



Log # 2025-2116

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On May 5, 2025, 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 earlier that day, at approximately 3:06 am, at or near [REDACTED].² COPA learned that an off-duty CPD member, Officer Damarcus Paris, discharged his firearm at his stepfather, [REDACTED] during a domestic dispute. Following its investigation, COPA determined that Officer Paris's use of deadly force complied with CPD policy, and no allegations related to this incident were served on him.³

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE⁴

In the early morning hours of May 5, 2025, there was an altercation at the home of Officer Paris between his mother, [REDACTED] and his stepfather, [REDACTED].⁵ [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] had entertained a few guests at their home the night before.⁶ Around 3:00 am, [REDACTED] began cleaning up and told their guests they had to leave. As the guests departed, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] began to argue. [REDACTED] then grabbed [REDACTED] by the neck and threw her onto the stairs.⁷ As the argument continued, [REDACTED] allegedly choked [REDACTED].⁸

Officer Paris was asleep in his bedroom, located in the basement, when his younger brother called his cell phone repeatedly.⁹ Officer Paris missed the first two calls and attempted to answer

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

² Pursuant to § 2-78-120 of the Chicago Municipal Code, COPA has a duty to investigate all incidents in which a CPD member discharges their firearm. Therefore, COPA determined it would be the primary administrative investigative agency in this matter.

³ COPA initially served allegations that Officer Paris failed to register his firearm with CPD and failed to qualify with the weapon (Att. 58); however, COPA withdrew those allegations after discovering that Officer Paris had already been disciplined for the weapons violation by CPD. Att. 54; Att. 60, pg. 43, ln. 6 to pg. 44, ln. 18.

⁴ The following is a summary of what COPA finds most likely occurred during this incident. This summary utilized information from several different sources, including third-party video, OEMC transmissions, police reports, and officer interviews.

⁵ Att. 1.

⁶ Att. 26 at 3:05 to 3:14.

⁷ Att. 26 at 4:25 to 4:45; 12:30 to 12:50; and 13:50 to 14:15.

⁸ Att. 26 at 14:22 to 14:36. In an interview with CPD, [REDACTED] denied that he engaged in a physical altercation with [REDACTED] other than to push her outside the residence. Att. 25 at 7:29 to 11:00; Att. 66, pg. 18.

⁹ Att. 60, pg. 9, lns. 8 to 13; Att. 59, pg. 91.

the third, but the call disconnected. Officer Paris heard a commotion and yelling upstairs on the first floor.¹⁰ He recognized [REDACTED] voice but could not make out the additional voice(s).¹¹ Officer Paris retrieved his firearm¹² from the safe and walked upstairs, where he observed [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in a verbal dispute.¹³

As Officer Paris stood by, [REDACTED] turned and saw Officer Paris holding a gun.¹⁴ [REDACTED] asked, "What you got that for? You know what?"¹⁵ Officer Paris explained to [REDACTED] that he had heard a commotion and did not know what was happening.¹⁶ Officer Paris added that there were two male guests in the home before he went to sleep, and the guests and his parents had been drinking alcohol.¹⁷ [REDACTED] ignored Officer Paris's explanation and walked upstairs to the second floor.¹⁸ According to Officer Paris, when [REDACTED] returned to the living room, he was concealing a gun behind his leg and subsequently pointed the gun at Officer Paris's forehead.¹⁹ Officer Paris asked [REDACTED] if he was going to shoot him.²⁰ [REDACTED] yelled at [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] went back upstairs.²¹ When [REDACTED] returned to the living room, he had put the gun away but ordered everyone to leave the house.²² [REDACTED] argued with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] said he would leave. Officer Paris told [REDACTED] to stop arguing with [REDACTED] and let him leave. That comment upset [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] told Officer Paris that *he* (Officer Paris) could leave.²³

Officer Paris reminded [REDACTED] that he had pointed a gun at his head. [REDACTED] replied, "You know what? Watch this."²⁴ [REDACTED] ran upstairs to get his gun, which was on top of his bedroom dresser, because he felt threatened.²⁵ Officer Paris followed [REDACTED] and warned him not to grab

¹⁰ Officer Paris said his girlfriend slept over that night but was asleep and did not witness the incident. Att. 60, pg. 8, ln. 18 to pg. 9, ln. 17; pg. 14, lns. 3 to 5; pg. 15, lns. 12 to 19; and pg. 62, lns. 21 to 23; Att. 66, pg. 16.

¹¹ Att. 60, pg. 18, lns. 13 to 22.

¹² Officer Paris retrieved his auxiliary weapon. Att. 60, pg. 43, lns. 6 to 23.

¹³ Att. 60, pg. 9, lns. 14 to 19; Att. 66, pg. 22.

¹⁴ Att. 25 at 11:15 to 12:15, 16:37 to 17:03; Att. 26 at 6:35 to 7:50; Att. 60, pg. 9, ln. 23 to pg. 10, ln. 3.

¹⁵ Att. 60, pg. 10, lns. 3 to 6; Att. 26 at 8:28 to 8:43.

¹⁶ Att. 26 at 8:54 to 9:30; Att. 59, pg. 68.

¹⁷ Att. 60, pg. 10, lns. 9 to 14; and pg. 19, lns. 4 to 10.

¹⁸ Officer Paris did not know why [REDACTED] was going upstairs. Att. 60, pg. 23, lns. 4 to 9.

¹⁹ Att. 60, pg. 10, lns. 15 to 19; and pg. 23, lns. 14 to 18; Att. 59, pg. 92; Att. 66, pg. 22.

²⁰ Officer Paris's firearm was still in his hand. Att. 60, pg. 24, ln. 24 to pg. 25, ln. 1.

²¹ Officer Paris said he did not shoot [REDACTED] when [REDACTED] initially pointed the firearm at his forehead because [REDACTED] had a tactical advantage over him. Att. 66, pg. 23.

²² Att. 60, pg. 11, lns. 4 to 6.

²³ Att. 60, pg. 11, ln. 20 to pg. 12, ln. 7.

²⁴ Att. 60, pg. 12, lns. 8 to 11.

²⁵ Att. 25 at 16:49 to 16:55, 19:50 to 20:15; Att. 26 at 8:43 to 8:54, and 14:57 to 15:10; Att. 66, pg. 18; Att. 66, pg. 24. In interviews with detectives, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] only referenced one instance where [REDACTED] went upstairs to get his gun before he was shot. In a second interview with detectives, [REDACTED] related that during a conversation with Officer Paris the morning following the incident, she remembered that [REDACTED] pointed a gun at Officer Paris shortly before the shooting but then put then gun away. Att. 66, pg. 20. When [REDACTED] was asked explicitly by Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) personnel whether [REDACTED] produced a gun twice, [REDACTED] said she did not recall. Att. 59, pg. 102.

the gun,²⁶ while [REDACTED] was behind Officer Paris.²⁷ According to Officer Paris, [REDACTED] entered the bedroom, grabbed the gun from the dresser,²⁸ and turned toward the doorway, where Officer Paris was standing.²⁹ Officer Paris discharged his weapon seven times,³⁰ striking [REDACTED]³¹ [REDACTED] heard the gunshots but did not see them.³² She momentarily retreated down the hall to her daughter's bedroom before entering her own bedroom. [REDACTED] discovered [REDACTED] lying on the floor, wounded, with his gun at his feet.³³ [REDACTED] asked for his gun. Officer Paris picked up [REDACTED] gun and moved it to the hallway.³⁴

Before the shooting, at 3:01 am, a child dialed 911 from the home and reported that her father ([REDACTED]) pulled a gun on her mother ([REDACTED]).³⁵ Three minutes later, a child dialed 911 from the home and requested an ambulance. She reported that her father tried to choke her mother, and her brother came upstairs with a gun and shot her father for her mother's safety.³⁶ Around the same time, Officer Paris dialed 911, identified himself as an off-duty police officer, and reported that he shot his stepfather after his stepfather pointed a gun at him.³⁷

Officer Paris told [REDACTED] to apply pressure to [REDACTED] wounds.³⁸ Officer Paris went to his vehicle to retrieve his Law Enforcement Medical and Rescue Training (LEMART) kit; however, he returned to the residence as responding officers arrived.³⁹

[REDACTED] was transported via ambulance to [REDACTED] Hospital.⁴⁰ [REDACTED] sustained one gunshot wound to his front right neck, the rear of the neck, left bicep, and right calf; three gunshot wounds to his right and left thighs above the knee; and one graze wound to his right forearm.⁴¹ Medical

²⁶ Att. 60, pg. 12, lns. 11 to 14; and pg. 26, ln. 22 to pg. 27, ln. 6; Att. 66, pg. 22.

²⁷ Att. 26 at 10:10 to 10:36.

²⁸ [REDACTED] told detectives that he merely reached for the gun. Att. 25 at 17:04 to 17:55. DCFS records document that [REDACTED] threatened Officer Paris with a gun on the date of incident; however, the records do not specify the circumstances or timing of when this occurred. Att. 59, pg. 5.

²⁹ Att. 60, pg. 12, ln. 15 to pg. 13, ln. 2; Att. 59, pg. 92; Att. 66, pg. 22.

³⁰ Officer Paris initially believed he discharged his firearm four or five times, but he later learned through the CPD investigation that he discharged his weapon seven times. While the Tactical Response Report notes that Officer Paris discharged his firearm five times, the physical evidence reflects that Officer Paris discharged his weapon seven times. In his statement to COPA, Officer Paris disclosed that he did not complete the Tactical Response Report himself and did not know who had done so on his behalf. Att. 7; Att. 60, pg. 40, lns. 4 to 9; and pg. 47, ln. 17 to pg. 49, ln. 1.

³¹ Att. 60, pg. 13, lns. 2 to 3; and pg. 32, lns. 20 to 22; Att. 66, pg. 16.

³² Att. 26 at 10:37 to 10:46; Att. 59, pg. 102; Att. 66, pg. 19.

³³ Att. 26 at 11:53 to 12:25.

³⁴ Att. 60, pg. 13, lns. 18 to 21; Att. 3 at 2:45; Att. 66, pg. 16.

³⁵ Att. 19 at 0:10 to 0:32. Three minor children were home at the time of incident; however, their mother, [REDACTED] refused to cooperate with the investigation. Att. 31. CMS Note: CO-1441561.

³⁶ Atts. 9 and 21; Att. 64, pg. 8.

³⁷ Atts. 11 and 20; Att. 60, pg. 13, lns. 8 to 13.

³⁸ Att. 26 at 11:25 to 11:30; Att. 60, pg. 13, lns. 14 to 17.

³⁹ Att. 4 at 2:17 to 2:45; Atts. 34 to 36; Att. 60, pg. 14, ln. 6 to pg. 15, ln. 8; Att. 59, pg. 92; Att. 66, pgs. 22 and 23.

⁴⁰ Att. 40, pg. 2.

⁴¹ Att. 53, pgs. 37 to 39; Att. 66, pgs. 7 to 8.

records note that ██████ had a Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) of 285 mg/Dl (or 0.285%), which represents severe alcohol intoxication.⁴²

██████ was subsequently charged with Domestic Battery/Physical Contact, Aggravated Unlawful Possession of a Weapon with a Previous Conviction, and two counts of Aggravated Assault/Use with a Deadly Weapon.⁴³ He later pled guilty to the weapons charge, and the Aggravated Assault and Domestic Battery charges were dismissed.⁴⁴

CPD reports document the recovery of evidence following the shooting.⁴⁵ Evidence Technicians (ETs) recovered a loaded Taurus Millennium PT140 Pro, .40 caliber, semi-automatic pistol in the upstairs hallway, on the floor between the stairs and the master bedroom.⁴⁶ ETs also recovered a Glock 19, 9mm semi-automatic pistol, from an open safe in the master bedroom closet.⁴⁷

CPD reports also document the processing of Officer Paris's Glock 19, Generation 5 firearm.⁴⁸ The weapon had eight rounds in the magazine and one round in the chamber. The weapon was chambered for Hornady 9mm Luger ammunition, with a capacity of 15 rounds in the magazine plus one in the chamber. A total of seven fired cartridge cases were recovered from the crime scene (all stamped Hornady 9mm Luger). The Illinois State Police subsequently tested the ballistics evidence and determined that all seven fired cartridge cases were fired by Officer Paris's weapon.⁴⁹

Officer Paris submitted to a breathalyzer test after the incident, which determined that he had a Breath Alcohol Concentration of .000.⁵⁰ He also provided a urine sample,⁵¹ which was tested and found to be negative for all substances listed on the Urine Substance Abuse Panel.⁵²

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 Officer Paris's firearm discharge.

⁴² Att. 53, pg. 15.

⁴³ Att. 1.

⁴⁴ Att. 73. ██████ was sentenced to three years of incarceration.

⁴⁵ Atts. 17 and 29.

⁴⁶ Att. 66, pg. 16.

⁴⁷ ██████ said the Glock 19 pistol belongs to her, and the other gun (the Taurus pistol) belongs to ██████ Att. 26 at 9:30 to 10:00.

⁴⁸ Atts. 17 and 29.

⁴⁹ Att. 61.

⁵⁰ Atts. 43 to 45.

⁵¹ Att. 45.

⁵² Amphetamines, Barbiturates, Benzodiazepines, Cocaine Metabolites, Marijuana Metabolites, Methadone, MDE-Analogues, Opiates, Oxycodones, Opiates (semi-synthetic), Phencyclidine, and Propoxyphene.

IV. CREDIBILITY ASSESSMENT

This investigation did not reveal any evidence that caused COPA to doubt the credibility of any individual who provided statements. COPA does note that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] accounts of the incident differ slightly from Officer Paris's description of the incident, insofar as [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] only described one instance where [REDACTED] went for his gun before he was shot, while Officer Paris described an initial encounter where [REDACTED] pointed the gun at his forehead but then put the gun away. In a second account, [REDACTED] told detectives that, after discussing the incident with Officer Paris later that day, she remembered the first instance of [REDACTED] pointing the gun. The variances around whether [REDACTED] went for his gun once or twice do not diminish the overall credibility of the involved parties' statements.

COPA found Officer Paris to be credible in his statement. His account was internally consistent, and he did not have difficulty remembering crucial details of the incident. Officer Paris was materially consistent throughout his statements to responding officers, CPD detectives, COPA, and DCFS. Although there is no objective evidence, such as camera video, of [REDACTED] raising or pointing a firearm in Officer Paris's direction, there is also no evidence to contradict Officer Paris's account. In fact, the available evidence supports his account. Before the shooting, a child dialed 911 from the residence and stated that her father pulled a gun on her mother. [REDACTED] also admitted that he ran upstairs and reached for his gun during the interaction with Officer Paris. Additionally, [REDACTED] stated that she saw [REDACTED] gun on the floor at his feet immediately after he was shot.

V. ANALYSIS⁵³

COPA finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the use of deadly force by Officer Paris was objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional to the circumstances he faced. COPA further finds that Officer Paris engaged in de-escalation tactics as required by CPD policy before using deadly force. Specifically, Officer Paris communicated extensively with [REDACTED] and attempted to stabilize the situation by using time as a tactic. COPA further finds that Officer Paris used deadly force as an option of last resort. COPA thus concludes by a preponderance of the evidence that Officer Paris'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.⁵⁴ 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.⁵⁵ This means that CPD members

⁵³ For a definition of COPA's standard of proof, see Appendix B.

⁵⁴ Att. 70, G03-02(II)(A), De-escalation, Response to Resistance, and Use of Force (effective June 28, 2023 to present).

⁵⁵ Att. 70, G03-02(III)(B).

will only resort to the use of force when required under the circumstances to serve a lawful purpose.⁵⁶ CPD members will use only the force that is proportional to the threat, actions, and level of resistance offered by a person.⁵⁷

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.⁵⁸ 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.”⁵⁹

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.”⁶⁰ 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.⁶¹

Based on its review of the evidence, COPA finds that it is more likely than not that Officer Paris’s use of deadly force was objectively reasonable given the imminent threat he faced. Officer Paris reported that he fired his weapon only after ██████ turned toward him with a gun in his hand in a manner that Officer Paris believed was threatening to his life and the life of others. Specifically, Officer Paris urged ██████ not to grab the gun before ██████ picked up the weapon. ██████ had already exhibited violent behavior toward ██████ and purportedly pointed a gun at Officer Paris’s forehead moments earlier. Officer Paris’s account is corroborated by the 911 calls, ██████ admission that he reached for his gun, and ██████ statement that she saw ██████ gun on the floor by his feet after the shooting. Further, ██████ had been consuming alcohol before the incident and was legally intoxicated when he arrived at the hospital following the shooting. It was thus objectively reasonable for Officer Paris to believe that ██████ actions were immediately likely to cause death or great bodily harm.⁶² Additionally, COPA finds by a preponderance of the evidence that ██████ had the means or instruments (the Taurus pistol) and the opportunity and ability to cause death or great bodily harm.

⁵⁶ Att. 70, G03-02(II)(C).

⁵⁷ Att. 70, G03-02(III)(B)(3).

⁵⁸ Att. 70, G03-02(IV)(C).

⁵⁹ Att. 70, G03-02(IV)(C)(1-2).

⁶⁰ Att. 70, G03-02(IV)(B)(1-3) (emphasis added).

⁶¹ Att. 70, G03-02(II)(D)(2).

⁶² By his actions, ██████ met the definition of an “assailant” under CPD policy. See Att. 71, G03-02-01(IV)(C), Response to Resistance and Force Options (effective June 28, 2023 to present).

The evidence further indicates that Officer Paris 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 and employed de-escalation techniques prior to using deadly force.⁶³ When Officer Paris saw [REDACTED] running upstairs for his gun, both Officer Paris and [REDACTED] immediately engaged in verbal communication with [REDACTED] attempting to convince him not to grab the weapon. It was only after [REDACTED] disregarded Officer Paris's verbal commands and turned toward him with a firearm that Officer Paris resorted to the use of deadly force. In addition, Officer Paris's use of deadly force was proportional to the threat he faced. Officer Paris fired his weapon only after [REDACTED] had threatened him with a firearm, and he stopped firing once [REDACTED] no longer posed a threat. Finally, COPA notes that Officer Paris immediately called 911, identified himself as an off-duty officer, and reported the incident to OEMC.

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

Approved:

[REDACTED]

Steffany Hreno
Deputy Chief Administrator

7/7/2026

Date

[REDACTED]

LaKenya White
Chief Administrator

7/7/2026

Date

⁶³ Att. 71, G03-02-01(III).

Appendix A**Case Details**

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	May 5, 2025 / 3:06 am / [REDACTED]
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	May 5, 2025 / 3:20 am
Involved Member #1:	Damarcus Paris, Star #17750, Employee ID # [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: December 30, 2022, Unit of Assignment: 004, Male, Black
Involved Individuals:	[REDACTED] Male, Black

Applicable Rules

- ☐ **Rule 2:** Any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department.
- ☐ **Rule 3:** Any failure to promote the Department's efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals.
- ☐ **Rule 5:** Failure to perform any duty.
- ☐ **Rule 6:** Disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral.
- ☐ **Rule 8:** Disrespect to or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty.
- ☐ **Rule 9:** Engaging in any unjustified verbal or physical altercation with any person, while on or off duty.
- ☐ **Rule 10:** Inattention to duty.
- ☐ **Rule 11:** Incompetency or inefficiency in the performance of 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, De-escalation, Response to Resistance, and Use of Force (effective June 28, 2023 to present).
- G03-02-01, Response to Resistance and Force Options (effective June 28, 2023 to present).
- G03-06, Firearm Discharge and Officer-Involved Death Incident Response and Investigation (effective April 15, 2021, to present).

Appendix B

Definition of COPA's Standard of Proof

COPA applies a preponderance of the evidence standard to determine whether allegations of excessive force are warranted or well-founded.⁶⁴ A **preponderance of evidence** is evidence indicating that it is more likely than not that a proposition is proved.⁶⁵ For example, if the evidence COPA gathers in an investigation establishes that it is more likely that not that misconduct occurred, even if by a narrow margin, then the preponderance of the evidence standard is met.

⁶⁴ See Municipal Code of Chicago, Ch. 2-78-110.

⁶⁵ 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).

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