



Log # 2024-8451

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On November 19, 2024, at approximately 3:12 pm, 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 2:23 pm at 5637 W Leland Ave.² COPA learned that off-duty Detective (Det.) Chris Matias observed an individual, now identified as [REDACTED] stabbing his estranged wife, [REDACTED] on the sidewalk. Det. Matias discharged his firearm at [REDACTED] striking him in his left arm and the left side of his torso. Upon review of the evidence, COPA determined that Det. Matias's firearm discharge complied with CPD policy, but COPA served an allegation that Det. Matias failed to qualify with the firearm he was carrying during the incident. Following its investigation, COPA reached a **Sustained** finding that Det. Matias failed to qualify annually with his revolver before carrying it off duty.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE³

On November 19, 2024, shortly before 2:23 pm, Det. Matias was off duty, dressed in civilian clothing, and walking westbound on the south sidewalk on the 5600 block of W Leland Ave.⁴ Det. Matias walked past [REDACTED] who was walking eastbound on the sidewalk.⁵ Shortly after Det. Matias and [REDACTED] crossed paths, [REDACTED] exited a van parked on the street and attacked her with a knife, slashing at her throat.⁶ [REDACTED] began screaming, which alerted Det. Matias to the attack.⁷ Det. Matias ran back towards them, drawing a revolver with a five-round capacity as he approached.⁸ Det. Matias saw that [REDACTED] had fallen to the ground and that [REDACTED] was continuing to attack her with the

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 Chicago Police Department member discharges their firearm. 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 third-party video, police reports, civilian interviews, and officer interviews.

⁴ Att. 2 at 50:49; Att. 178, pg. 8, lns. 1 to 6.

⁵ Att. 2 at 50:49 to 51:08.

⁶ Att. 162; Att. 178, pg. 8, lns. 6 to 14, and pg. 11, lns. 3 to 9.

⁷ Att. 2 at 51:12.

⁸ Att. 2 at 51:19 to 51:27; Att. 178, pg. 11, ln. 10, to pg. 12, ln. 3.

knife.⁹ Det. Matias discharged his revolver at [REDACTED] firing all five rounds and striking [REDACTED] twice: once in his left arm and once in the left side of his torso.¹⁰

As Det. Matias was firing, [REDACTED] ran into the street towards his van.¹¹ As [REDACTED] approached the driver's side door of the van, he threw a knife at Det. Matias.¹² Det. Matias ran after him, and [REDACTED] opened the door and sat in the driver's seat of the van.¹³ Det. Matias approached the van, announced his office, and began to struggle with [REDACTED] as he ordered [REDACTED] to get out of the vehicle.¹⁴ [REDACTED] then retrieved and brandished another knife, and Det. Matias—whose firearm was now empty—backed away to call 911.¹⁵ [REDACTED] walked back over to [REDACTED] who was lying motionless on the sidewalk, and stabbed her multiple times, leaving one knife stuck in her chest.¹⁶ [REDACTED] then stood, threw another knife at Det. Matias, and returned to his van.¹⁷

[REDACTED] drove away heading east, and Det. Matias called 911 to report the incident.¹⁸ CPD officers and Chicago Fire Department (CFD) personnel arrived at the location.¹⁹ [REDACTED] was deceased prior to the arrival of CPD and CFD.²⁰ CFD rendered medical aid to Det. Matias, who suffered an injury to his right leg by unknown means.²¹

Several hours later, at approximately 5:40 pm, CPD members located [REDACTED] deceased inside his parked van in the 5500 block of W Leland Ave.²² The vehicle was still running, and a plastic hose connected the tailpipe to the passenger cabin of the van via a hole cut in the floor.²³ The Medical Examiner determined that [REDACTED] cause of death was carbon monoxide toxicity due to inhalation of motor vehicle exhaust in an enclosed space.²⁴ The Medical Examiner also recovered a fragmented bullet from [REDACTED] left collarbone, along with additional metal fragments from his upper left arm, and a fired bullet was recovered from his left

⁹ Att. 178, pg. 8, lns. 11 to 14.

¹⁰ Att. 1 at 0:00; Att. 2 at 51:27 to 51:33; Att. 165, pg. 6; Att. 178, pg. 12, ln. 6, to pg. 13, ln. 18; Att. 193, pgs. 2 to 4.

¹¹ Att. 1 at 0:01.

¹² Att. 1 at 0:03; Att. 165, pg. 6; Att. 178, pg. 14, lns. 20 to 22. This knife was later recovered from the front yard at 5633 W Leland Ave., and the Illinois State Police (ISP) laboratory determined that biological material on the blade of the knife matched [REDACTED] DNA profile, and that [REDACTED] DNA profile was excluded. Atts. 78, 165, and 214; Att. 170, pgs. 15, 22, 23, and 124 to 127.

¹³ Att. 1 at 0:05.

¹⁴ Att. 1 at 0:08 to 0:25; Att. 7 at 0:00 to 0:14; Att. 178, pg. 14, ln. 22, to pg. 15, ln. 2.

¹⁵ Att. 1 at 0:26; Att. 4 at 0:00 to 0:09; Att. 178, pg. 15, lns. 2 to 12.

¹⁶ Att. 4 at 0:10 to 0:16; Att. 189, pg. 5.

¹⁷ Att. 4 at 0:17 to 0:30; Att. 73. This knife was later recovered from the street near 5632 W Leland Ave., and the ISP laboratory determined that biological material on the blade of the knife matched [REDACTED] DNA profile. Atts. 78, 165, and 214; Att. 170, pgs. 20, 35 to 37, and 128 to 130.

¹⁸ Att. 8 at 28:04; Att. 111; Att. 178, pg. 15, ln. 23, to pg. 16, ln. 12.

¹⁹ Att. 45 at 2:48 to 5:58; Att. 48 at 2:47 to 5:48.

²⁰ Att. 205, pg. 1.

²¹ Att. 178, pg. 16, lns. 16 to 19, and pg. 17, ln. 11, to pg. 18, ln. 15.

²² Att. 186, pg. 7.

²³ Att. 170, pgs. 75 to 76, 86, and 96 to 100.

²⁴ Att. 193, pg. 9.

abdominal wall.²⁵ The Illinois State Police (ISP) laboratory determined that the fired bullet and fired bullet fragments recovered by the Medical Examiner had been fired by Det. Matias's revolver.²⁶

At the time of this event, [REDACTED] was on electronic monitoring after being arrested on October 7, 2024, for domestic battery and attempting to kidnap [REDACTED].²⁷

III. ALLEGATIONS

Pursuant to section 2-78-120 of the Municipal Code of Chicago, COPA has a duty to investigate all incidents in which a CPD member discharges their firearm. During its investigation of this incident, COPA did not find evidence to support allegations related to Det. Matias's firearm discharge.

Det. Chris Matias:

- Failing to qualify annually with his Smith & Wesson 38 Special Revolver before carrying the weapon off-duty.
 - Sustained; Violation of Rules 5, 6, and 10

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 to accurately recall the event from memory.

COPA found Det. Matias to be credible in his statement.²⁸ Det. Matias did not have difficulty remembering the details of the incident, and his account was consistent with the account given by [REDACTED], a civilian who observed the incident from across the street.²⁹ Although the only available video recording of the incident began after Det. Matias started firing at [REDACTED] it is clear from the video that [REDACTED] had just attacked [REDACTED] [REDACTED] he was standing over her with a knife when the recording began.³⁰ The reliability of Det. Matias's statement is further supported by its consistency with the video recording showing Det. Matias walk past [REDACTED] prior to the shooting, and the struggle between Det. Matias and [REDACTED] after Det. Matias stopped firing.³¹

²⁵ Att. 193, pgs. 2 to 4.

²⁶ Atts. 86, 87, 98, 165, and 179.

²⁷ Atts. 56, 57, and 197; Att. 170, pg. 90.

²⁸ See Att. 178.

²⁹ See Att. 162.

³⁰ Att. 1 at 0:00.

³¹ Att. 1 at 0:05 to 0:30.

V. ANALYSIS³²

a. Use of Deadly Force

COPA finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the use of deadly force by Det. Matias was objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional to the circumstances he faced. COPA further finds that the circumstances did not permit Det. Matias to employ de-escalation techniques prior to using deadly force. Specifically, Det. Matias discharged his firearm at [REDACTED] after seeing that [REDACTED] was armed with a knife and stabbing [REDACTED].³³ COPA further finds that Det. Matias used deadly force as an option of last resort. COPA thus concludes by a preponderance of the evidence that Det. Matias'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.³⁴ 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.³⁵ This means that CPD members may use only the amount of force necessary to serve a lawful purpose.³⁶ CPD members will use only the force that is proportional to the threat, actions, and level of resistance offered by a person.³⁷

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 member or another person.³⁸ 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 imminent threat of death or great bodily harm to a sworn member or another person unless arrested without delay."³⁹

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."⁴⁰

³² For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, *see* Appendix B.

³³ Att. 178, pg. 8, lns. 14 to 15.

³⁴ Att. 210, G03-02(II)(A), De-escalation, Response to Resistance, and Use of Force (effective June 28, 2023, to present).

³⁵ Att. 210, G03-02(III)(B).

³⁶ Att. 210, G03-02(II)(C).

³⁷ Att. 210, G03-02(III)(B)(3).

³⁸ Att. 210, G03-02(IV)(C).

³⁹ Att. 210, G03-02(IV)(C)(1-2).

⁴⁰ Att. 210, G03-02(IV)(B)(1-3) (emphasis added).

Officers are expected to modify the use of force as circumstances change and in ways that are consistent with officer safety, including stopping the use of force when it is no longer necessary.⁴¹

Based on its review of the evidence, COPA finds that it is more likely than not that Det. Matias's use of deadly force was objectively reasonable in light of the imminent threat presented by [REDACTED]. Det. Matias reported that he initially believed [REDACTED] was punching [REDACTED] and that he drew and discharged his firearm only after getting closer and seeing that [REDACTED] was stabbing [REDACTED].⁴² Det. Matias continued to fire at [REDACTED] after [REDACTED] backed away from [REDACTED].⁴³ However, [REDACTED] was still armed with a knife and presented a continued threat to both Det. Matias and [REDACTED] as evidenced by the fact that [REDACTED] subsequently continued his attack on [REDACTED] and threw two knives at Det. Matias.⁴⁴ It was thus objectively reasonable for Det. Matias to believe that [REDACTED] actions were immediately likely to cause death or great bodily harm.⁴⁵ Additionally, COPA finds that [REDACTED] had the means or instruments and the opportunity and ability to cause death or great bodily harm.

The evidence further indicates that Det. Matias used only the amount of force necessary based on the circumstances he faced. Specifically, the evidence shows that he continually assessed the necessity for the use of force. When Det. Matias turned around after hearing [REDACTED] scream, he saw [REDACTED] attacking her, and Det. Matias ran towards them to intervene.⁴⁶ It was only after Det. Matias got closer and realized that [REDACTED] was stabbing [REDACTED] that Det. Matias resorted to the use of deadly force.⁴⁷ In addition, Det. Matias's use of deadly force was proportional to the threat posed by [REDACTED]. Det. Matias first discharged his firearm while [REDACTED] was stabbing [REDACTED] with a knife.⁴⁸ Det. Matias continued firing at [REDACTED] after [REDACTED] moved away from [REDACTED] but [REDACTED] was still armed with at least one knife.⁴⁹ Det. Matias fired at [REDACTED] five times, and he stopped firing after expending all the ammunition in his firearm.⁵⁰ [REDACTED] continued to be a threat at that time, despite having been shot by Det. Matias. After Det. Matias stopped firing, [REDACTED] threw two knives at Det. Matias and returned to [REDACTED] to stab her again after Det. Matias was forced to

⁴¹ Att. 210, G03-02(II)(D)(2).

⁴² Att. 178, pg. 11, ln. 22, to pg. 12, ln. 9.

⁴³ Att. 1 at 0:00.

⁴⁴ Att. 178, pg. 12, ln. 13, to pg. 13, ln. 8.

⁴⁵ By his actions, [REDACTED] met the definition of an "assailant" under CPD policy. *See* Att. 211, G03-02-01(IV)(C), Response to Resistance and Force Options (effective June 28, 2023, to present).

⁴⁶ Att. 178, pg. 8, lns. 6 to 13.

⁴⁷ Att. 178, pg. 11, ln. 22, to pg. 12, ln. 9.

⁴⁸ Att. 178, pg. 8, lns. 14 to 15.

⁴⁹ Att. 178, pg. 12, ln. 13, to pg. 13, ln. 8.

⁵⁰ Att. 165, pgs. 3 to 4; Att. 178, pg. 12, lns. 13 to 15.

retreat.⁵¹ Based on a totality of the circumstances, COPA finds by a preponderance of the evidence that Det. Matias's use of deadly force complied with CPD policy.

b. Firearm Qualification

COPA finds the allegation that Det. Matias failed to qualify annually with his Smith & Wesson 38 Special Revolver before carrying the weapon off duty, is **Sustained**.

CPD members must complete the annual prescribed weapon qualification program for any firearm that the member carries on or off duty.⁵² CPD training records show that prior to this incident, Det. Matias qualified with a SIG Sauer P228 semi-automatic pistol on June 28, 2024, and that he qualified using that pistol every year going back to 2010.⁵³ At the time of this incident, however, Det. Matias was carrying a Smith & Wesson Airweight .38 Special revolver.⁵⁴

In his statement to COPA, Det. Matias acknowledged that he had not completed the weapon qualification program with his Smith & Wesson revolver in the past year.⁵⁵ He explained that at the time of the incident, he was on medical leave from CPD due to a shoulder injury, and he was carrying the revolver because it was lighter than the pistol he had qualified with.⁵⁶ By Det. Matias's own admission, he was carrying a firearm that he had not qualified with. Accordingly, COPA finds by a preponderance of evidence that Det. Matias violated Rules 5, 6, and 10, and this allegation is **Sustained**.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Detective Chris Matias

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History⁵⁷

Det. Matias has been employed by CPD since November 22, 1993, and he was promoted to the position of detective on July 1, 2003. Det. Matias has received the Superintendent's Award of Merit, the Problem Solving Award, 16 Department Commendation Awards, 43 Honorable Mention Certificates, 12 complimentary letters, and at least 32 other awards and commendations. Det. Matias has no recent disciplinary history.⁵⁸

⁵¹ Att. 1 at 0:03; Att. 4 at 0:10 to 0:22.

⁵² Att. 209, U04-02(II)(D)(4)(a), Department Approved Weapons and Ammunition (effective May 7, 2021, to present).

⁵³ Att. 164, pgs. 5 to 6.

⁵⁴ Att. 165, pg. 3.

⁵⁵ Att. 178, pg. 24, lns. 5 to 17, and pg. 27, ln. 14, to pg. 28, ln. 2.

⁵⁶ Att. 178, pg. 26, ln. 14, to pg. 27, ln. 5.

⁵⁷ Att. 215.

⁵⁸ Det. Matias was suspended for 3 days for an April 2004 incident involving neglect of duty. Att. 216. Because this incident occurred more than 20 years ago and because Det. Matias has no other history of disciplinary action, COPA did not consider the April 2004 incident when determining its disciplinary recommendation in this matter.

ii. Recommended Discipline

Here, COPA has found that Det. Matias violated Rules 5, 6, and 10 by failing to qualify with his revolver before carrying that firearm while off duty. In aggravation, COPA notes that CPD requires sworn members to receive training from a certified instructor before carrying any firearm on or off duty, and to demonstrate proficiency with the firearm during annual qualification. By choosing to carry a firearm that he had not qualified with, Det. Matias demonstrated a lack of appreciation for an important safety directive. In mitigation, COPA notes that Det. Matias was on medical leave and recovering from a shoulder injury at the time of this incident, and he chose to carry a lighter-weight firearm because of his injury. COPA also credits Det. Matias for heroically intervening and attempting to stop a brutal attack against an innocent civilian, which placed his own life in jeopardy, while he was off duty.

Based on these aggravating and mitigating factors, and considering Det. Matias’s considerable complimentary history and lack of disciplinary history, COPA recommends that Det. Matias receive a **Reprimand**.

Approved:

[Redacted Signature]

Steffany Hreno
Acting Deputy Chief Administrator

5/8/2026

Date

[Redacted Signature]

LaKenya White
Chief Administrator

5/8/2026

Date

Appendix A

Case Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	November 19, 2024 / 2:23 pm / 5637 W Leland Ave., Chicago, IL 60630
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	November 19, 2024 / 3:12 pm
Involved Member #1:	Det. Chris Matias, Star #20592, Employee ID # [REDACTED] DOA: November 22, 1993, Unit: 640, Male, Hispanic
Involved Individual #2:	[REDACTED] Male, White

Applicable Rules

- ☒ **Rule 5:** Failure to perform any duty.
- ☒ **Rule 6:** Disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.
- ☒ **Rule 10:** Inattention to duty.

Applicable Policies and Laws

- 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)
- U04-02: Department Approved Weapons and Ammunition (effective May 7, 2021, 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.⁵⁹ 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.”⁶⁰

⁵⁹ See *Avery v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 216 Ill. 2d 100, 191 (2005) (“A proposition proved by a preponderance of the evidence is one that has been found to be more probably true than not true.”).

⁶⁰ *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