



Log # 2023-4555

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

### I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On September 28, 2023, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received a telephone complaint from ██████████ reporting alleged misconduct by a member of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). ██████████ alleged that on September 27, 2023, Officer Pedro Venegas committed sexual misconduct against her.<sup>2</sup> Upon reviewing the body-worn camera footage of the officers, COPA found no evidence supporting this allegation and therefore did not serve this allegation. Additionally, ██████████ claimed that she requested a female officer to search her; however, the BWC footage indicates that ██████████ was never searched. Therefore, COPA did not serve this allegation. However, COPA served allegations that Officer Shahrukh Ali searched the vehicle without justification, searched a black purse without justification, and searched a pink backpack without justification. Additionally, COPA served allegations that Officer Juan Pintor Jr. searched the vehicle without justification and patted down ██████████ without justification. COPA also served allegations that Officer Antonio Ramirez searched the vehicle without justification, patted down ██████████ without justification, searched a bag without justification, and failed to timely activate his body worn camera. COPA **Sustained** the BWC allegation against Officer Ramirez.

### II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE<sup>3</sup>

On September 27, 2023, ██████████ was pulled over for failure to wear a seatbelt.<sup>4</sup> When Officer Ramirez approached, ██████████ handed Officer Ramirez his driver's license and proof of auto insurance.<sup>5</sup> In the Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) for ██████████ the report alleged ██████████ made sudden movements with her head which were actions consistent with that of a person concealing a weapon.<sup>6</sup> As a result, Officer Ali asked ██████████ to step out of the car and Officer Ramirez asked ██████████ to step out.<sup>7</sup> Both ██████████ and ██████████ became verbally

<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> 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, third-party video, police reports, and officer interviews.

<sup>4</sup> Att. 7, Investigatory Stop Report for ██████████ Page 11

<sup>5</sup> Att. 2, Officer Ramirez BWC at 1:00 to 1:40

<sup>6</sup> Att. 8, Investigatory Stop Report for ██████████ Page 9

<sup>7</sup> Att. 1, Officer Ali BWC at 6:00 to 6:15; Att. 2 at 4:50 to 5:00

combative and refused to step out of the vehicle.<sup>8</sup> Eventually, ██████ stepped out of the car and was handcuffed behind the vehicle by Officer Ali and Officer Venegas.<sup>9</sup> Then ██████ stepped out of the car and Officer Pintor him patted down his hoodie and pants.<sup>10</sup>

Officer Pintor searched the driver's seat area and center console.<sup>11</sup> Then ██████ the passenger in the back seat, exited the car and Officer Ramirez patted down his pants and hoodie.<sup>12</sup> Officer Ramirez then handcuffed ██████<sup>13</sup> Officer Ramirez searched the backseat area of the vehicle.<sup>14</sup> He grabbed a black bag, opened it and removed a pack of cigarettes.<sup>15</sup> ██████ told Officer Ramirez they were her cigarettes.<sup>16</sup>

Officer Ali searched the front passenger seat area.<sup>17</sup> He picked up a clear plastic cup, which had a small amount of liquid, from the door pocket.<sup>18</sup> He then went through a black purse that was on top of the front passenger seat.<sup>19</sup> Officer Ali picked up a mostly empty bottle of Tequila from the floor of the car.<sup>20</sup>

Eventually, all parties were uncuffed and allowed to leave the area in their vehicle.<sup>21</sup> No citations were issued.<sup>22</sup>

### III. ALLEGATIONS

#### Officer Shahrukh Ali:

1. Searching a vehicle without justification.  
- Not Sustained
2. Searching a black purse without justification.  
- Not Sustained
3. Searching a pink backpack without justification  
- Not Sustained

---

<sup>8</sup> Att. 1, at 6:15 to 6:45; Att. 2 5:00 to 5:30

<sup>9</sup> Att. 1, at 8:20 to 9:15. ██████ indicated that in her complaint that Officer Venegas conducted sexual misconduct against her. However, the footage of the officers BWC (Att. 1 at 8:20 to 9:15, Att. 4 at 4:30 to 5:20) and ██████ cell phone footage (Att. 6 at 0:00 to 1:27) show no sexual misconduct occurred against ██████ also said that she requested a female officer to search; however, the BWC footage indicates that ██████ was never searched

<sup>10</sup> Att. 3, Officer Pintor BWC at 4:15 to 5:14

<sup>11</sup> Att. 3, at 5:50 to 8:25

<sup>12</sup> Att. 2, Officer Ramirez BWC at 8:15 to 8:30

<sup>13</sup> Att. 2, at 8:30 to 8:40

<sup>14</sup> Att. 2, at 8:45 to 9:12

<sup>15</sup> Att. 2, at 8:45 to 9:12

<sup>16</sup> Att. 2, at 9:22 to 11:00

<sup>17</sup> Att. 1, at 9:50 to 11:30

<sup>18</sup> Att. 1, at 9:58 to 10:02

<sup>19</sup> Att. 1, at 10:04 to 10:16. See: One of the items Officer Ali handled was a green plastic container which he stated was "cannabis."

<sup>20</sup> Att. 1, at 11:10 to 11:20

<sup>21</sup> Att. 1, at 14:00 to 15:00

<sup>22</sup> Att. 8

**Officer Juan Pintor Jr:**

1. Searching a vehicle without justification.  
- Not Sustained
2. Patting down [REDACTED] without justification  
- Not Sustained

**Officer Antonio Ramirez:**

1. Searching a vehicle without justification.  
- Not Sustained
2. Searching a bag without justification  
- Not Sustained
3. Patting down [REDACTED] without justification  
- Not Sustained
4. Failing to timely activate his body worn camera  
- Sustained, Violations of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10

**IV. CREDIBILITY ASSESSMENT**

The credibility of an individual relies primarily on two factors: 1) the individual's truthfulness and 2) the reliability of the individual's account. The first factor addresses the honesty of the individual making the statement, while the second factor speaks to the individual's ability to accurately perceive the event at the time of the incident and then accurately recall the event from memory. COPA believes the officers provided accounts of the incident that were true and accurate to the best of their knowledge

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

**a) Searching the Vehicle and Bags**

COPA finds Allegations that Officers Shahrukh Ali, Pintor, and Ramirez searched the vehicle and its contents without justification, is **Not Sustained**. Warrantless searches of citizens and their property have been strictly limited by the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution and the Illinois Constitution, which established "the right of individuals to be free from unreasonable searches and seizure."<sup>24</sup> However, a police officer may perform a protective pat-down search where, after making a lawful stop, only if the officer has a reasonable articulable suspicion that he or another is in danger of attack because the defendant is armed and dangerous.<sup>25</sup> Furthermore, Department policy allows officers with the aforementioned reasonable articulable suspicion to perform a limited search of the vehicle, passenger compartments, and passengers for

---

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

<sup>24</sup> *People v. Colyar*, 2013 IL 111835, ¶ 31 (citing U.S. Const., amend. IV; Ill. Const. 1970, art. I, § 6).

<sup>25</sup> *People v. Sorenson*, 196 Ill. 2d 425, 432 (2001).

weapons.<sup>26</sup> However, such a search must be limited to those areas in which “a weapon may be placed or hidden,” including containers, such as bags within the automobile.<sup>27</sup>

In this case, Officer Ali told COPA he searched this vehicle because of [REDACTED] suspicious movements, which he described as [REDACTED] head moving towards the front dash and her upper body shifting from side to side.<sup>28</sup> He noted that these movements could be an indication that [REDACTED] was concealing contraband or a firearm.<sup>29</sup> Officer Ali said that he searched the black purse and backpack because [REDACTED] had possession of one and access to the other.<sup>30</sup> Officer Ramirez said he searched the vehicle as a result of [REDACTED] movements and limited his search to the bag within [REDACTED] reach.<sup>31</sup> Finally, Officer Pintor said he conducted a search of the vehicle because Officer Ali said that the movements of the vehicle’s occupants were excessive.<sup>32</sup> All of the officers’ accounts appear to be corroborated by BWC, however COPA cannot find clear and convincing evidence that the officers possessed enough reasonable articulable suspicion to justify the extent of their search and exonerate the allegations. Therefore, COPA finds the allegations that Officers Ali, Ramirez, and Pintor searched the vehicle and its contents without justification is **Not Sustained**.

#### b) Protective Pat downs

COPA finds the allegations that officers performed a pat down on [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] without justification are **Not Sustained**. When a police officer, after making a lawful stop, has reasonable suspicion that he, she, or another is in danger of an attack the officer may search for weapons.<sup>33</sup> The search is limited in scope and officers may not go into pockets, or reach underneath the outer surface of garments.<sup>34</sup>

In this case, officers witnessed what they described as suspicious behavior that in their experience could indicate the concealment of a weapon or contraband.<sup>35</sup> For example, Officer Pintor told COPA he conducted “a protective pat-down for weapons just based on how he was behaving and -- and that he wasn't cooperating with us.”<sup>36</sup> And that Office Pintor saw [REDACTED] “left hand was behind the door panel towards the back seat,” which made him believe [REDACTED] was “trying to conceal something or pass something off.”<sup>37</sup> COPA’s review of Officer Pinto’s BWC corroborates Officer Pintor’s statement.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>26</sup> Att. 23, S04-13-09(II)(C) Investigatory Stop System (Effective July 10, 2017 to present).

<sup>27</sup> Michigan v. Long, 463 U.S. 1032, 1048-49 (1983).

<sup>28</sup> Att. 22, at Pg. 7, Ins. 7 to 20

<sup>29</sup> Att. 22, at Pg. 13, Ins. 3 to 7

<sup>30</sup> Att. 22, at Pg. 9, Ins. 8 to 11; and Att. 22, at Pg. 22, Ins. 11 to 13

<sup>31</sup> Att. 20, at Pg. 16, Ins. 20 to 21; Att. 20, at Pg. 10, Ins. 10 to 13

<sup>32</sup> Att. 21 at Pg. 8, Ins. 12 to 16

<sup>33</sup> Att. 23, referencing 725 ILCS 5/108-1.01 (IL State Law for Protective Pat Downs)

<sup>34</sup> Att. 23, VI(A)(2)

<sup>35</sup> Att. 8

<sup>36</sup> Att. 21, at Pg. 8, Ins. 7 to 10 and Pg. 12, Ins. 11 to 13

<sup>37</sup> Att. 21, at Pg. 8, Ins. 7 to 10, and Pg. 12, Ins. 11 to 13

<sup>38</sup> Att. 3

Officer Ramirez told COPA he patted down ██████ because movements in the back seat of the vehicle created an officer safety issue.<sup>39</sup> COPA was unable to prove or disprove Officer Ramirez's statement as the vehicle's windows are darkly tinted and his BWC does not capture anything in the back seat.<sup>40</sup>

Here, COPA finds that officers more likely than not conducted a protective pat down of ██████ and ██████ due to officer safety concerns. However, COPA cannot prove by clear and convincing evidence that the officers possessed enough reasonable articulable suspicion to fully exonerate the allegations. Therefore, COPA finds the allegations that Officers Ali, Ramirez, and Pintor searched the vehicle and its contents without justification is **Not Sustained**.

### c) Officer Ramirez Failed to Timely Activate his BWC

COPA finds the Allegation that Officer Ramirez failed to timely activate his body worn camera, is **Sustained**. CPD Special Order S-03-14 states Department members will "activate" their BWC at "the beginning of an incident."<sup>41</sup> In his statement, Officer Ramirez admitted his BWC was "activated late, but eventually, it was activated once I realized it was not recording."<sup>42</sup> In this case, Officer Ramirez's BWC footage clearly shows As the BWC footage clearly shows he failed to activate his BWC at the beginning of the incident.<sup>43</sup> Therefore, COPA finds this Allegation is **Sustained**.

## VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

### a) Officer Antonio Ramirez

#### i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History<sup>44</sup>

Officer Ramirez has received 230 total awards, including 210 honorable mentions, seven Department commendations, and four top gun arrest awards. Officer Ramirez has no record of sustained complaints. He has one SPAR for a court violation appearance, which resulted in a reprimand in 2025.

#### ii. Recommended Discipline

<sup>39</sup> Att. 20, Pg. 9, lns. 21 to 24, and Pg. 10, lns. 2 to 6.

<sup>40</sup> Att. 2, at 0:00 to 9:00

<sup>41</sup> Att. 24, S03-14 (III)(A) (2), Body Worn Cameras (Cameras (effective April 30, 2018 to December 28, 2023)

<sup>42</sup> Att. 20, Pg. 38, lns. 6 to 8

<sup>43</sup> Att. 2, at 0:55 to 1:59. Officer Ramirez interacts with ██████ and the BWC has no audio recording which is indicative that Officer Ramirez did not activate his BWC at the start of this law enforcement activity. At 1:59, the BWC clearly shows Officer Ramirez activating his BWC by double tapping his BWC.

<sup>44</sup> Att. 26.

COPA has found that Officer Ramirez has violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10 when he failed to timely activate his BWC. In mitigation, COPA has considered Officer Ramirez's numerous awards and honors. However, the Department GO in this case is very clear. CPD Special Order S-03-14 states Department members will "activate" their BWC at "the beginning of an incident." For his part, Officer Ramirez admitted to activating late and was remorseful. Therefore, COPA recommends Officer Ramirez receive a **reprimand** and **retraining** on the Department's BWC policy.

Approved:



---

Angela Hearts-Glass  
*Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator*

5-29-25

---

Date

**Appendix A**

**Case Details**

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	September 27, 2023 / 5500 S Union Ave., Chicago, IL 60609
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	September 28, 2023 / 10:25 am
Involved Member #1:	Officer Shahrukh Ali / Star#14112 / Employee# [REDACTED] / Date of Appointment: October 26, 2015 / Unit of Assignment: 07 (detailed to 211) / Male / Asian/Pacific Island
Involved Member #2:	Officer Juan Pintor Jr. / Star#6255 / Employee# [REDACTED] / Date of Appointment: October 16, 2017 / Unit of Assignment: 07 (detailed to 211) / Male / Hispanic
Involved Member #3:	Officer Antonio Ramirez / Star#19116 / Employee# [REDACTED] / Date of Appointment: February 20, 2018 / Unit of Assignment: 07 (detailed to 211) / Male / Hispanic
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] / Female / Black
Involved Individual #2:	[REDACTED] / Male / Black
Involved Individual #3:	[REDACTED]
Involved Individuals #4:	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] / 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.
- Rule \_\_:** *[Insert text of any additional rule(s) violated]*

**Applicable Policies and Laws**

---

- Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution and the Illinois Constitution
- S03-14, Body Worn Cameras (effective April 30, 2018 to December 28, 2023)
- People v. Colyar, 2013 IL 111835
- People v. Sorenson, 196 Ill. 2d 425 (2001).
- Michigan v. Long, 463 U.S. 1032, 1048-49 (1983).

## 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>45</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>46</sup>

---

<sup>45</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>46</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