



Log # 2024-8840

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On December 14, 2024, at approximately 4:51 am, Lieutenant (Lt.) Anthony Sabella telephoned the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) and registered this complaint. Lt. Sabella reported that off-duty Officer Trevor Ben,² off-duty Officer Earl Dorsey, and their three friends, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were dropping [REDACTED] off at his residence at [REDACTED] after a party. When [REDACTED] exited their vehicle, an unknown person(s) discharged a firearm(s) at them several times, striking [REDACTED] in his left wrist. [REDACTED] reentered the vehicle driven by [REDACTED] and the group fled from the attack. As they were driving away, Officer Ben utilized [REDACTED] firearm³ to return fire.⁴

[REDACTED] drove the group to West Suburban Hospital, where [REDACTED] accompanied [REDACTED] into the emergency room to seek medical treatment for his gunshot wound. [REDACTED] drove away with Officers Ben and Dorsey, intending to return to the location of the shooting to retrieve [REDACTED] firearm, which he had dropped when he was shot. Before they could make it back to the scene. Oak Park Police Department (OPPD) officers pulled over their vehicle. After Officers Ben and Dorsey identified themselves as members of the Chicago Police Department (CPD), the OPPD officers contacted CPD. CPD responded to the scene and took over the investigation. Officers Ben and Dorsey were subsequently transported to St. Mary's Hospital, where they spoke with several CPD supervisors in furtherance of this investigation.

Through its investigation, COPA served numerous allegations against the officers. COPA alleged that Officer Ben discharged a firearm without justification, failed to timely and/or accurately notify the Office of Emergency Management and Communication (OEMC) that he discharged a firearm, and failed to ensure the firearm he discharged was secured until it could be submitted to Forensic Services personnel. COPA also served allegations that Officer Ben made a false, misleading, or inaccurate oral report to Sgt. Michael Katsantonos, Lt. Sabella, and Deputy Chief Gabriella Shemash by denying that he discharged a firearm during the shooting incident. Finally, Lt. Sabella also alleged that Officer Ben and Officer Dorsey were both intoxicated while off duty.

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 Officer Ben resigned from CPD effective September 27, 2025. Att. 171.

³ [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] are all Illinois Concealed Carry License holders. Att. 178, pgs. 10 to 11.

⁴ 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 a firearm. Therefore, COPA determined it would be the primary administrative investigative agency in this matter.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE⁵

On the evening of December 13, 2024, Officers Ben and Dorsey attended a party at Legends Grill and Music Venue in Maywood, Illinois with their friends, ██████████⁶ ██████████ and ██████████. They arrived at approximately 11:00 pm and left around 1:00 am.⁷ Officers Ben and Dorsey both reported that neither of them were armed during this incident.⁸

After leaving the party in Maywood, ██████████ drove the group to ██████████ home at ██████████ ██████████⁹ ██████████ stopped along the curb to let ██████████ out.¹⁰ As ██████████ exited the vehicle, ██████████ said to him, "Watch that car. Watch that car."¹¹ ██████████ then observed an older model Chevy Malibu slowly making a U-turn in the intersection behind them.¹² ██████████ proceeded to walk across the street towards his residence. When he reached the parkway, numerous gunshots rang out.¹³ ██████████ who was sitting in the front passenger seat of ██████████ vehicle, turned around in her seat to look at the car that ██████████ had warned ██████████ about. ██████████ stated that she saw an unidentified person shooting at ██████████¹⁴

██████████ explained that when he heard the gunshots, he turned and saw an unidentified person standing outside the Chevy Malibu, shooting at him. ██████████ reacted by attempting to draw his firearm from his holster on his left hip.¹⁵ As ██████████ went to pull his firearm from its holster, the holster also came loose from his pants.¹⁶ ██████████ then felt pain in his left wrist, which caused him to drop his firearm to the ground.¹⁷ As the shots rang out, ██████████ drove his vehicle further down the block, and the unidentified person then began shooting in their direction, striking the rear window of ██████████ vehicle.¹⁸ ██████████ stated that she pulled out her firearm, opened the front passenger door of ██████████ vehicle, and leaned out and returned fire at the unidentified person.¹⁹ ██████████ believed she discharged her firearm four times towards the unidentified person.²⁰ ██████████ stopped his vehicle in the middle of the street, and ██████████ then re-entered the backseat of ██████████ vehicle.²¹

⁵ The following is a summary of what COPA finds most likely occurred during this incident. This summary utilized information from several different sources, including body worn camera (BWC) footage, civilian and officer interviews, event queries, and radio transmission.

⁶ ██████████ is ██████████ boyfriend and ██████████ older brother. ██████████ did not cooperate with COPA's investigation. See CMS Notes CO-1420542, CO-1420549, CO-1422869, CO-1422874.

⁷ Att. 95, pg. 4, line 9 to pg. 9, line 8.

⁸ Att. 165, pg. 13, line 22 to pg. 14, line 5; Att. 170, pg. 25, line 20 to pg. 26, line 7.

⁹ ██████████ drove a black 2021 Jeep Grand Cherokee. Att. 178, pgs. 17 and 24.

¹⁰ Att. 22 at 00:01.

¹¹ Att. 95, pg. 12, lines 11 to 13; Att. 96, pg. 14, lines 19 to 21.

¹² Att. 96, pg. 14, line 22 to pg. 16, line 7.

¹³ Att. 22 from 00:19 to 00:22; Att. 25 at 00:10.

¹⁴ Att. 95, pg. 18, lines 15 to 20.

¹⁵ Att. 96, pg. 22, line 2 to pg. 23, line 21.

¹⁶ Att. 96, pg. 24, line 23 to pg. 24, line 1.

¹⁷ Att. 96, pg. 25, lines 2 to 3 and pg. 26, lines 12 to 24.

¹⁸ Att. 95, pg. 28, lines 8 to 15.

¹⁹ Att. 95, pg. 18, lines 21 to 24, pg. 28, lines 17 to 24.

²⁰ Att. 95, pg. 31, lines 4 to 9.

²¹ Att. 22 at 00:27; Att. 96, pg. 28, lines 3 to 23.

As the gunshots continued, Officer Ben asked for someone to pass him a firearm, at which time [REDACTED] handed him her firearm.²² [REDACTED] then focused her attention on rendering aid to [REDACTED] by wrapping her coat around his gunshot wound.²³ Officer Ben attempted to shoot back at the unidentified person, explaining that he acted in defense of himself and the other occupants of [REDACTED] vehicle.²⁴ However, Officer Ben stated that [REDACTED] weapon did not fire when he pulled the trigger. Attempting to make the firearm operate properly, Officer Ben said he repeatedly performed a tap-rack-assess²⁵ to clear any possible firearm malfunction, but the weapon did not appear to fire even after multiple trigger pulls.²⁶

As the group drove away from the area, [REDACTED] continued to hear gunshots but stated that he believed they came from the unidentified person who shot him. [REDACTED] feared that they were then being chased by the unidentified person.²⁷ [REDACTED] added that he had been unaware that [REDACTED] had passed her firearm to Officer Ben during the shooting incident.²⁸

[REDACTED] then drove the group directly to West Suburban Hospital. On the way to the hospital, [REDACTED] heard Officer Ben repeatedly tell Officer Dorsey to “call it in.” [REDACTED] stated that Officer Dorsey, who was ducked down in the back of [REDACTED] vehicle, spoke into his cellphone. [REDACTED] believed Officer Dorsey called 911 because she thought she heard him report that there were shots fired as he identified himself as an off-duty police officer.²⁹

Once the group reached West Suburban Hospital, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] remained in the emergency room while [REDACTED] Officer Ben, and Officer Dorsey left to retrieve [REDACTED] firearm that he had dropped at the location of the shooting incident.³⁰ Before leaving West Suburban Hospital, Officer Ben handed [REDACTED] firearm back to her. [REDACTED] left her firearm inside [REDACTED] vehicle.³¹ After [REDACTED] Officer Ben, and Officer Dorsey drove away from the hospital, officers from the OPPD arrived and spoke to [REDACTED] who told them that [REDACTED] and the other two men were heading back to where [REDACTED] was shot to retrieve the firearm that [REDACTED] left at the scene.³²

At approximately 1:39 am, several members of the OPPD pulled over [REDACTED] vehicle at 4 S. Austin Boulevard.³³ After confirming the identities of Officers Ben and Dorsey, the OPPD notified CPD of the incident. CPD officers Nicholas Scaletta and Juan Ortiz (Beat 1523) arrived

²² Att. 165, pg. 26, line 15 to pg. 30, line 1.

²³ Att. 95, pg. 32, line 23 to pg. 33, line 4.

²⁴ Att. 165, pg. 32, line 18 to pg. 35, line 22.

²⁵ A “tap-rack” is a tactical maneuver for a firearm that fails to fire. It involves tapping the firearm’s magazine to ensure it is fully inserted, and then racking the firearm’s slide to clear a malfunction and load a new round in the firearm’s chamber.

²⁶ Att. 165, pg. 30, line 3 to 13 and pg. 31, line 13 to pg. 32, line 16.

²⁷ Att. 96, pg. 34, lines 16 to 23.

²⁸ Att. 96, pg. 39, lines 5 to 10.

²⁹ Att. 95, pg. 35, line 19 to pg. 36, line 12.

³⁰ Att. 95, pg. 48, lines 12 to 18; Att. 170, pg. 30, line 10 to pg. 31, line 2; Att. 165, pg. 68, lines 4 to 18.

³¹ Att. 95, pg. 58, lines 21 to pg. 53, lines 16; Att. 165, pg. 50, lines 3 to 16.

³² Att. 95, pg. 50, lines 12 to 22.

³³ Att. 63 at 2:38; Att. 65 at 2:13; Att. 157.

on-scene and spoke with Officers Ben and Dorsey. At no time while speaking to Officers Scaletta or Ortiz did Officer Ben report that he had discharged a firearm, even when the officers asked, although both Officers Ben and Dorsey answered other questions.³⁴

Additionally, while still on the scene of the traffic stop with the OPPD, Officer Ben denied that he had discharged a firearm to Lt. Sabella and Sgt. Michael Katsantones.³⁵ Lt. Sabella said he asked Officer Ben if he fired a weapon, and Officer Ben replied by stating words to the effect of, “I didn’t even have my gun on me. I heard gunfire. I hit the floorboard of the car. I didn’t see anything that happened.”³⁶ Officer Ben also denied being armed. Lt. Sabella explained that he asked the officers whether they had discharged a firearm because, if they had, then it would require different detectives to investigate the incident as an officer-involved shooting.³⁷ Sgt. Katsantones also asked Officer Ben whether he had discharged a weapon, and Officer Ben told him he did not.³⁸

The BWC video shows that Officer Ben repeatedly walked away from the officers conducting the investigation at the traffic stop, frequently turning his back to them as it appeared he was handling his phone.³⁹ At one point, however, Officer Ben re-approached the officers and provided an account of the incident. He relayed that once [REDACTED] exited the vehicle, he observed a man standing on the southeast corner of the intersection, near a silver vehicle, just before the shooting started.⁴⁰

Officer Ben and Officer Dorsey were subsequently transported to St. Mary’s Hospital by separate Chicago Fire Department ambulances.⁴¹ While at St. Mary’s Hospital, Officer Ben and Officer Dorsey were interviewed by several CPD supervisors in furtherance of the shooting investigation. Deputy Chief Gabriella Shemash responded to St. Mary’s Hospital and spoke with Officer Ben. During their initial conversation, Officer Ben denied discharging a firearm during this incident.⁴² Later that morning, however, Sgt. Richard Piek, who was part of the investigation into this shooting incident, confronted Officer Ben with [REDACTED] account of the incident, in the presence of Deputy Chief Shemash. When Officer Ben learned that [REDACTED] had reported that she gave her firearm to him, Officer Ben acknowledged that [REDACTED] handed him her weapon and added that he may have performed a “tap, rack, and assess,” at which time he may have fired her weapon.⁴³

Deputy Chief Shemash stated she believed Officer Ben was intoxicated, and she was not sure if his varying accounts of the incident were attributable to his intoxication. Sgt. Piek did not

³⁴ Atts. 18 and 29.

³⁵ Att. 123, pg. 13, line 18 to pg. 14, line 14; Att. 144, pg. 31, lines 6 to 10.

³⁶ Att. 123, pg. 14, lines 2 to 5 and 10 to 17.

³⁷ Att. 123, pg. 27, line 20 to pg. 28, line 5.

³⁸ Att. 144, pg. 31, lines 6 to 10.

³⁹ Att. 18 at 8:43 to 12:00.

⁴⁰ Att. 18 at 13:49 to 14:20.

⁴¹ Atts. 102 and 103.

⁴² Att. 97, pg. 15, line 16 to pg. 16, line 15.

⁴³ Att. 97, pg. 27, lines 1 to 8; Att. 127, pg. 45, line 21 to pg. 50, line 17.

believe Officer Ben was highly intoxicated, as he was not slurring or falling over.⁴⁴ Sgt. Katsantonos told COPA he initially could not tell if Officer Ben had been drinking, but he later noticed that Officer Ben had bloodshot, watery, and glassy eyes, and his breath smelled strongly of alcohol.⁴⁵ Lt. Sabella told COPA that he observed a “slight odor” of alcohol on Officers Ben and Dorsey when he spoke to them at the scene of the traffic stop and in the ambulance. Lt. Sabella was later instructed to complete an initiation report for the suspicion of intoxication.⁴⁶

Officer Ben told COPA he did not know if he was intoxicated, and he did not remember the results of the breathalyzer test he was administered. COPA’s review of the available BWC footage did not reveal conclusive signs of Officer Ben’s intoxication.⁴⁷ Although he did not answer all questions, he answered some questions without significant slurring. Officer Ben’s gait showed some signs of possible impairment, but he stood upright without assistance and was able to walk to and from the traffic stop without difficulty.

For his part, Officer Dorsey denied being intoxicated. He told COPA that he had multiple drinks but was aware of what was happening, and was able to walk and talk.⁴⁸ He could not remember if he was given the results of the breathalyzer test he was administered.⁴⁹ Sgt. Piek did not believe Officer Dorsey was overly intoxicated in that he was not slurring or “sloppy.”⁵⁰ Additionally, the BWC video shows Officer Dorsey answered questions coherently, and he did not appear to exhibit signs of intoxication as his gait was normal and his speech was not slurred.

In his interview with COPA, Officer Ben explained that during the shooting, he asked for someone to pass him a firearm, at which time [REDACTED] handed him her weapon.⁵¹ Officer Ben attempted to shoot back at the unidentified person, but [REDACTED] weapon did not fire when he pulled the trigger. Officer Ben told COPA that he repeatedly performed a tap-rack-assess to clear any possible firearm malfunction, but the weapon did not fire even after multiple trigger pulls.⁵² Officer Ben said it was possible that he experienced auditory exclusion, which would explain why he did not hear the sound of him discharging [REDACTED] firearm.⁵³ Upon inquiry, Officer Ben stated that when he repeatedly pulled the trigger, he did not feel any recoil, see any muzzle flashes, or smell any gunpowder, all of which led him to believe that he never actually returned fire.⁵⁴ Additionally, Officer Ben acknowledged that when Sgt. Katsantonos asked if he discharged a firearm, he responded that he had not, because he did not believe the firearm was operable.⁵⁵

⁴⁴ Att. 127, pg. 58, lines 3 to 6.

⁴⁵ Att. 144, pgs. 31, line 18 to pg. 32, line 5.

⁴⁶ Att. 123, pg. 18, lines 3 to 11; pg. 26, line 4.

⁴⁷ The result of PO Ben’s breathalyzer test, administered at 6:00 am, indicated that his BrAC was .109.

⁴⁸ Att. 170, pg. 50, lines 21 to 24.

⁴⁹ The result of PO Dorsey’s breathalyzer test, administered at 5:11 am, indicated that his BrAC was .012.

⁵⁰ Att. 127, pg. 57, lines 17 to 23.

⁵¹ Att. 165, pg. 26, line 15 to pg. 30, line 1.

⁵² Att. 165, pg. 30, line 3 to 5.

⁵³ Att. 165, pg. 32, lines 20 to 24.

⁵⁴ Att. 165, pg. 38, lines 12 to 24.

⁵⁵ Att. 165, pg. 53, lines 11 to 20.

Following the incident, evidence technicians (ETs) recovered three firearms owned by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] firearm was a Ruger LCP 380 semi-automatic pistol, which was located under the driver's seat of his vehicle and reportedly was not fired during this incident.⁵⁶ [REDACTED] firearm was a Springfield Armory Hellcat 9mm semi-automatic pistol, which ETs recovered from the street at 1047 S. Mayfield Avenue.⁵⁷ [REDACTED] reported that he dropped his firearm when he was shot and did not fire it during this incident.⁵⁸ Finally, [REDACTED] firearm was a Glock Model 43X 9mm semi-automatic pistol, with a 10-round capacity magazine, which was also recovered from under the driver's seat of [REDACTED] vehicle.⁵⁹ [REDACTED] told COPA that she fired approximately four times during this incident, and ETs recovered five fired cartridge casings headstamped "Hornady 9mm + P Luger 23" from the street at 1046 S. Mayfield Avenue.⁶⁰ Additionally, four fired cartridge casings with the same headstamp were recovered from the rear hatch compartment of [REDACTED] vehicle.⁶¹ Finally, ETs recovered 26 additional fired cartridge casings from the street near 5854 S. Fillmore Avenue, with headstamps RP, Blazer, Troy, or FC.⁶²

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer Trevor Ben:⁶³

1. Being intoxicated.
 - Not Sustained.
2. Failing to timely and/or accurately notify the Office of Emergency Management and Communication that he discharged a firearm, in violation of General Order G03-06.
 - Sustained, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10 and 11.
3. Failing to ensure the firearm he discharged was secured until it could be submitted to Forensic Services personnel, in violation of General Order G03-06.
 - Sustained, Rules in violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10 and 11.
4. Discharging a firearm without justification.
 - Not Sustained.
5. Making a false, misleading, or inaccurate oral report to Sgt. Michael Katsantones by denying that he discharged a firearm during the shooting incident.
 - Sustained, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 14, and 39.

⁵⁶ Att. 178, pgs. 11 and 24.

⁵⁷ Att. 178, pg. 11.

⁵⁸ Att. 178, pg. 26.

⁵⁹ Att. 178, pg. 11; Att. 95, pg. 23, lns. 15 to 18; see also Atts. 91 and 134.

⁶⁰ Att. 95, pg. 31, lns. 4 to 6; Att. 134; Att. 147, Photos #55 to 60.

⁶¹ Att. 91; Att. 134; Att. 149, Photo #53.

⁶² Atts. 134 and 178.

⁶³ Officer Ben resigned and is no longer employed by CPD. As such, COPA will place the sustained allegations in "close hold" status. See Att. 171.

6. Making a false, misleading, or inaccurate oral report to Lt. Anthony Sabella by denying that he discharged a firearm during the shooting incident.
 - Sustained, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 14, and 39.
7. Making a false, misleading, or inaccurate oral report to Deputy Chief Gabriella Shemash by denying that he discharged a firearm during the shooting incident.
 - Sustained, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 14, and 39.

Officer Earl Dorsey:

1. Being intoxicated.
 - Not Sustained.

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 their ability to accurately perceive the event at the time of the incident and then accurately recall the event from memory.

COPA questions the credibility and reliability of Officer Ben's account based on his behavior throughout the incident. First, Officer Ben exhibited arguably evasive behavior during the initial stop by OPPD. Officer Ben failed to answer whether he or Officer Dorsey fired a weapon. Officer Ben several times distanced himself from the investigation by walking away and appearing to manipulate his phone. Sgt. Katsantonos described Officer Ben as initially combative during their interaction, further explaining that by combative he meant that Officer Ben was in an emotional state and was verbally combative. Sgt. Katsantonos recalled that Officer Ben kept walking away, did not follow verbal direction, and "wasn't trying to have a conversation."⁶⁴ Sgt. Katsantonos later said that Officer Ben explained he was acting emotionally because of post-traumatic stress related to his service in the military.⁶⁵ Officer Ben, however, never made that claim to COPA, although he did attribute his failure to admit he fired a weapon to the trauma of the incident itself. However, the BWC video does not appear to show Officer Ben in an excited or emotional state.

Further, Officer Ben apparently stopped cooperating with investigators and instead stated that he needed to speak to his union representative.⁶⁶ The request itself is curious, and Officer Dorsey did not make a similar request. The timing also raises questions, as Officer Ben asked for a union representative after entering an ambulance but before reaching the hospital. Sgt. Piek told COPA that, in his experience, when an officer requests to "rep up" and go to the hospital, the incident is usually treated as a shooting.⁶⁷

⁶⁴ Att. 144, pg. 23, lines 5 to 11 and pg. 23, line 22 to pg. 24 line 6.

⁶⁵ Att. 144, pg. 27, lines 4 to 6.

⁶⁶ Att. 127, pg. 11, line 12 to pg. 12, line 10.

⁶⁷ Att. 127, pg. 16, lines 13 to 18.

Second, Officer Ben initially denied firing a weapon when directly asked by Deputy Chief Shemash while at the hospital. Notably, Officer Ben failed to even mention that he had asked ██████ to pass her firearm to him, or that ██████ had handed her firearm to him during the incident. Officer Ben mentioned this fact only after he was confronted with evidence of a firearm discharge in the back of ██████ vehicle, where he had been sitting. He *then* claimed, with some specificity, that he performed a tap-rack-assess three to four times and that he may have discharged the firearm.

Officer Ben provided several possibilities to explain his inaccurate and unreliable recollection of this incident. According to Officer Ben, these factors include the chaotic and traumatic nature of the incident, him being tired and in a daze, and the fact that he feared for his life.⁶⁸ During his interview with COPA, Officer Ben stated that the amount of alcohol he consumed prior to this incident affected his decision making and memory.⁶⁹ However, Officer Ben also claimed he did not know whether he was intoxicated during the incident, and claimed he did not know the results of the breathalyzer test he took following the incident. Officer Ben's answers suggest an intent to avoid responsibility for potential misconduct, as it is difficult to believe that he did not know whether he was intoxicated.

Despite Officer Ben's claims that he was impaired by alcohol or trauma, he was able to provide a description of the incident minutes after the OPPD stopped their vehicle, including a suspect description and location. His demeanor was calm and his speech was clear.

This investigation determined that there was no reason to question the credibility of Officer Dorsey, ██████⁷⁰ or ██████. Each provided COPA with statements that were consistent with each other's statements, as well as with the physical evidence.

V. ANALYSIS⁷¹

Officer Trevor Ben:

a. Intoxicated while off-duty.

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Ben was intoxicated is **Not Sustained**. CPD policy provides that "[a]lcohol intoxication means that a person's mental or physical functioning is substantially impaired as the result of the use of alcohol."⁷² Additionally, the officer's collective bargaining agreement provides:

⁶⁸ Att. 165, pg. 31, line 20 to pg. 32, line 2.

⁶⁹ Att. 165, pg. 65, lines 9 to 17.

⁷⁰ It appears ██████ incorrectly believed that Officer Dorsey called 911 to report the incident. COPA attributes this to a misperception rather than a lack of truthfulness. ██████ account was otherwise credible and supported by the available evidence.

⁷¹ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, *see* Appendix B.

⁷² Att. 173, S08-01-10(II)(E)(1)(b), Special Situations Involving Allegations of Misconduct (effective April 8, 2019 to present).

[I]f the Officer has discharged his/her weapon off duty and the [alcohol] test reveals the presence of alcohol, the Department shall not discipline the Officer based solely on the results of the alcohol test when the Officer's actions are consistent with the Department's use of force guidelines.⁷³

While at St. Mary's Hospital, Officer Ben informed Deputy Chief Shemash that he had consumed alcohol just prior to this incident. In Deputy Chief Shemash's opinion, Officer Ben was intoxicated when she spoke to him at the hospital.⁷⁴ Additionally, Lt. Sabella and Sgt. Piek stated that Officer Ben appeared to be intoxicated when they interacted with him.⁷⁵ Further, Sgt. Katsantonos recalled that when he spoke to Officer Ben, he could smell a strong odor of alcohol on Officer Ben's breath.⁷⁶ Officer Ben's breathalyzer resulted in a BrAC reading of .109 at 6:01 am, approximately four and a half hours after the shooting.⁷⁷ These results indicate that Officer Ben was intoxicated at the time of this incident. Officer Ben reported drinking several shots of Tequila, as well as several additional shots of Tequila mixed with lemonade.⁷⁸ Officer Ben stated that although he was unsure if he was intoxicated, he consumed enough alcohol that it was probable that his memory of the incident, as well as his decision-making abilities, were negatively affected.⁷⁹

While there is evidence that Officer Ben was intoxicated, as discussed below, Officer Ben's actions were consistent with CPD's use of force policy. Accordingly, to the extent Officer Ben was intoxicated, the allegation that he was intoxicated is **Not Sustained**, based on the language in the collective bargaining agreement discussed above.

b. Firearm Discharge.

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Ben discharged a firearm without justification is **Not Sustained**. CPD's 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.⁸⁰ 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 Department member, stop an attack, make an arrest, bring a person or situation safely under control, or prevent escape.⁸¹ This means that CPD members will only resort to the use of force when required under the circumstances to serve a lawful

⁷³ Agreement between Fraternal Order of Police Chicago Lodge No. 7 and the City of Chicago, Appx. T.

⁷⁴ Att. 97, pg. 16, line 16 to pg. 17, line 6.

⁷⁵ Att. 123, pg. 18, lines 1 to 6; Att. 127, pg. 57, lines 17 to 24.

⁷⁶ Att. 144, pg. 32, lines 2 to 5.

⁷⁷ Att. 162. BrAC is the abbreviation for Breath Alcohol Content.

⁷⁸ Att. 165, pg. 19, lines 10 to 24.

⁷⁹ Att. 165, pg. 65, lines 4 to 17.

⁸⁰ Att. 174, G03-02(II)(A), De-escalation, Response to Resistance, and Use of Force (effective June 28, 2023 to present).

⁸¹ Att. 174, G03-02(III)(B).

purpose.⁸² CPD members will use only the force that is proportional to the threat, actions, and level of resistance offered by a person.⁸³

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.⁸⁴ 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.”⁸⁵

A threat is considered 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.”⁸⁶

Based on a review of the evidence, COPA finds that 1) Officer Ben discharged [REDACTED] firearm from inside [REDACTED] vehicle; and 2) it was objectively reasonable for Officer Ben to discharge the firearm in self-defense or in defense of others. The evidence shows that the five individuals had left a party and were dropping [REDACTED] off at his residence. While on his way from the vehicle to his house, [REDACTED] heard gunshots and was struck by a bullet to his left wrist. [REDACTED] and the remaining occupants of [REDACTED] vehicle saw an unknown individual standing near an older model Chevy Malibu, repeatedly discharging a firearm in their direction.⁸⁷ [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] reported that the unknown individual, without warning or provocation, first shot [REDACTED] and then shot at the vehicle occupied by [REDACTED] Officer Dorsey, and Officer Ben. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] statements are corroborated by the accounts provided by Officer Ben and Officer Dorsey. Additionally, the physical evidence confirms that 26 fired cartridge casings were recovered from the street where the unknown individual was reportedly located.⁸⁸ [REDACTED] medical records from Stroger Hospital also document that he sustained a gunshot wound to the left wrist.⁸⁹

The evidence further shows that [REDACTED] leaned out of the front passenger’s side door and discharged her firearm approximately five times.⁹⁰ Officer Ben asked for someone to pass him a

⁸² Att. 174, G03-02(II)(C).

⁸³ Att. 174, G03-02(III)(B)(3).

⁸⁴ Att. 174, G03-02(IV)(C).

⁸⁵ Att. 174, G03-02(IV)(C)(1-2).

⁸⁶ Att. 174, G03-02(IV)(B)(1-3) (emphasis added).

⁸⁷ Att. 178, pgs. 22 to 26. Note: Officer Dorsey saw the unknown individual prior to the shooting, but he ducked down inside [REDACTED] vehicle when he heard gunshots and did not see the unknown individual fire.

⁸⁸ Att. 134.

⁸⁹ Att. 116, pg. 8.

⁹⁰ Att. 95, pg. 18, lines 21 to 24, pg. 28, lines 17 to 24, pg. 31, lns. 4 to 6; see Att. 134; Att. 147, Photos #55 to 60.

firearm, and [REDACTED] gave him her firearm.⁹¹ Officer Ben then discharged [REDACTED] weapon approximately four times. This is consistent with the physical evidence, which includes four fired cartridge casings recovered from the rear of [REDACTED] vehicle, where Officer Ben had been sitting when he fired.⁹² Further, [REDACTED] told detectives that she heard approximately four gunshots after she handed her firearm to Officer Ben.⁹³

In his COPA interview, Officer Ben explained that when he attempted to return fire, he only did so in defense of himself and the other occupants of [REDACTED] vehicle.⁹⁴ The totality of the circumstances show that the unknown individual posed an imminent threat of death or great bodily harm, and Officer Ben's firearm discharge was objectively reasonable in light of the circumstances he faced. Therefore, COPA finds by a preponderance of the evidence that Officer Ben's use of deadly force complied with CPD policy, and this allegation is **Not Sustained**.

c. Failing to timely and/or accurately notify OEMC.

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Ben failed to timely and/or accurately notify OEMC that he discharged a firearm, in violation of G03-06, is **Sustained**. CPD policy requires officers to notify OEMC following all firearm discharges and officer-involved deaths.⁹⁵ The policy requires the involved member to "immediately notify" OEMC and provide "all relevant information" and request "additional resources."⁹⁶

As discussed above, COPA finds that Officer Ben discharged [REDACTED] firearm during the incident. However, Deputy Chief Shemash reported to COPA that neither Officer Ben nor Officer Dorsey notified OEMC of the shooting incident.⁹⁷ [REDACTED] believed that Officer Dorsey called 911 because Officer Ben told him to call it in,⁹⁸ but Officer Dorsey told Sgt. Piek that neither he nor the other occupants of [REDACTED] vehicle ever contacted the OEMC regarding this incident.⁹⁹ Officer Ben also acknowledged that he never telephoned 911.¹⁰⁰

Because Officer Ben discharged a firearm and did not notify OEMC, COPA finds the allegation that he failed to notify OEMC of his firearm discharge is **Sustained**, in violation of CPD Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, and 11.

⁹¹ Att. 165, pg. 26, line 15 to pg. 30, line 1.

⁹² Att. 91; Att. 134; Att. 149, Photo #53. Note: The five casings likely attributed to [REDACTED] discharge, as well as the four casings attributed to Officer Ben's discharge of [REDACTED] weapon, all have the same headstamp (Hornady 9mm +P Luger 23).

⁹³ Att. 178, pg. 25.

⁹⁴ Att. 165, pg. 27, lines 7 to 12; pg. 31, line 13 to pg. 33, line 1; pg. 34, line 5 to pg. 35, line 4.

⁹⁵ Att. 172, G03-06(V)(A), Firearm Discharge and Officer-Involved Death Incident Response and Investigation (effective April 15, 2021, to present).

⁹⁶ Att. 172, G03-06(V)(A).

⁹⁷ Att. 97, pg. 35, lines 9 to 11.

⁹⁸ Att. 95, pg. 35, line 19 to pg. 36, line 16.

⁹⁹ Att. 127, pg. 35, lines 9 to 14; Att. 170, pg. 48, line 16 to pg. 49, line 2.

¹⁰⁰ Att. 165, pg. 43, lines 3 to 5.

d. Failing to secure the firearm.

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Ben failed to ensure the firearm he discharged was secured until it could be submitted to Forensic Services personnel, in violation of G03-06, is **Sustained**. CPD policy requires that officers, if physically capable, must ensure their firearm is holstered and secured until it is submitted to forensic personnel for processing.¹⁰¹

According to [REDACTED] Officer Ben returned her firearm to her before [REDACTED] Officer Ben, and Officer Dorsey left West Suburban Hospital.¹⁰² [REDACTED] then left her firearm in [REDACTED] vehicle, where it was ultimately recovered from under the driver's seat.¹⁰³ Officer Ben stated he could not recall what he did with [REDACTED] firearm, but he was pretty sure he did not enter West Suburban Hospital with it.¹⁰⁴

The evidence shows that Officer Ben did not secure the firearm he discharged, nor did he ensure that it was preserved as evidence for processing. To the contrary, Officer Ben could not even recall what he did with [REDACTED] firearm. Accordingly, the allegation that Officer Ben failed to secure the firearm is **Sustained** in violation of CPD Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, and 11.

e. False, Misleading, or Inaccurate Statements.

COPA finds the allegations that Officer Ben made a false, misleading, or inaccurate oral report to Sgt. Katsantonos, Lt. Sabella, and Deputy Chief Shemash by misleading and/or denying that he discharged a firearm during the shooting incident, are all **Sustained**.

CPD Rule 14 forbids an officer from making a false report, written or oral.¹⁰⁵ An officer cannot be found guilty of a Rule 14 violation unless it has been determined that (1) the officer willfully made a false statement and (2) the false statement was made about a fact that was material to the incident under investigation.¹⁰⁶ A statement is "material" when the statement has "a natural tendency to influence, or are capable of influencing, the decision-making body to which it was addressed."¹⁰⁷ COPA must also show that the statement was false.

When Sgt. Katsantonos arrived at the traffic stop where the OPPD officers curbed [REDACTED] vehicle, Sgt. Katsantonos asked Officer Ben if he had discharged a firearm. Officer Ben responded

¹⁰¹ Att. 172, G03-06(VI)(B)(5)(a).

¹⁰² Att. 95, pg. 58, lines 21 to pg. 59, lines 16.

¹⁰³ Att. 178, pgs. 11 and 25.

¹⁰⁴ Att. 165, pg. 42, lines 18 to 23.

¹⁰⁵ Police Board of Chicago Rules of Conduct Rule 14, available at <https://www.chicago.gov/dam/city/depts/cpb/PoliceDiscipline/RulesofConduct.pdf>

¹⁰⁶ See *Agreement between City of Chicago Department of Police and Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) Lodge No. 7 §6.1(M)*.

¹⁰⁷ See *United States v. Akram*, 152 F.3d 698, 700 (1998) (citing cases); *Taylor v. Police Bd.*, 2011 Ill. App., *P35 (1st) 101156 (1st Dist. 2011) ("The test of materiality for an allegedly perjured statement is whether the statement tends to prove or disprove an issue in the case . . .").

that he had not discharged a firearm.¹⁰⁸ When Lt. Sabella arrived at the location of the traffic stop, he also asked Officer Ben if he had discharged a firearm. Officer Ben again responded that he had not discharged a firearm, adding that he did not even have his firearm with him during the incident.¹⁰⁹ According to Lt. Sabella, Officer Ben told him, “I heard gunfire. I hit the floorboard of the car. I didn’t see anything that happened.”¹¹⁰ During his COPA interview, Officer Ben related that he did not recall Lt. Sabella asking him whether he discharged a firearm.¹¹¹

Following the incident, Deputy Chief Shemash responded to St. Mary’s Hospital, where she first spoke with Officer Ben. During that conversation, Officer Ben initially denied discharging a firearm.¹¹² Later that morning, in the presence of Deputy Chief Shemash, Sgt. Piek confronted Officer Ben with [REDACTED] account of the incident. Officer Ben then confirmed that [REDACTED] had handed her firearm to him, and that he had performed a “tap rack assess,” at which time he may have discharged a round.¹¹³ During his interview with COPA, Officer Ben acknowledged that he initially told Deputy Chief Shemash that he did not discharge a firearm, explaining that at the time he spoke with her, he did not believe he had fired the weapon.¹¹⁴

First, COPA finds Officer Ben’s statement was **false**. The evidence shows that Officer Ben requested [REDACTED] firearm during the incident, and that he pulled its trigger several times. Four fired cartridge casings were found in the rear hatch of [REDACTED] vehicle, where Officer Ben had been seated during the incident. Five fired cartridge casings were also found outside [REDACTED] vehicle, where [REDACTED] said she opened the door, leaned out, and fired her weapon.¹¹⁵ All nine fired cartridge casings had the same Hornady 9mm +P Luger headstamp, supporting the conclusion that they were all fired from [REDACTED] firearm. Additionally, [REDACTED] told detectives that she heard approximately four gunshots after she handed her firearm to Officer Ben.¹¹⁶

Second, COPA finds it is more likely than not that Officer Ben’s denials were **willfully made**. Officer Ben demonstrated evasive behavior immediately following the incident, including failing to respond to direct questions about whether he had fired a weapon. He then denied that he had discharged a firearm until he was confronted with evidence to the contrary. Officer Ben’s shifting narratives suggest an intent to deceive investigators. Additionally, his claim that the traumatic nature of the incident impaired his memory is contradicted by his behavior following the traffic stop in Oak Park. Officer Ben was calm and eventually responded to questions, although he repeatedly walked away while focusing on his phone. Further, Officer Ben provided a coherent account of the incident to Officers Scaletta and Ortiz, relaying that after [REDACTED] had exited [REDACTED]

¹⁰⁸ Att. 144, pg. 30, line 15 to pg. 31, line 10.

¹⁰⁹ Att. 123, pg. 13, line 20 to pg. 14, line 14. COPA notes that it was misleading for Officer Ben to say that he did not have his firearm with him, as the evidence shows he discharged [REDACTED] firearm.

¹¹⁰ Att. 123, pg. 14, lines 2 to 5.

¹¹¹ Att. 165; pg. 54, lines 8 to 14.

¹¹² Att. 97, pg. 15, line 16 to pg. 16, line 15.

¹¹³ Att. 97, pg. 26, line 24 pg. 25, line 8; Att. 127, pg. 45, line 21 to pg. 50, line 17.

¹¹⁴ Att. 165, pg. 56, line 17 to pg. 57, line 12.

¹¹⁵ Att. 95, pg. 29, lines 3 to 6.

¹¹⁶ Att. 178, pg. 25.

vehicle, a man standing on the southeast corner of the intersection, near a silver vehicle, “started letting rounds go.”¹¹⁷ Officer Ben provided specific, detailed information about the beginning of the incident, but he omitted any reference to returning fire.

Similarly, Officer Ben’s claim that alcohol impaired his recollection is contradicted by his coherent responses on scene. Officer Ben recounted the shooting and told Lt. Sabella, without equivocation, that he did not have a firearm and that he did not even witness the incident because he had hit the floor. In addition, Officer Ben claimed to COPA to not know whether he was intoxicated. This statement suggests Officer Ben was unwilling to take responsibility for his actions during the incident. Furthermore, the statement undermines his suggestion that alcohol impaired his memory of the incident.

Finally, COPA finds Officer Ben’s denial was **material**. Officer involved shootings are investigated differently than other shooting incidents. Officer Ben’s denial impeded a prompt investigation of his firearm discharge, because if OEMC had knowledge of an officer firing, they would have responded to the incident differently. For example, COPA would have been alerted to the shooting earlier.

For all these reasons, COPA finds that Officer Ben made false, misleading, or inaccurate oral reports to Sgt. Katsantones, Lt. Sabella, and Deputy Chief Shemash by denying that he discharged a firearm during the shooting incident. Accordingly, these allegations are **Sustained** as violations of Rules 2, 3, 6, 14, and 39.

Officer Earl Dorsey:

a. Intoxicated while off-duty.

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Dorsey was intoxicated is **Not Sustained**. CPD policy provides that “[a]lcohol intoxication means that a person’s mental or physical functioning is substantially impaired as the result of the use of alcohol.”¹¹⁸

When Deputy Chief Shemash met with Officer Dorsey at St. Mary’s Hospital, she believed him to be intoxicated.¹¹⁹ Additionally, in Lt. Sabella’s opinion, Officer Dorsey was also intoxicated on the night of this incident.¹²⁰ However, Deputy Chief Shemash and Lt. Sabella did not elaborate on why they thought Officer Dorsey was intoxicated beyond [REDACTED] the odor of alcohol. Officer Dorsey’s breathalyzer resulted in a BrAC reading of .012 at 5:11 am, approximately three and a half hours after the shooting.¹²¹ During his COPA interview, Officer Dorsey acknowledged that

¹¹⁷ Att. 18 at 13:49 to 14:20.

¹¹⁸ Att. 173, S08-01-10(II)(E)(1)(b).

¹¹⁹ Att. 97, pg. 18, line 23 to pg. 19, line 2.

¹²⁰ Att. 123, pg. 18, lines 1 to 6.

¹²¹ Att. 162. For context, this is well below the legal intoxication limit of .08 for drivers in Illinois.

he consumed a few alcoholic beverages prior to this incident, but he maintained that he was not drunk.¹²²

The totality of the evidence suggests that Officer Dorsey was not intoxicated; however, COPA lacks clear and convincing evidence to unfound this allegation. Therefore, COPA finds the allegation against Officer Dorsey is **Not Sustained**.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Officer Trevor Ben

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History¹²³

Officer Ben began his employment at CPD on July 17, 2017, and he resigned on September 27, 2025. He received a total of 60 awards, including one Chicago Police Leadership Award, six Department Commendations, two Life Saving Awards, one Police Officer of the Month Award, one Special Commendation Award, and 42 Honorable Mention Certificates. At the time of his resignation, Officer Ben did not have any sustained complaints or recent SPARs.

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officer Ben violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, and 11 by failing to notify OEMC that he discharged a firearm, and by failing to ensure that the firearm he discharged was secured prior to processing. Additionally, Officer Ben violated Rules 2, 3, 6, 14, and 39 when he provided false oral reports to Sgt. Katsantonos, Lt. Sabella, and Deputy Chief Shemash denying that he had discharged a firearm.

The evidence shows that Officer Ben discharged a firearm during this incident, then repeatedly lied to conceal and minimize his involvement in the shooting. In fact, Officer Ben did not admit that he discharged a firearm until several hours after the incident, when he was directly confronted with evidence of his involvement. Officer Ben's conduct reflects an intentional effort to deceive responding CPD members and at least three CPD supervisors.

Truthfulness is the cornerstone of the law enforcement profession and any member who knowingly provides false information is not suitable to properly enforce the law. Notably, a CPD member who has violated Rule 14 can no longer function effectively as a police officer because that member would not be a credible witness in later criminal prosecutions.

For these reasons, COPA would have recommended that Officer Ben be **Separated** from CPD, but he resigned in September 2025, prior to the conclusion of this investigation. COPA therefore recommends that CPD issue a formal determination on COPA's findings, and place this

¹²² Att. 170, pg. 13, line 23 to pg. 14, line 3.

¹²³ Atts. 176, 177.

report in Officer Ben's personnel file for consideration in the event he applies for re-employment with the City.¹²⁴

Approved:



Steffany Hreno
Deputy Chief Administrator

5/25/2026

Date



LaKenya While
Chief Administrator

5/25/2026

Date

¹²⁴ Additionally, COPA will refer Officer Ben to the Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board (ILETSB) for decertification as a police officer in Illinois.

Appendix A**Case Details**

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	December 14, 2024 / 1:28 am / [REDACTED] Chicago Illinois, 60644.
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	December 14, 2025 / 4:51 am.
Involved Member #1:	Police Officer Trevor Ben; Star #7795; Employee ID # [REDACTED] DOA: July 17, 2017; Unit 128; Male / Black.
Involved Member #2:	Police Officer Earl Dosey; Star #6587; Employee ID # [REDACTED] DOA: April 16, 2018; Unit 007; Male / Black.
Involved Civilian #1:	[REDACTED] / Male / Black.
Involved Civilian #2:	[REDACTED] / Female / Black.
Involved Civilian #3:	[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 10:** Inattention to duty.
- ☒ **Rule 11:** Incompetency or inefficiency in the performance of duty.
- ☒ **Rule 14:** Making a false report, written or oral.
- ☒ **Rule 39:** Failure to immediately make an oral report to the desk sergeant at the District of occurrence and to follow such oral report with a written report on the prescribed form, whenever a firearm is discharged by a member.

Applicable Policies and Laws

- Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department.
- General Order G03-06, Firearm Discharge and Officer-Involved Death Incident Response and Investigation (effective April 15, 2021 to present).
- Special Order S08-01-10, Special Situations Involving Allegations of Misconduct (effective April 8, 2019 to present).
- Agreement between City of Chicago Department of Police and Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) Lodge No. 7.

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.¹²⁵ 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.”¹²⁶

¹²⁵ 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).

¹²⁶ *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