



Log # 2024-7481

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On September 29, 2024, at approximately 6:29 pm, ██████████ submitted an online complaint to the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) regarding a member of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). ██████████ alleged that on September 29, 2024, at approximately 9:30 am, at the ██████████ located at ██████████, off-duty Field Training Officer Burdett Griffin III (Officer Griffin) engaged in a verbal altercation with restaurant employees over his food order. ██████████ stated that during the argument, Officer Griffin called ██████████ an “asshole” and “nappy-headed,” threatened to “choke out” ██████████ and ██████████ called ██████████ a “nigger,” stated words to the effect of, “I hate dealing with Negroes,” threatened ██████████ by saying to him, “How about we take this outside,” and displayed his firearm while saying to ██████████ “Try me if you want to.” COPA interviewed ██████████ six restaurant employees, and Officer Griffin. Following its investigation, COPA sustained three of the allegations against Officer Griffin.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE²

On September 29, 2024, between 8:00 am and 9:30 am, off-duty Officer Griffin was alone when he went to the ██████████ to pick up his food order.³ A short while after leaving the restaurant with his food, Officer Griffin noticed that he had not received his full order, specifically a frozen lemonade. Officer Griffin returned to the restaurant and initially spoke with the restaurant’s cashier, ██████████ who informed him that he was charged correctly for his order. As they argued over whether or not his order was correct, Officer Griffin became frustrated and said to ██████████ “You’ve been an asshole to me all day.”⁴ ██████████ continued in her attempt to explain to Officer Griffin that he had been charged appropriately for his food order. ██████████ sister, ██████████ who also worked as a waitress at the restaurant, approached and attempted to help resolve the situation. ██████████ told COPA that she heard Officer Griffin call ██████████ “nappy-headed.”⁵

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 The following is a summary of what COPA finds most likely occurred during this incident. This summary utilized information from several different sources, including ██████████ web complaint and COPA interview, the interviews of six restaurant employees, and the interview of Officer Griffin.

³ Att. 39, pg. 6, ln. 13 to pg. 7, ln. 22.

⁴ Att. 13, pg. 5, ln. 2 to pg. 6, ln. 3.

⁵ Att. 9, pg. 16, lns. 4 to 5.

As Officer Griffin and ██████████ continued to argue over his food order, the restaurant's 18-year-old busboy, ██████████ intervened by telling Officer Griffin that they would correct his order and that there was no need to speak to them in that manner.⁶ Officer Griffin responded by telling ██████████ to mind his business "before I choke you out."⁷ At that point, ██████████ who was also waiting for a food order, exclaimed that it was crazy to threaten to choke anyone. According to ██████████ Officer Griffin then turned his attention to ██████████ and told him to mind his business before he [Officer Griffin] choked him [██████████ out too.⁸ The restaurant owner's son, ██████████ told COPA that ██████████ got in Officer Griffin's face and stated, "You never talk to someone's child like that. If you want to take this outside, we can right now."⁹ Conversely, ██████████ stated that it was Officer Griffin who told him, "How about we take this outside."¹⁰

The two men continued to argue. Officer Griffin was subsequently given his food order and began to leave the restaurant. ██████████ who overheard restaurant staff identify Officer Griffin as a Chicago Police Officer, said he told Officer Griffin, "My heart goes out to you. I know you're probably dealing with a whole lot throughout the Chicagoland area on a day-to-day basis."¹¹ According to ██████████ Officer Griffin responded by saying, "Yeah, I have to deal with niggers like you."¹² No other witness said they heard Officer Griffin refer to ██████████ as a "nigger," and Officer Griffin denied saying it. However, ██████████ and ██████████ stated that they heard Officer Griffin say words to the effect of, "I hate dealing with Negroes."¹³ ██████████ also reported hearing Officer Griffin call ██████████ a "Negro."¹⁴

Officer Griffin exited the restaurant, and a few moments later, ██████████ was given his food order and also left the restaurant. ██████████ told COPA that as he walked through the parking lot, Officer Griffin drove up alongside him, displayed a small, black semi-automatic handgun that was positioned near his hip, and said, "Try me if you want to."¹⁵ Officer Griffin then drove away and had no further contact with anyone involved in this incident. Officer Griffin denied making any of the statements alleged by ██████████ or the restaurant employees.¹⁶

⁶ Att. 31, pg. 5, ln. 12 to pg. 6, ln. 11.

⁷ Att. 9, pg. 5, lns. 22 to 23; Att. 4, pg. 5, lns. 6 to 7; Att. 13, pg. 6, lns. 15 to 17; Att. 29, pg. 6, lns. 15 to 16; Att. 31, pg. 6, lns. 4 to 5; Att. 32, pg. 11, lns. 1 to 3.

⁸ Att. 4, pg. 5, lns. 11 to 13.

⁹ Att. 29, pg. 14, lns. 11 to 15. Restaurant employee ██████████ also reported that ██████████ said to Officer Griffin, "We can take this outside." Att. 32, pg. 5, ln. 22.

¹⁰ Att. 4, pg. 6, lns. 6 to 7. In addition to ██████████ restaurant employees ██████████ and ██████████ all told COPA that it was Officer Griffin who made this statement. See Att. 13, pg. 6, lns. 22 to 23; Att. 31, pg. 6, lns. 12 to 14; Att. 9, pg. 6, ln. 11.

¹¹ Att. 4, pg. 5, lns. 17 to 19.

¹² Att. 4, pg. 5, lns. 21 to 22.

¹³ Att. 9, pg. 9, ln. 19; Att. 13, pg. 14, ln. 12.

¹⁴ Att. 31, pg. 13, lns. 8 to 9. ██████████ could not recall if Officer Griffin called anyone a "Negro," and Officer Griffin denied saying it. Additionally, cashier ██████████ and server ██████████ did not hear the remark, but they had also continued preparing and serving other customers' food orders throughout the incident. See Att. 29, pg. 18, lns. 11 to 13; Att. 39, pg. 32, lns. 2 to 7; Att. 30, pgs. 10 to 11 and pg. 14, lns. 18 to 20; Att. 32, pgs. 15 to 16.

¹⁵ Att. 4, pg. 7, ln. 9, and pg. 14, lns. 4 to 15.

¹⁶ Att. 39, pg. 31, ln. 4 to pg. 33, ln. 1.

During a telephone conversation with [REDACTED] the owner of [REDACTED], he explained that the restaurant is not equipped with any internal or external security cameras, and therefore, no security recording exists.¹⁷

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer Burdett Griffin III:

- Calling [REDACTED] an “asshole.”
 - Sustained, in violation of CPD Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9.
- Calling [REDACTED] “nappy-headed.”
 - Not Sustained.
- Threatening to “choke out” [REDACTED]
 - Sustained, in violation of CPD Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9.
- Threatening to “choke out” [REDACTED]
 - Not Sustained.
- Calling [REDACTED] a “nigger.”
 - Not Sustained.
- Stating words to the effect of, “I hate dealing with Negroes.”
 - Sustained, in violation of CPD Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9.
- Threatening [REDACTED] by saying words to the effect of, “How about we take this outside?”
 - Not Sustained.
- Threatening [REDACTED] by displaying his firearm and stating words to the effect of, “Try me if you want to.”
 - 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 the individual’s ability to accurately perceive the event at the time of the incident and then accurately recall the event from memory.

Initially, it is difficult to determine from the evidence exactly where each of the witnesses were standing and whether they were close enough to hear everything that was said during this interaction. For example, [REDACTED] said she walked away at one point; however, she testified as to what she heard, and she said she heard most of Officer Griffin’s alleged statements. [REDACTED] also told COPA that she stepped away to continue working on the food orders, and [REDACTED] said she tried to keep an eye on her tables as well as the argument. With respect to the other witnesses, it cannot be absolutely determined whether any of them changed positions such that they might not have heard the statements, since none of them reported changing positions.

¹⁷ Column CMS Note CO-1411866.

Nevertheless, COPA notes that Officer Griffin, who stated that he did not make any of the alleged remarks, had a clear motive to minimize his culpability by denying that he made the inappropriate statements. In contrast, ██████████ and the restaurant employees had no apparent reason to accuse Officer Griffin of making those statements. Officer Griffin was a frequent and longtime customer, and the employees did not report any history of problems with him.¹⁸ They also knew he was a CPD officer who often came into the restaurant in uniform with his partner. While ██████████ and the employees' statements varied as to the specific comments they heard Officer Griffin make, overall, COPA finds they provided credible accounts of the incident.

V. ANALYSIS¹⁹

a. CPD Policy and Rules

CPD policy requires that members respect the human rights of all individuals with whom they interact. In particular, the policy requires that members interact with all members of the public in an unbiased, fair, and respectful manner.²⁰ Members will treat all persons with courtesy and dignity, and they will act, speak, and conduct themselves in a courteous, respectful, and professional manner.²¹ Members will “not use language or take action intended to taunt or denigrate an individual, including using racist or derogatory language.”²²

The CPD Rules of Conduct further stress the requirement that CPD members treat all individuals in a respectful manner. CPD Rule 2 prohibits any action or conduct which impedes CPD's policy and goals or brings discredit upon CPD, and it expressly applies to both the professional and private conduct of all CPD members.²³ Rule 3 prohibits actions that fail to promote CPD's efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals. Rule 8 prohibits any disrespect or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty. Finally, Rule 9 prohibits CPD members from engaging in any unjustified verbal or physical altercation with any person, while on or off duty.

b. COPA's Findings Regarding Officer Griffin's Remarks.

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Griffin called ██████████ an “asshole” is sustained. Although Officer Griffin denied the allegation, during separate statements to COPA, restaurant employees ██████████ and ██████████ all reported hearing Officer Griffin call ██████████ an “asshole” during the dispute

¹⁸ See, e.g., Att. 32, pg. 4 (server ██████████ noted that Officer Griffin “comes in here a lot, he's been coming here a long time as well. And I never had a issue with him. He always seem, you know, he was calm and respectful.”)

¹⁹ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, see Appendix B.

²⁰ Att. 43, G02-01(III)(B)(1), Protection of Human Rights (effective June 30, 2022).

²¹ Att. 43, G02-01(III)(B)(2), (3).

²² Att. 43, G02-01(III)(B)(4).

²³ Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department, Rules of Conduct (V) (effective April 16, 2015). Additionally, the Standards of Conduct provide that, “Since the conduct of a member, on or off duty, does reflect directly upon the Department, a member must at all times conduct himself in a manner which does not bring discredit to himself, the Department or the city.” Rules and Regulations (I)(B)(5).

over his food order.²⁴ There was no audio or video recorded evidence of this incident, but COPA has no reason to question the credibility of the restaurant's employees. Based on the accounts of those involved in this incident, the preponderance of evidence indicates that it is more likely than not that Officer Griffin called ██████████ an "asshole." Accordingly, this allegation is **sustained** as a violation of CPD Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9.

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Griffin called ██████████ "nappy-headed" is not sustained. During her interview with COPA, ██████████ alleged that Officer Griffin called her sister, ██████████ "nappy-headed." However, ██████████ never mentioned that Officer Griffin used this language during their argument. Additionally, Officer Griffin denied the allegation, and his denial is supported by ██████████ and ██████████ each of whom told COPA they did not hear Officer Griffin call ██████████ "nappy-headed." Because only one witness claimed to have heard this statement, and Officer Griffin denied making the statement, COPA finds the allegation is **not sustained**.

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Griffin threatened to "choke out" ██████████ is sustained. Although Officer Griffin denied that he threatened ██████████ his denial of the allegation is contradicted by most of the individuals interviewed by COPA. During separate interviews with COPA, ██████████ and ██████████ all stated that they heard Officer Griffin threaten ██████████ after ██████████ intervened in the argument between Officer Griffin and ██████████.²⁵ The only witness that did not hear this was ██████████ who stated that she stepped away to get the food orders and did not personally hear the threat; however, the other witnesses told her about it.²⁶ Additionally, COPA notes that while Officer Griffin unequivocally denied most of the allegations, he responded "not that I recall" when asked if he threatened to choke out ██████████ or anyone else.²⁷ For these reasons, COPA finds that Officer Griffin threatened to choke out ██████████ by a preponderance of the evidence; therefore, this allegation is **sustained** as a violation of CPD Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9.

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Griffin threatened to "choke out" ██████████ is not sustained. ██████████ alleged that during the verbal altercation, Officer Griffin threatened to choke him out. During her interview with COPA, ██████████ stated that she heard the threat by Officer Griffin.²⁸ But, during separate interviews with COPA, ██████████

²⁴ Att. 9, pg. 5, lns. 5 to 6; Att. 13, pg. 6, ln. 3; Att. 29, pg. 18, lns. 2 to 5; Att. 30, pg. 9, lns. 3 to 4; Att. 31, pg. 5, lns. 9 to 12.

²⁵ The following are the quotes each witness attributed to Officer Griffin. ██████████ "You need to mind your business before I choke you out." (Att. 9, pg. 5, lns. 22 to 23); ██████████ "I don't know why you in my business. You must want to get choked out." (Att. 13, pg. 14, lns. 9 to 11); ██████████ "Don't make me have to choke you out." (Att. 31, pg. 12, lns. 7 to 10); ██████████ "Shut up, before I come over there and choke you." (Att. 32, pg. 11, ln. 3); ██████████ "I'll choke you out." (Att. 29, pg. 13, lns. 11 to 12); ██████████ Officer Griffin told ██████████ to "mind his business before he choked him out." (Att. 4, pg. 5, lns. 6 to 7).

²⁶ Att. 30, pg. 10, lns. 16 to 24.

²⁷ Att. 39, pg. 31, ln. 14 to pg. 32, ln. 1.

²⁸ Att. 9, pg. 9, ln. 11.

██████████ and ██████████ all denied hearing Officer Griffin make that threat.²⁹ Additionally, Officer Griffin denied that he threatened ██████████ at any time.³⁰ This investigation revealed insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation. Accordingly, COPA finds this allegation is **not sustained**.

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Griffin called ██████████ a “nigger” is not sustained. ██████████ alleged that Officer Griffin called him a “nigger,” but Officer Griffin denied ever directing the aforementioned slur toward ██████████.³¹ During separate interviews with COPA, ██████████ and ██████████ each denied hearing Officer Griffin call ██████████ a “nigger.”³² Because only ██████████ claimed to have heard this statement, and Officer Griffin denied making the statement, COPA finds the allegation is **not sustained**.

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Griffin stated words to the effect of, “I hate dealing with Negroes” is sustained. ██████████ and ██████████ all separately stated to COPA that they heard Officer Griffin make this statement during the verbal altercation with restaurant staff and ██████████.³³ Additionally, this comment is substantially similar to ██████████ claim that Officer Griffin told him, “I have to deal with niggers like you.”³⁴ Although ██████████ could not recall if Officer Griffin called anyone a “Negro,”³⁵ and ██████████ and ██████████ did not hear the remark, the latter two witnesses reported that they were also focused on their work responsibilities.³⁶ Officer Griffin denied the allegation; on balance, however, COPA finds that it is more likely than not that Officer Griffin used this language. The term “Negro” is a very specific word choice, as well as a very offensive one. COPA finds it unlikely that three employees would independently report hearing this language if Officer Griffin did not use it. Therefore, by a preponderance of the evidence, COPA finds this allegation is **sustained** as a violation of CPD Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9.

COPA finds that the allegation that Officer Griffin threatened ██████████ by saying words to the effect of, “How about we take this outside?” is not sustained. ██████████ and ██████████ all stated in their COPA interviews that they heard Officer Griffin make the threat to ██████████ that they could take it outside.³⁷ However, ██████████ and ██████████ were clear that they heard ██████████ tell Officer Griffin that they could take it outside.³⁸ ██████████

²⁹ Att. 13, pg. 18, lns. 9 to 12; Att. 29, pg. 17, lns. 3 to 11; Att. 30, pg. 12, lns. 11 to 13; Att. 31, pg. 17, lns. 22 to 24; Att. 32, pg. 16, lns. 13 to 18.

³⁰ Att. 39, pg. 31, lns. 20 to 22.

³¹ Att. 39, pg. 32, lns. 2 to 4.

³² Att. 9, pg. 10, lns. 4 to 6; Att. 9, pg. 16, lns. 12 to 13; Att. 13, pg. 24, lns. 7 to 11; Att. 29, pg. 18, lns. 6 to 10; Att. 30, pg. 12, lns. 14 to 16; Att. 30, pg. 14, ln. 24 to pg. 25, ln. 1; Att. 31, pg. 18, lns. 6 to 9; Att. 32, pg. 15, lns. 9 to 14.

³³ Att. 9, pg. 9, ln. 19; Att. 13, pg. 14, ln. 12; Att. 31, pg. 13, lns. 7 to 16.

³⁴ Att. 4, pg. 15, lns. 21 to 22.

³⁵ Att. 29, pg. 18, lns. 11 to 13.

³⁶ Att. 30, pgs. 10 to 11, pg. 14, lns. 18 to 20; Att. 32, pgs. 15 to 16.

³⁷ Att. 4, pg. 6, lns. 6 to 7; Att. 9, pg. 6, ln. 11; Att. 13, pg. 6, lns. 22 to 23; Att. 31, pg. 6, lns. 12 to 14.

³⁸ Att. 29, pg. 6, lns. 18 to 22, pg. 14, lns. 11 to 23; Att. 32, pg. 5 and pgs. 14 to 15.

██████ never indicated whether or not she heard this threat,³⁹ and Officer Griffin denied the allegation.⁴⁰ Additionally, there is no audio or video recording of this incident. For these reasons, COPA lacks sufficient evidence to prove or disprove this allegation; as such, COPA finds the allegation is **not sustained**.

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Griffin threatened ██████ by displaying his firearm and stating words to the effect of, “Try me if you want to,” is not sustained. ██████ alleged that after he exited the restaurant and walked through the parking lot, Officer Griffin pulled up alongside him in his personal vehicle, displayed a small black handgun held at his hip, and said, “Try me if you want to.”⁴¹ Officer Griffin denied the allegation and stated that he was not carrying a firearm when the incident occurred.⁴² This is consistent with the accounts of the restaurant employees, none of whom observed Officer Griffin with a firearm. However, it is clear that Officer Griffin and ██████ did have an interaction in the parking lot. ██████ and ██████ all reported seeing Officer Griffin drive across the parking lot and stop briefly alongside ██████⁴³ Officer Griffin himself acknowledged this but told COPA, “I don’t know what we said. We was just chirping.”⁴⁴ As a result, while COPA finds that Officer Griffin and ██████ exchanged words in the parking lot, there is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the specific elements of this allegation. Therefore, this allegation is **not sustained**.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Officer Griffin’s Complimentary and Disciplinary History⁴⁵

Officer Griffin had been a CPD member for 26 years at the time this incident occurred. He has received 31 various awards, including three complimentary letters and 20 honorable mentions. Officer Griffin has no finalized sustained disciplinary history in the past five years.⁴⁶

b. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officer Griffin violated Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9 when he called ██████ an “asshole,” threatened to “choke out” ██████ and stated words to the effect of, “I hate dealing with Negroes.” Although COPA was unable to prove that Officer Griffin made the other specific remarks alleged against him, the seven witnesses whom COPA interviewed were unequivocal about the overall nature of the officer’s conduct. Officer Griffin’s comments and

³⁹ Att. 30, pg. 15, lns. 2 to 5.

⁴⁰ Att. 39, pg. 32, lns. 8 to 14.

⁴¹ Att. 4, pg. 7, lns. 6 to 11.

⁴² Att. 39, pgs. 32 to 33.

⁴³ Att. 13, pgs. 18 to 20; Att. 9, pg. 12; Att. 32, pgs. 5 to 6; Att. 9, pg. 7.

⁴⁴ Att. 39, pg. 28, ln. 3.

⁴⁵ Att. 42.

⁴⁶ COPA notes that in Log 2021-0004821, Officer Griffin was found to have engaged in an unnecessary verbal altercation with a citizen, and referred to the citizen as “this nigga.” CPD concurred with these sustained findings and determined that a 7-day suspension was appropriate. To date, however, the case has not been finalized.

threats were inappropriate and disrespectful, and they left a lasting impression on [REDACTED] and the restaurant employees. Given that all of the witnesses knew Officer Griffin was a CPD member, his conduct brought significant discredit upon CPD.

Based on Officer Griffin's complimentary and disciplinary history, and considering the particular violations in this case, COPA recommends that Officer Griffin receive a **5 to 30 day suspension** and **retraining** on the standards of professionalism expected of all CPD members.

Approved:

[REDACTED]

Steffany Hreno
Director of Investigations

4/18/2025

Date

Appendix A

Case Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	September 29, 2024 / 9:30 am / ██████████, Chicago Illinois, 60617.
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	September 29, 2024 / 7:07 pm.
Involved Member #1:	FTO Burdett Griffin III; Star #19118; Employee ID #██████; DOA: May 26, 1998; Unit 005; Male, Black.
Involved Individual #1:	██████████ Male Black.
Involved Individual #2:	██████████ Female Black.
Involved Individual #3:	██████████ Male Hispanic.

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

- G02-01, Protection of Human Rights (effective June 30, 2022).
- Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department (effective April 16, 2015).

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.⁴⁷ 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.”⁴⁸

⁴⁷ 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).

⁴⁸ *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