



Log # 2023-0005086

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

### I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On October 27, 2023, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received a telephone complaint from ██████████ reporting alleged misconduct by members of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). ██████████ alleged that on October 20, 2023, Officers Tyreon Davis, Thomas Hawkins, and Travis Betts committed misconduct by beating him, falsely arresting him, and illegally searching and seizing his vehicle.<sup>2</sup> ██████████ informed COPA that he had an attorney, and after further unsuccessful attempts to acquire a statement from ██████████ COPA proceeded without his cooperation. COPA served allegations that the CPD officers pulled ██████████ from his vehicle, struck him about his body, towed his vehicle, and failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR), all without justification.<sup>3</sup> COPA reached exonerated, not sustained, or unfounded findings for all the allegations.

### II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE<sup>4</sup>

On October 20, 2023, Officers Davis, Hawkins, and Betts conducted a traffic stop of ██████████ vehicle for a tinted front windshield.<sup>5</sup> Officer Davis made contact with the driver of the vehicle (██████████). At the same time, Officer Hawkins stood on the passenger side of the vehicle, and Officer Betts was located on the rear driver's side of the vehicle. ██████████ provided Officer Davis with his driver's license, and after further questioning, ██████████ informed Officer Davis he had a Firearm Owner's Identification Card.<sup>6</sup> Officer Betts obtained ██████████ driver's license and returned to the CPD vehicle to look up ██████████ information.

---

<sup>1</sup> Appendix A includes case identifiers such as the date, time, and location of the incident, the involved parties and their demographics, and the applicable rules and policies.

<sup>2</sup> One or more of these allegations fall within COPA's jurisdiction pursuant to Chicago Municipal Code § 2-78-120. Therefore, COPA determined it would be the primary investigative agency in this matter.

<sup>3</sup> In his initial call with COPA, ██████████ also made allegations that he was falsely arrested, and that his vehicle was illegally searched by the officers. Based on BWC of the incident, COPA determined there was insufficient objective verifiable evidence of misconduct to serve these allegations. The officers on-scene had probable cause to believe there was additional cannabis in the vehicle after ██████████ provided Officer Hawkins with an ashtray containing cannabis. The arrest was also justified, as ██████████ resisted the officers' lawful commands and battered Officer Davis during his attempted detainment of ██████████.

<sup>4</sup> The following is a summary of what COPA finds most likely occurred during this incident. This summary utilized information from several different sources, including BWC footage, an Arrest Report, Tactical Response Reports, the Original Case Incident Report, and the accused officers' statements.

<sup>5</sup> Att. 3 at 2:14 to 2:18.

<sup>6</sup> Att. 3 at 2:18 to 2:33.

Officer Hawkins asked [REDACTED] about an ashtray located in the center console of the vehicle and requested that [REDACTED] hand it to him.<sup>7</sup> [REDACTED] complied with Officer Hawkins's request and gave him the ashtray. Officer Hawkins discovered the presence of cannabis inside the ashtray, which [REDACTED] said was from the previous year.<sup>8</sup> Officer Hawkins then confirmed to Officer Davis that there was cannabis in the ashtray, and Officer Davis asked [REDACTED] to step out of the vehicle.<sup>9</sup> [REDACTED] then insisted that he would not step out of the vehicle, and he told the officers that they would have to arrest him.<sup>10</sup>

After Officer Davis requested that [REDACTED] exit the vehicle multiple times, [REDACTED] continued arguing with Officer Davis and told him to let him call someone to pick up his girlfriend, who was in the passenger seat. Officer Davis then attempted to handcuff [REDACTED] while he was still sitting in the driver's seat of the vehicle. [REDACTED] pushed Officer Davis's hand away and insisted he would get out of the vehicle.<sup>11</sup> Officer Davis then grabbed [REDACTED] by his sweatshirt and attempted to pull [REDACTED] from the vehicle. [REDACTED] grabbed Officer Davis's tactical vest and pulled him into the driver's seat of the vehicle.<sup>12</sup> A struggle ensued between Officer Davis and [REDACTED]. Officer Hawkins relocated to the driver's side of the vehicle to assist Officer Davis. Officer Davis freed himself from the struggle, relocated to the rear passenger compartment of the vehicle, and called for additional units over his radio. Officer Betts then left the CPD vehicle and approached the passenger side of [REDACTED] vehicle to assist Officer Hawkins. Officer Betts wrapped his right arm around [REDACTED] upper body while Officer Hawkins attempted to gain control of [REDACTED] arms. During the struggle, [REDACTED] could be heard asking the officers to stop punching him.<sup>13</sup>

After the officers removed [REDACTED] from the vehicle, he was handcuffed. The officers placed [REDACTED] into a CPD vehicle for transport to the 006<sup>th</sup> District station. Officers Davis and Betts briefly searched the passenger compartment of [REDACTED] vehicle. A crowd began to form around the vehicle, and the officers then relocated to the 006<sup>th</sup> District station. Officer Davis initiated the tow report for [REDACTED] vehicle,<sup>14</sup> and Officer Hawkins transported the vehicle to the station.<sup>15</sup> The female passenger in [REDACTED] vehicle was never identified in any reports. The officers subsequently completed Tactical Response Reports (TRRs), an arrest report, and an original case incident report (OCIR).

During their interviews with COPA, Officers Davis,<sup>16</sup> Hawkins,<sup>17</sup> and Betts<sup>18</sup> each denied that they or the other officers struck [REDACTED] at any point during the incident. Officer Davis

---

<sup>7</sup> Att. 4 at 2:13 to 2:35.

<sup>8</sup> Att. 4 at 2:20 to 2:30.

<sup>9</sup> Att. 3 at 3:00 to 3:07.

<sup>10</sup> Att. 3 at 3:07 to 3:10.

<sup>11</sup> Att. 3 at 3:38 to 3:41.

<sup>12</sup> Att. 4 at 3:27 to 3:30.

<sup>13</sup> Att. 4 at 3:25 to 3:40.

<sup>14</sup> Att. 25, Motor vehicle inventory report.

<sup>15</sup> Att. 4 at 7:00 to 10:00.

<sup>16</sup> Att. 36, Transcribed interview of Officer Davis.

<sup>17</sup> Att. 37, Transcribed interview of Officer Hawkins.

<sup>18</sup> Att. 35, Transcribed interview of Officer Betts.

explained, which was corroborated by BWC, that he did not strike [REDACTED] and only attempted to handcuff [REDACTED] and hold [REDACTED] legs to prevent him from kicking.<sup>19</sup> In his statement to COPA, Officer Hawkins clarified what he meant by “closed hand push,” which he reported in his TRR.<sup>20</sup> Officer Hawkins explained that he used a closed fist to push [REDACTED] shoulder away from him so that he could handcuff [REDACTED]. Officer Betts told COPA that the only force he used during the incident was a “bearhug,” in that he wrapped his arms around [REDACTED] upper body to keep him from moving his arms.<sup>21</sup>

### III. ALLEGATIONS

#### **Officer Tyreon Davis**

1. Failing to utilize objectively reasonable de-escalation techniques, in violation of G03-02-02.
  - Unfounded.
2. Forcefully pulling [REDACTED] from his car, without justification.
  - Exonerated.
3. Striking [REDACTED] about his body without justification.
  - Unfounded.
4. Initiating a tow of [REDACTED] vehicle without justification.
  - Exonerated.
5. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report documenting the interaction with an unknown female subject.
  - Not Sustained.

#### **Officer Thomas Hawkins**

1. Failing to utilize objectively reasonable de-escalation techniques, in violation of G03-02-02.
  - Unfounded.
2. Striking [REDACTED] about his body without justification.
  - Not Sustained.
3. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report documenting the interaction with an unknown female.
  - Not sustained.

#### **Officer Travis Betts**

1. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report documenting the interaction with an unknown female.
  - Not sustained.

---

<sup>19</sup> Att. 36, Pg. 17 Ln. 7 to Ln. 9.

<sup>20</sup> Att. 37, Pgs. 13, 15 to 18; see Att. 17, Pg. 2.

<sup>21</sup> Att. 35, Pg. 9, Ln.17 to Ln. 19

#### 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. In this case, there were no factors present to give cause to question the reliability of Officers Davis, Hawkins, or Betts.

COPA interviewed Officers Davis, Hawkins, and Betts in March 2025.<sup>22</sup> The officers' recollection of the incident was consistent with BWC footage and other evidence. This investigation did not reveal any evidence that caused COPA to question the credibility of any of the sworn individuals who provided statements. ██████████ did not cooperate with COPA's investigation into his complaint, and did not provide COPA with a statement other than his initial telephonic complaint.

#### V. ANALYSIS<sup>23</sup>

##### a. Uses of Force

COPA alleged that Officers Davis and Hawkins struck ██████████ about the body without justification. COPA finds this allegation is unfounded with respect to Officers Davis, and not sustained with respect to Officer Hawkins.

In their statements to COPA, Officers Davis, Hawkins, and Betts all denied striking ██████████ during the incident. Officer Davis stated, and BWC footage confirmed, that he only attempted to handcuff ██████████ and hold ██████████ legs to prevent him from kicking.<sup>24</sup> Additionally, Officer Hawkins explained that he observed ██████████ stiffen his body to resist handcuffing, then push Officer Davis's arm away. According to Officer Hawkins, ██████████ kicked and punched at the officers; Officer Hawkins responded by using a closed fist to push/redirect ██████████ upper body so that ██████████ could be handcuffed.<sup>25</sup> Officer Hawkins denied using any other force against ██████████<sup>26</sup>

The BWC footage corroborates Officer Davis's statement that he did not strike ██████████ at any point during the incident. Therefore, the allegation that Officer Davis struck ██████████ about his body is unfounded. Officer Hawkins's BWC footage, however, is not as clear as Officer Davis's BWC footage. Not all of Officer Hawkins' actions were captured on BWC. Although COPA does not have any reason to question Officer Hawkins's credibility, COPA cannot prove or disprove

---

<sup>22</sup> Atts. 32 to 37.

<sup>23</sup> For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, *see* Appendix B.

<sup>24</sup> Att. 36, Pg. 17 Ln. 7 to Ln. 9.

<sup>25</sup> Att. 37, Pgs. 13, 15 to 18; Att. 17, Pg. 2.

<sup>26</sup> Att. 37, pg. 18.

that the actions occurred with clear and convincing evidence. Therefore, the allegation against Officer Hawkins is not sustained.

COPA also alleged that Officer Davis forcefully pulled █████ from his vehicle without justification. This allegation is exonerated by clear and convincing evidence. The officers established probable cause for a narcotics search after Officer Hawkins observed both burnt and raw cannabis inside █████ vehicle. Therefore, the question at hand is not whether removing █████ from the vehicle was allowed, but whether the manner in which █████ was removed was justified.

Officer Davis gave █████ several orders to exit the vehicle before he used any force. █████ in turn, was argumentative and wanted to call someone to retrieve his girlfriend, who was his passenger. Officer Davis attempted to handcuff █████ while █████ was still in the driver's seat. In his statement to COPA, Officer Davis explained that as he attempted to handcuff █████ pushed his hands away, causing pain to his left wrist.<sup>27</sup> At that point, Officer Davis categorized █████ as an assailant.<sup>28</sup> Per CPD policy,<sup>29</sup> a subject who uses or threatens to use force that is likely to cause physical injury, with or without weapons, is an assailant. This authorizes the CPD member to utilize several force techniques, including emergency takedowns and control holds. COPA considers Officer Davis's use of force to be within the outlined policy, as he could have used higher levels of force, such as a taser or OC spray, and still complied with CPD policy. Instead, Officer Davis forcefully pulled █████ from the vehicle, using a lower level of force to compel █████ compliance. Further, Officer Davis's use of force was proportional to the level of resistance given by █████ For these reasons, COPA finds that Officer Davis was justified in using force to remove █████ from the vehicle; therefore, this allegation is exonerated.

#### **b. De-escalation**

COPA finds the allegation that Officers Davis and Hawkins failed to use objectively reasonable de-escalation techniques is unfounded. As described above, the officers had probable cause to believe that █████ possessed cannabis in an unlawful manner, and they were justified in ordering █████ out of the vehicle. The officers continually communicated with █████ by giving him several orders to exit the vehicle. They also employed time as a tactic by allowing sufficient time for █████ to exit the vehicle on his own accord. █████ responded by telling Officer Davis that the officers would have to arrest him.<sup>30</sup> When Officer Davis attempted to handcuff █████ became an assailant by pushing or striking Officer Davis's hand. Considering the totality of the circumstances, COPA finds that Officers Davis and Hawkins utilized sufficient de-escalation techniques before using force to detain █████ Therefore, this allegation is unfounded by clear and convincing evidence.

---

<sup>27</sup> Att. 36, Pg. 11, Ln. 10 to Ln. 12.

<sup>28</sup> Att. 36, Pg. 15, Ln. 17 to ln. 22.

<sup>29</sup> Att. 39, CPD Force Options Model; Att. 41, G03-02-01, Response to Resistance and Force Options (effective June 28, 2023).

<sup>30</sup> Att. 3 at 3:07 to 3:10.

### c. Reporting

COPA finds the allegation that Officers Davis, Hawkins, and Betts failed to complete an ISR for [REDACTED] unidentified female passenger is not sustained. Although no ISR was completed documenting the interaction with the female passenger,<sup>31</sup> the officers explained that it was a chaotic situation with a growing crowd that outnumbered the officers, as well as a hostile arrestee.<sup>32</sup> Additionally, as the officers interacted with [REDACTED] the female passenger stood near the vehicle by herself. She was not handcuffed, patted down, searched, or told she was detained; in fact, it appears she left the scene of her own volition.<sup>33</sup> Ideally, the officers should have completed an ISR for a Jane Doe; however, given the totality of the circumstances, including the chaotic nature of the scene, COPA finds this allegation is not sustained.

### d. Unjustified towing of the vehicle.

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Davis initiated a tow of [REDACTED] vehicle, without justification, is exonerated. According to CPD policy, an arrestee's vehicle will be removed from the scene if "the vehicle cannot be legally, securely, and continuously parked at the scene of the arrest; or the arrestee does not authorize another person to take control of the vehicle."<sup>34</sup> After [REDACTED] was placed into custody, his vehicle was located in the roadway. Additionally, [REDACTED] never authorized the female passenger to take control of his vehicle; to the contrary, the BWC footage captured him asking the officers if he could call someone to pick her up.<sup>35</sup>

In this case, Officer Davis explained that [REDACTED] vehicle was towed to the police impound lot because it was arrestee property.<sup>36</sup> Although Officer Davis's justification for the tow is slightly different than the outlined reasons in CPD policy, the tow itself was justified due to the vehicle being located in the roadway following [REDACTED] arrest. Officer Davis also followed policy by documenting the reason for the tow. Therefore, this allegation is exonerated by clear and convincing evidence.

Approved:

[REDACTED]

Steffany Hreno  
*Director of Investigations*

4/16/2025

Date

<sup>31</sup> See Att. 40, S04-13-09, Investigatory Stop System (effective July 10, 2017 to present).

<sup>32</sup> Att. 35, Pgs. 18 to 22; Att. 37, Pgs. 22 to 26; Att. 36, Pgs. 26 to 27.

<sup>33</sup> Att. 35, Pgs. 20 to 22.

<sup>34</sup> Att. 38, G07-03 (IV)(G), Vehicle Towing and Relocation Operations (effective November 1, 2014 to present).

<sup>35</sup> There is some evidence suggesting that the female passenger did not have a driver's license. See, e.g., Att. 36, Pgs. 25 to 26.

<sup>36</sup> Att. 36, Pgs. 24 to 26.

Appendix ACase Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	October 20, 2023/ 7:00 pm/ 8058 S Halsted Street, Chicago, IL
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	October 27, 2023/ 1:31 pm
Involved Member #1:	Tyreon Davis, star # 18041, employee ID# [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: 19 February 2019, Unit of Assignment: 006, male, black.
Involved Member #2:	Thomas Hawkins, star # 4113, employee ID# [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: 17 December 2018, Unit of Assignment: 006, male, black.
Involved Member #3:	Travis Betts, star # 6068, employee ID# [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: 16 May 2018, Unit of Assignment: 006, male, black.
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] male, black
Involved Individual #2:	Unidentified female, 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

- G03-02-01: Response to Resistance and Force Options (effective June 28, 2023 to present).
- G07-03: Vehicle Towing and Relocation Operations (effective 1 November 2014 to present).
- S04-13-09: Investigatory Stop System effective (effective 10 July 2017 to present).

## Appendix B

### **Definition of COPA's Findings and Standards of Proof**

For each Allegation, COPA must make one of the following findings:

1. Sustained – where it is determined the allegation is supported by a preponderance of the evidence;
2. Not Sustained – where it is determined there is insufficient evidence to prove the allegations by a preponderance of the evidence;
3. Unfounded – where it is determined by clear and convincing evidence that an allegation is false or not factual; or
4. Exonerated – where it is determined by clear and convincing evidence that the conduct described in the allegation occurred, but it is lawful and proper.

A **preponderance of evidence** can be described as evidence indicating that it is **more likely than not** that a proposition is proved.<sup>37</sup> 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.”<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> See *Avery v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co.*, 216 Ill. 2d 100, 191 (2005) (a proposition is proved by a preponderance of the evidence when it is found to be more probably true than not).

<sup>38</sup> *People v. Coan*, 2016 IL App (2d) 151036, ¶ 28 (quoting Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions, Criminal, No. 4.19 (4<sup>th</sup> ed. 2000)).

**Appendix C****Transparency and Publication Categories**

Check all that apply:

- Abuse of Authority
- Body Worn Camera Violation
- Coercion
- Death or Serious Bodily Injury in Custody
- Domestic Violence
- Excessive Force
- Failure to Report Misconduct
- False Statement
- Firearm Discharge
- Firearm Discharge – Animal
- Firearm Discharge – Suicide
- Firearm Discharge – Unintentional
- First Amendment
- Improper Search and Seizure – Fourth Amendment Violation
- Incidents in Lockup
- Motor Vehicle Incidents
- OC Spray Discharge
- Search Warrants
- Sexual Misconduct
- Taser Discharge
- Unlawful Denial of Access to Counsel
- Unnecessary Display of a Weapon
- Use of Deadly Force – other
- Verbal Abuse
- Other Investigation