

⁴⁴ Att. 87, G03-02(III)(B)(3).

⁴⁵ Att. 87, G03-02(IV)(C).

imminent threat of death or great bodily harm to a sworn member or another person unless arrested without delay.”⁴⁶

A threat is imminent “when it is objectively reasonable to believe that: (1) the person’s actions are immediately likely to cause death or great bodily harm to the member or others unless action is taken; **and** (2) the person has the means or instruments to cause death or great bodily harm; **and** (3) the person has the opportunity and ability to cause death or great bodily harm.”⁴⁷ CPD members are expected to modify the force they use as circumstances change and in ways that are consistent with officer safety, including stopping the use of force when it is no longer necessary.⁴⁸

Based on its review of the evidence, COPA finds that it is more likely than not that Officer Humbles’s use of deadly force was objectively reasonable in light of the imminent threat he and Officer Kozlowski faced. Officer Humbles reported that he fired at [REDACTED] after [REDACTED] discharged his firearm. Video footage confirms that [REDACTED] had a firearm in his hands, and Officer Humbles’s shot occurred after [REDACTED] firearm was discharged. The evidence thus suggests that [REDACTED] was an imminent threat. Specifically, [REDACTED] firearm discharged as the officers were attempting to disarm him. According to Officer Humbles, [REDACTED] pointed his gun at both Officer Kozlowski and bar patrons who were nearby.⁴⁹ COPA finds it was objectively reasonable for Officer Humbles to believe that [REDACTED] actions were immediately likely to cause death or great bodily harm to him, Officer Kozlowski, or others. The evidence further suggests that [REDACTED] had the means or instruments, and the opportunity and ability, to cause death or great bodily harm. [REDACTED] firearm discharged towards the officers, giving Officer Humbles a reasonable belief that [REDACTED] weapon was functional and that [REDACTED] was willing to use it against the officers.

The evidence further indicates that Officer Humbles used only the amount of force necessary based on the circumstances he faced. Specifically, the evidence shows that Officer Humbles continually assessed the necessity for the use of force and employed de-escalation techniques prior to using deadly force.⁵⁰ For example, when Officer Humbles first encountered [REDACTED] the officer immediately engaged in verbal communication with him, warning him that he would be shot, in an attempt to convince him to drop his weapon.⁵¹ It was only when [REDACTED] weapon fired that Officer Humbles resorted to the use of deadly force.⁵² In addition, Officer Humbles’s use of deadly force was proportional to the threat he faced. Officer Humbles fired his weapon only after [REDACTED] appeared to have discharged his weapon towards the officers. Notably,

⁴⁶ Att. 87, G03-02(IV)(C)(1 to 2).

⁴⁷ Att. 87, G03-02(IV)(B)(1 to 3)(emphasis added).

⁴⁸ Att. 87, G03-02(II)(D)(2).

⁴⁹ Att. 116, pg. 21, lns. 15 to 16; Att. 128, pg. 11, lns. 2 to 10.

⁵⁰ Specifically, Officer Humbles attempted to use communication, tactical positioning, and time as a tactic to de-escalate the encounter. *See* Att. 88, G03-02-01(III), Response to Resistance and Force Options (effective June 28, 2023, to present) ; *see also* Att. 5 at 2:20 to 2:30; Att. 55 at 34:25 to 34:52.

⁵¹ Att. 5 at 2:20 to 2:30; Att. 128, pg. 10, ln. 23 to pg. 11, ln. 5.

⁵² Att. 55 at 34:25 to 34:52.

Officer Humbles only fired one time, and he stopped firing once [REDACTED] no longer posed a threat. Based on a totality of the circumstances, COPA finds by a preponderance of the evidence that Officer Humbles's use of deadly force complied with CPD policy.

b. Officer Kozlowski's use of time, distance, and positioning to prevent or reduce the need for the use of deadly force

COPA finds Allegation #1, that Officer Kozlowski failed to use time, distance, or positioning to prevent or reduce the need for the use of deadly force, without justification, is **not sustained**.

CPD defines an investigatory stop as the temporary detention and questioning of a person in the vicinity where the person was stopped based on reasonable articulable suspicion that the person is committing, is about to commit, or has committed a criminal offense.⁵³ Additionally, CPD members are responsible for ensuring public safety by deterring and responding to crime.⁵⁴ Here, [REDACTED] was approached for such a reason.

CPD officers were dispatched to El Zapotlan Bar after a member of the public reported that he had been threatened with a firearm by a person who had entered El Zapotlan Bar, which the officers understood to be an aggravated assault. Based on that information, the officers appropriately responded to El Zapotlan Bar to ensure the safety of its patrons. Given the information provided by the OEMC dispatcher, combined with Officer Kozlowski's observation of a person who matched the description of the subject, there was enough reasonable articulable suspicion for Officer Kozlowski (and Officer Strauss) to conduct an investigatory stop of [REDACTED]

In Officer Kozlowski's statement to COPA, he stated that many 911 calls about firearm pointing are not legitimate, but they still have to be taken seriously because there is a potential danger to the public.⁵⁵ Officer Kozlowski believed that if [REDACTED] was still armed, he (Officer Kozlowski) would have a better chance to disarm [REDACTED] and defend himself and the public if he was positioned closer to [REDACTED].⁵⁶ Thus, Officer Kozlowski also used time, distance, and positioning to prevent or reduce the need for force. Officer Kozlowski first asked [REDACTED] if he had pulled a firearm on anyone. When [REDACTED] reached for his firearm, Officer Kozlowski grabbed [REDACTED] and tried to control him. Officer Kozlowski explained that he feared that evacuating the bar prior to questioning [REDACTED] would alert [REDACTED] and potentially lead him to start shooting, which would threaten the public and eliminate any tactical advantage or positioning.⁵⁷ In fact, [REDACTED] did create a dangerous environment inside of El Zapotlan Bar by entering with a firearm, appearing to draw his firearm when questioned by the officers, and by struggling with the officers over the firearm instead of relinquishing it.

⁵³ Att. 138, S04-13-09(II)(A), Investigatory Stop System (effective July 10, 2017 to February 2, 2026).

⁵⁴ Att. 138, S04-13-09(III)(B).

⁵⁵ Att. 116, pg. 44, lns. 10 to 23.

⁵⁶ Att. 116, pg. 45, lns. 2 to 5 and pg. 46, lns. 9 to 16.

⁵⁷ Att. 116, pg. 46, lns. 3 to 18.

Although COPA recognizes that it may have been possible for Officer Kozlowski to wait for additional officers, the evidence shows that he used time, communication, and tactical positioning to confront [REDACTED]. While COPA cannot fully exonerate Officer Kozlowski by clear and convincing evidence, COPA does find, by a preponderance of the evidence, that he used de-escalation tactics in an attempt to prevent or reduce the need for the use of deadly force. Therefore, COPA finds allegation #1 against Officer Kozlowski is **not sustained**.

c. Officer Kozlowski's use of derogatory and disrespectful language

COPA finds Allegation #2, that Officer Kozlowski directed derogatory language at a member of the public by stating words to the effect of, "Whoever fucking searched him is a retard," without justification, is **sustained**. CPD policy requires its members to "interact with all members of the public in an unbiased, fair, and respectful manner,"⁵⁸ "treat all persons with the courtesy and dignity which is inherently due to every person as a human being,"⁵⁹ and "act, speak, and conduct themselves in a courteous, respectful, and professional manner."⁶⁰ CPD members are also prohibited from exhibiting a condescending attitude or directing any derogatory terms toward any person in any manner, and they may not use language or take action intended to taunt or denigrate an individual, including using derogatory language.⁶¹ Additionally, Rule 8 of the CPD Rules of Conduct prohibits the disrespect or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty.⁶²

In this instance, it is undisputed that Officer Kozlowski used language that was derogatory and offensive. Although Officer Kozlowski did not recall making the statement, after reviewing his BWC footage he acknowledged that he said it.⁶³ Officer Kozlowski added that he was not directing the statement at a specific person; instead, it was a general statement of frustration.⁶⁴

Officer Kozlowski explained that this officer-involved shooting reintroduced a heightened level of emotional stress, similar to what he had experienced after his involvement in an officer-involved fatal traffic collision that occurred less than two weeks prior to this incident.⁶⁵ Officer Kozlowski added that he does not normally use such language, but he was upset because the bar's security officers had assured him that all patrons, including [REDACTED] had been searched before they were allowed entry into the bar; however, the bar security team failed to do their job.⁶⁶

⁵⁸ Att. 86, G02-01(III)(B)(1), Protection of Human Rights (effective June 30, 2022 to present).

⁵⁹ Att. 86, G02-01(III)(B)(2).

⁶⁰ Att. 86, G02-01(III)(B)(3).

⁶¹ Att. 86, G02-01(III)(B)(4).

⁶² Att. 133, Rules and Regulation of the Chicago Police Department, (V), Rule 8.

⁶³ Att. 4 at 6:38 to 6:48; Att. 116, pg. 29, lns. 13 to 21.

⁶⁴ Att. 116, pg. 34, lns. 6 to 8.

⁶⁵ Att. 116, pg. 30, lns. 14 to 18; pg. 31, lns. 9 to 24; pg. 32, lns. 2 to 4; and pg. 33, lns. 1 to 10. Note: The traffic collision referenced by Officer Kozlowski is a separate incident that COPA investigated under Log 2024-0007497.

⁶⁶ Att. 116, pg. 34, lns. 1 to 5.

While COPA acknowledges Officer Kozlowski's emotional state after this deadly force incident, COPA must also acknowledge that Officer Kozlowski's duty to remain professional and refrain from using derogatory language was still in effect. Regardless of whether he directed the statement at a specific person, Officer Kozlowski's inappropriate and offensive language was prohibited. Further, Officer Kozlowski was on duty and loudly proclaimed his statement in front of numerous civilians. His conduct brought discredit to CPD and had the potential to impede CPD's efforts to achieve its policies and goals. As such, by a preponderance of the evidence, COPA finds allegation #2 is **sustained**, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Officer Andrzej Kozlowski

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History⁶⁷

Officer Kozlowski has been employed by CPD since June 29, 2015. He has received 107 awards, the highlights of which include one Superintendent's Award of Valor, one Problem Solving Award, two Honorable Mention Ribbon Awards, and five Department Commendation Awards.

Officer Kozlowski's disciplinary history includes a sustained finding for making a materially false statement to the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) by stating that an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) had been completed, when it had not. He received a 120-day suspension as a result of that investigation. (Log 2021-0000413). Additionally, Officer Kozlowski has received three recent SPARs, for a Court Appearance Violation (Reprimand), a Preventable Accident (Reprimand), and a Radio Call Violation (Reprimand).

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officer Kozlowski violated Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9 when he used words to the effect of, "Whoever fucking searched him is a retard." In aggravation, Officer Kozlowski directed this derogatory language at a member of the public in front of a large crowd and while being recorded on BWC, thus bringing discredit to CPD. Additionally, Officer Kozlowski had been a CPD member for nine years at the time of this incident, so his misconduct cannot be attributed to inexperience or inadequate training.

In mitigation, COPA recognizes that Officer Kozlowski had just experienced a stressful and traumatic experience in which two firearms had discharged within close proximity to his head. Additionally, while the language Officer Kozlowski used was inappropriate and disrespectful, COPA acknowledges that it was based on his legitimate frustration with the bar security staff who had failed to properly search [REDACTED] Officer Kozlowski also expressed remorse for his language

⁶⁷ Atts. 140 and 141.

and accepted responsibility for his misconduct. Finally, COPA recognizes Officer Kozlowski’s impressive complimentary history and lack of relevant disciplinary history.

In light of these aggravating and mitigating circumstances, COPA recommends a **Reprimand** and **Retraining** on professionalism.

Approved:

[Redacted Signature]

Steffany Hreno
Acting Deputy Chief Administrator

4/6/2026

Date

[Redacted Signature]

LaKenya White
Chief Administrator

4/6/2026

Date

Appendix A**Case Details**

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	October 12, 2024 / 12:19 am / 3925 S. Kedzie Ave. Chicago, IL
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	October 12, 2024 / 12:40 am
Involved Member #1:	Tyler Humbles / Star #4711 / Employee ID# [REDACTED] / Date of Appointment: December 17, 2018 / Unit of Assignment: 009 / Male / White
Involved Member #2:	Andrzej Kozlowski / Star #11900 / Employee ID# [REDACTED] / Date of Appointment, June 29, 2015 / Unit of Assignment: 009 / Male / White
Involved Member #3	Ryan Schickel / Star #5033 / Employee ID# [REDACTED] / Date of Appointment: January 16, 2024 / Unit of Assignment: 044/009 / Male / White
Involved Member #4	Conor Strauss / Star #4742 Employee ID# [REDACTED] / Date of Appointment: June 05, 2017 / Unit of Assignment 009 / Male / White
Involved Member #5	David Suarez / Star #18169 / Employee ID# [REDACTED] / Date of Appointment: July 16, 2019 / Unit of Assignment: 009 / Male / White
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] Male, 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

- G02-01, Human Rights and Human Resources (effective June 30, 2022 to present).
- G03-02, De-escalation, Response to Resistance, and Use of Force (effective June 28, 2023 to present).
- G03-02-01, Response to Resistance and Force Options (effective June 28, 2023 to present).
- G03-02-03, Firearm Discharge Incidents - Authorized Use and Post-Discharge Administrative Procedures (effective June 28, 2023 to present).
- S04-13-09, Investigatory Stop System (effective July 10, 2017 to February 2, 2026).

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.⁶⁸ For example, if the evidence gathered in an investigation establishes that it is more likely that the conduct complied with CPD 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.”⁶⁹

⁶⁸ 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).

⁶⁹ *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