



Log # 2023-0005446

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On November 19, 2023, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received an Initiation Report complaint from Chicago Police Department (CPD) Lieutenant Richard Unizycki reporting that Officer Aislinn Crocker “used multiple conditions of a taser discharge along with a baton incident,”² indicating that these use-of-force incidents may require further review. COPA took jurisdiction pursuant to M.C.C. 2-78-120(b).³

Upon review of the evidence, COPA served allegations on Officer Crocker that she utilized a baton to strike ██████████ and discharged a taser at ██████████ without justification. Following its investigation, COPA exonerated Officer Crocker from the allegations.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE⁴

On the evening of November 18, 2023, CTA security called 911 to report an alleged assault in progress involving an intoxicated individual, later identified as ██████████ CPD officers were dispatched to the CTA Red Line at the Jackson Boulevard stop at approximately 8:09 pm. ██████████ was reported to be following and harassing an underage female as well as fighting with women who were trying to get away from him.⁵ Officer Crocker and Officer Anna Pachuta were dispatched to the call. Officer Essoromawe Karma, who was working alone, heard the call, responded, and arrived at the scene first.

Officer Karma came upon ██████████ arguing with an unknown individual on the underground Red Line platform.⁶ As Officer Karma approached ██████████ began to walk away.⁷ Officer Karma ordered ██████████ to stop, but ██████████ continued to walk away. ██████████ picked up a backpack from the platform.⁸

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 Att. 7, CPD Initiation Report.

³ 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.

⁴ 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 observation device (POD), third-party video, police reports, and officer interviews.

⁵ Att. 27, from 4:20 to 4:42.

⁶ Att. 1, from 0:45 to 0:55, and Att. 13, from 3:45 to 4:00.

⁷ Att. 13, from 3:49 to 4:00.

⁸ Att. 13, from 4:00 to 4:05.

Officer Karma repeatedly instructed ██████ to put ██████ hands behind his back and notified ██████ that Officer Karma would “tase” ██████ if ██████ did not comply.⁹ ██████ did not comply and continued to walk away. Officer Karma did not discharge his taser but applied one handcuff to ██████ right wrist and a second set of handcuffs attached to the handcuffs already attached to ██████ wrist. Officer Karma told ██████ he was, “being detained for questioning,” and again gave ██████ orders to place his hands behind his back.¹⁰ ██████ did not comply. ██████ defeated Officer Karma’s attempts to handcuff ██████ by pulling away from Officer Karma.¹¹ A struggle between Officer Karma and ██████ ensued.¹²

Officer Crocker was next to arrive on the scene. Officer Karma handed his taser to Officer Crocker as Officer Karma continued to attempt to handcuff ██████¹³ Officer Pachuta arrived and began to assist Officer Karma.¹⁴ ██████ who still had two sets of handcuffs dangling from his right wrist, pulled away from the officers and swung his arms, striking Officer Karma.



Screenshot from Att. 12 at 3:09: ██████ on the train platform with two sets of handcuffs attached to his right wrist.

Officer Crocker used her baton to strike ██████ five times.¹⁵ ██████ continued to struggle. Officer Crocker, using Officer Karma’s taser, discharged the taser into ██████ (deployed probes) which resulted in ██████ falling to the ground.¹⁶ Once ██████ was on the ground, Officers Karma and Pachuta redoubled their efforts to restrain ██████ with handcuffs. ██████ continued to struggle. Officer Crocker “arced” the taser, delivering additional electrical current from the device to the probes that were

⁹ Att. 13, from 4:05 to 4:20.

¹⁰ Att. 13, from 4:20 to 4:38.

¹¹ Att. 13, from 4:10 to 5:10.

¹² Att. 13, from 4:40 to 4:55, and Att. 1, from 1:45 to 3:50.

¹³ Att. 12, from 2:50 to 3:05.

¹⁴ Att. 10, from 3:00 to 3:10.

¹⁵ Att. 12, from 3:05 to 3:15, and Att. 17, Officer Crocker’s TRR.

¹⁶ Att. 12, from 3:13 to 3:16, and Att. 1, from 4:05 to 4:15.

already attached to [REDACTED] body; however, this had no effect. [REDACTED] continued to struggle and not allow himself to be handcuffed. At this time, Officer Karma, Officer Pachuta, and [REDACTED] were positioned on the ground near the edge of the platform. A crowd of onlookers formed nearby. Officer Crocker used the taser to drive stun [REDACTED] thigh (she placed the device directly against [REDACTED] body and activated it); this had the effect of gaining [REDACTED] compliance, allowing [REDACTED] to be handcuffed and taken into police custody.

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer Aislinn Crocker:

1. Utilizing a baton to strike [REDACTED] without justification, in violation of G03-02-07.
 - Exonerated
2. Discharging a taser, without justification, in violation of G03-02-04.
 - Exonerated

IV. CREDIBILITY ASSESSMENT

The credibility of an individual relies primarily on two factors: the individual's truthfulness and 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 later accurately recall the event from memory.

During COPA's investigation, no reason presented itself to question the credibility of the testimony provided by the officers regarding the events that occurred. In addition, the four officers who gave statements to COPA provided detailed testimony; their recollection of events was corroborated by the available video footage.

[REDACTED] was not interviewed. The Office of the Cook County Public Defender was representing [REDACTED] in relation to the criminal charges filed against him. Through his attorney, COPA requested that [REDACTED] provide a statement but did not receive permission to speak with [REDACTED]

An additional witness, [REDACTED] was contacted by COPA but declined to provide COPA with a statement, having already provided a statement to CPD.¹⁷ A CTA employee, [REDACTED] was identified as a witness but also did not provide a statement to COPA.¹⁸

¹⁷ Note CO-1369452.

¹⁸ Note CO-1369452. A telephone message was left for the CTA employee but was not returned.

V. ANALYSIS¹⁹

Officer Aislinn Crocker

Overall, state law governs a peace officer’s use of force in making arrests. “A peace officer, or any person whom he has summoned or directed to assist him, need not retreat or desist from efforts to make a lawful arrest because of resistance or threatened resistance to the arrest. He is justified in the use of any force which he reasonably believes, based on the totality of the circumstances, to be necessary to effect the arrest and of any force which he reasonably believes, based on the totality of the circumstances, to be necessary to defend himself or another from bodily harm while making the arrest.”²⁰

G03-02-01 sets out CPD’s use of force policy. “Members will modify their force in relation to the amount of continued resistance offered by the person; As the person offers less resistance, the member will immediately lower the amount or type of force used; and, as the person increases resistance, the member may increase the amount or type of force used.²¹ For the purposes of determining the appropriate level of force that may be used against a particular subject, CPD policy characterizes individuals according to their level of cooperation or resistance to the police, as set out below.²²

Cooperative (level 1)	Compliant without direction
Cooperative (level 2)	Compliant only in response to verbal direction
Passive Resister	Non-movement in response to verbal direction
Active Resister	Movement to avoid physical control
Assailant (level 1)	Using or threatening the use of force without weapons Actions likely to cause physical injury
Assailant (level 2)	Aggressively offensive with weapons (Actions not immediately likely to cause death or great bodily harm)
Assailant Deadly Force	Actions immediately likely to cause death or great bodily harm

1. Utilizing a baton to strike [REDACTED]

COPA **exonerates** Officer Crocker from the allegation of utilizing a baton to strike [REDACTED] without justification.

G03-02-07 is CPD’s baton use policy; it authorizes use of a baton as an impact weapon against assailants.²³

¹⁹ For a definition of COPA’s findings and standards of proof, *see* Appendix B.

²⁰ 720 ILCS 5/7-5.

²¹ Att. 43, G03-02-01(II)(F)(1) and (2).

²² Force Options Model, CPD-11.960 (11/17).

²³ Att. 51, G03-02-07(II)(D)(1).

During her statement to COPA, Officer Crocker told COPA that when she arrived to assist Officer Karma she observed Officer Karma attempting to do a takedown on Mr. [REDACTED] Mr. [REDACTED] was doing his utmost to resist the takedown.²⁴ When Officer Crocker arrived on the CTA platform, Officer Karma was attempting to handcuff [REDACTED] but Officer Karma was unable to apply handcuffs to [REDACTED] due to [REDACTED] actions.²⁵ Officer Karma handed his taser to Officer Crocker so that he could use both his hands to handcuff [REDACTED].²⁶

Officer Crocker told COPA, “We're on the platform. The trains are still moving, and I'm so concerned for Karma. Like, what if this guy picks one of us up and just throws us over the -- into the railing and we get electrocuted or get ran over by one of the trains. So that was, like, one of my biggest concerns was the safety for Karma and the safety for ourselves on top of Mr. [REDACTED] because it's like, God forbid, any of us have to die that way. But I was just assuming the worst, like, this is not a safe place to be. Like, the sooner we can get this situation under control, the better it is for all of us.”²⁷

As [REDACTED] continued to struggle with Officer Karma, Officer Crocker repeatedly gave [REDACTED] orders to stop resisting and to get down on the ground.²⁸ During the struggle, Officer Karma was able to move [REDACTED] to a bench in the middle of the platform and placed [REDACTED] into a prone position.²⁹ As Officer Karma continued to struggle with [REDACTED] Officer Crocker stood in front of and beside Officer Karma and [REDACTED] while she held her baton on her right shoulder. Officer Karma wrote in his Tactical Response Report (TRR), “During the struggle, I was still giving verbal warnings to the male to stop moving and stop resisting and place his hands behind his back. The male was able to pull away with the double handcuffs on and while swinging his arms in an attempt to resist he struck me in the arm.”³⁰

Officer Crocker did not immediately strike [REDACTED] with her baton. [REDACTED] pushed himself up from the bench and swung his arms as Officer Karma stood immediately behind [REDACTED] struck Officer Karma. It was at this time that Officer Crocker utilized her baton to strike [REDACTED] in his leg. In her TRR, Officer Crocker stated, “Believing Officer Karma was battered and the offender was an assailant and attempting to defeat the arrest and escape, I used my baton to strike the offender 5 times about the arms and legs so that Officer Karma could handcuff the offender and effect the arrest.”³¹

²⁴ Att. 38, pg. 17, ln. 18 thru pg. 18, ln. 1.

²⁵ Att. 45, from 3:50 to 3:56.

²⁶ Att. 15, Officer Karma TRR.

²⁷ Att. 38, pg. 19, ln. 21 thru pg. 20, ln. 8.

²⁸ Att. 45, from 4:00 to 4:09.

²⁹ Att. 45, from 4:00 to 4:05.

³⁰ Att. 15, Officer Karma TRR.

³¹ Att. 17, Officer Crocker TRR.

Officer Crocker categorized [REDACTED] at the time she struck [REDACTED] with the baton, as an assailant because [REDACTED] actions were likely to cause physical injury.³² BWC footage depicts [REDACTED] escalating his struggle with police, beginning with the first encounter with Officer Karma, and lasting throughout the encounter until [REDACTED] was finally handcuffed and taken into police custody.³³ COPA finds that [REDACTED] flailing of his right arm with the attached handcuffs did, at one point in the encounter, transform him from an active resister into an assailant. For these reasons, COPA finds that Officer Crocker was justified in her use of the baton.

2. Discharging a taser.

COPA **exonerates** Officer Crocker from the allegation of discharging a taser, without justification.

CPD Directive G03-02-04 sets forth CPD policy regarding use of tasers; CPD members may use a taser only in response to assailants and active resisters.³⁴

Officer Crocker discharged the taser three times.

The first time she discharged taser probes into [REDACTED] causing him to fall to the ground.³⁵ Officer Crocker documented in her TRR that, “I observed ([REDACTED] continue to resist arrest and become more combative and more aggressive against Officer Pachuta and Officer Karma.”³⁶ Video footage supports this.³⁷ G03-02-04 states that use of a taser must be objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional under the totality of the circumstances, including using the minimum amount of force needed under the circumstances; CPD members will continually assess the necessity of the use of a taser and whether alternatives may be employed, including the use of de-escalation techniques, other response options, and availability of other resources.³⁸ Footage from Officer Crocker’s BWC shows that Officer Crocker issued loud verbal commands to [REDACTED] to “Get down,” and to “stop resisting” in the time preceding the first taser discharge.³⁹ After deploying her baton, without effect, Officer Crocker discharged the taser into [REDACTED]. G03-02-04 requires a member to give verbal commands and warnings prior to, during, and after the discharge of the taser.⁴⁰ As evidenced in BWC, Officer Crocker gave multiple orders to [REDACTED] and Officer Crocker advised three times, “taser, taser, taser” prior to discharging the taser into [REDACTED].⁴¹

³² Att. 38, pg. 21, ln. 12 thru pg. 21, ln. 14.

³³ Att. 1, from 3:45 to 8:02.

³⁴ Att. 52, G03-02-04(II)(D)(1 and 2).

³⁵ Att. 45, from 4:10 to 4:17.

³⁶ Att. 17, Officer Crocker TRR.

³⁷ Att. 45, from 4:00 to 4:05.

³⁸ Att. 52, G03-02-04(II)(C)(1 and 2).

³⁹ Att. 45, from 4:00 to 4:11.

⁴⁰ Att. 52, G03-02-04(III)(B)(1).

⁴¹ Att. 45, from 4:13 to 4:16.

Appendix A**Case Details**

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	November 18, 2023/8:09 pm/CTA Red Line
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	November 19, 2023/9:17 am
Accused Member:	Aislinn Crocker, star #7501, employee ID # [REDACTED] Date of Appointment September 30, 2022, Unit of Assignment 001, female, White
Involved Member #1:	Essoroma Karma, star #18282, employee ID # [REDACTED] Date of Appointment June 17, 2019, Unit of Assignment 001, male, Black
Involved Member #2:	Anna Pachuta, star # 18477, employee ID # [REDACTED] Date of Appointment June 17, 2019, Unit of Assignment 001, female, White
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] male, Black

Applicable Rules

- Rule 2:** Any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department.
- Rule 3:** Any failure to promote the Department's efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals.
- Rule 5:** Failure to perform any duty.
- Rule 6:** Disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.
- Rule 8:** Disrespect to or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty.
- Rule 9:** Engaging in any unjustified verbal or physical altercation with any person, while on or off duty.
- Rule 10:** Inattention to duty.
- Rule 14:** Making a false report, written or oral.
- Rule 38:** Unlawful or unnecessary use or display of a weapon.

Applicable Policies and Laws

- 720 ILCS 5/7-5, Peace officer's use of force in making arrest
- G03-02-01, RESPONSE TO RESISTANCE AND FORCE OPTIONS, June 28, 2023
- G03-02-07, BATON USE INCIDENTS, June 28, 2023
- Force Options Model, CPD-11.960 (11/17)

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.⁴⁶ 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.”⁴⁷

⁴⁶ 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).

⁴⁷ *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