DRAFT Log # 2024-0002364

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT[1]

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On February 13, 2024, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received a telephone complaint from [redacted] reporting alleged misconduct by members of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). [redacted] alleged that on February 10, 2024, Officers William Washington, Jr. and Kobe Nelson, Jr. entered the yard of her home and asked her granddaughters and their father to exit their parked car, without justification.[2] Upon review of the evidence, COPA served allegations that Officers Washington and Nelson detained and handcuffed [redacted] and [redacted] without justification, and failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report. COPA also alleged that Officer Nelson searched the handbag of [redacted] and performed a pat-down search of [redacted] without justification. Following its investigation, COPA reached sustained findings regarding the allegations that Officers Nelson and Washington failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report. COPA also sustained allegations that Officer Nelson performed a pat down search of [redacted] and searched the handbag of [redacted] without justification.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE[3]

On February 10, 2024, at approximately 10:34 pm, Officers Nelson and Washington were in a squad vehicle on patrol in the 6th District when they received a transmission of a ShotSpotter[4] report in the area.[5] The ShotSpotter report identified four rounds fired near 7611 S. St. Lawrence Avenue at approximately 10:33:06 pm.[6] Officers Nelson and Washington drove toward the area

[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] 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. The original complaint was brought against four officers but COPA's preliminary investigation revealed no basis to bring allegations against Officers Cristian DeLuna and Simon Zhong.
[3] 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, police reports, civilian interviews and officer interviews.
[4] Att. 14, S03-19, ShotSpotter Flex Program (III), The ShotSpotter Flex program was an area wide acoustic gunshot detection, alert, and analysis tool. The system was decommissioned by the City of Chicago on September 22, 2024.
[5] Att. 3, BWC of Officer Kobe Nelson Jr. at 1:29 to 1:32.
[6] Att. 12, Shot Spotter Report.

of the alert and observed an idling vehicle in a dark lot behind a house located at 7619 S. Lawrence Avenue, approximately sixty-two feet from the location of the ShotSpotter.[7]

As the officers approached the vehicle from the alley behind the lot, OEMC transmitted over the radio that the shots on St. Lawrence Avenue were coming from the backyard.[8] Nelson radioed in response that they were investigating the ShotSpotter and that they had a car in the backyard with occupants.[9] Officer Nelson approached the passenger's side of the vehicle and Officer Washington approached the driver's side. [redacted] was in the passenger's seat and [redacted] was in the driver's seat. Officer Nelson shined a flashlight at [redacted] as he approached and asked [redacted] if he was good and if he heard any shooting.[10] [redacted] stated that he did and that was why they were trying to leave.[11] Officer Nelson then asked if [redacted] had any weapons and asked to see his hands.[12] [redacted] complied and put both hands out the window.[13] Officer Nelson asked [redacted] to step out of the vehicle and [redacted] complied.[14] When [redacted] exited the vehicle, his right arm was inside the sleeve of his jacket.[15] Officer Nelson performed a protective pat down on [redacted][16] No weapons were found on [redacted] Officer Nelson told [redacted] that he was being detained, not arrested, and placed a handcuff on [redacted] left wrist.[17] [redacted] repeatedly asked why he was being detained and stated that he did not feel safe.[18] Officer Nelson did not recall [redacted] or [redacted] saying anything threatening toward the officers[19] or [redacted] making any threatening movements[20] during the stop.

Officer Washington informed [redacted] that she was being detained. [redacted] exited the vehicle, and Officer Washington brought her to the rear of the vehicle.[21] [redacted] and [redacted] protested being handcuffed. Officers Nelson and Washington then handcuffed [redacted] left wrist to A [redacted] right wrist and Officer Washinton removed a handcuff from [redacted] right wrist.[22] [redacted] asked that her little sister, a minor who was seated in the back seat of the car, be allowed to go inside of the house to get their grandmother.[23] The officers allowed the minor to exit the car and go into the house. Around this time, Officers DeLuna and Zhong arrived on scene but did not interact with [redacted] or [redacted] Officer Nelson searched

[7] Att. 30, Google Map Screenshot of Distance between 7611 S. St. Lawrence Ave. and 7619 S. St. Lawrence Ave.; Att. 3 at 2:52 to 2:54.
[8] Att. 3 at 3:01 to 3:03.
[9] Att. 3 at 3:05 to 3:11.
[10] Att. 3 at 3:21 to 3:24.
[11] Att. 3 at 3:26 to 3:28.
[12] Att. 3 at 3:29 to 3: 32.
[13] Att. 3 at 3:33 to 3:34.
[14] Att. 3 at 3:39 to 3:41.
[15] Att. 3 at 3:44.
[16] Att. 3 at 3:49 to 3:56.
[17] Att. 3 at 3:56 to 3:59.
[18] Att. 3 at 4:00 to 4:12.
[19] Att. 29, pg. 16, lns. 6 to 11.
[20] Att. 29, pg. 17 ln. 24 to pg. 18, ln.
[21] Att. 4, BWC of Officer William Washington Jr. at 4:20 to 4:41.
[22] Att. 4 at 4: 51 to 5:22.
[23] Att. 3 at 4:54 to 5:00.

inside of the vehicle.[24] He stated that he searched all areas of the passenger compartment that were accessible from the driver's or passenger's seat to make sure there were no accessible firearms inside the vehicle.[25] [redacted] stated that she gave the officers permission to search the vehicle.[26] Officer Nelson then searched [redacted] handbag.[27] [redacted] could not recall if she gave permission to search her handbag.[28] Officer Nelson stated that he searched the handbag because in his experience, a handbag is commonly used to conceal a firearm.[29] No weapons were found in the vehicle or in [redacted] handbag. At the end of the stop, Officer Nelson offered Investigatory Stop receipts to [redacted] and [redacted] accepted the receipt and [redacted] declined it.[30] Officer Washington gave [redacted] the receipt and all the officers left the lot.

Officers Nelson and Washington believed they had Articulable Suspicion (RAS) to detain [redacted] and [redacted] because of the location of the vehicle relative to the ShotSpotter report,[31] the fact that the vehicle was the only vehicle sitting in the area,[32] and because [redacted] was sitting in the vehicle wearing his outer jacket in an unnatural way,[33] on only one side of his body.[34] Officers Nelson and Washington believed they were justified in handcuffing [redacted] and [redacted] for officer safety purposes because of the proximity of their vehicle to the ShotSpotter call,[35] and the risk of an ambush due to the dark area.[36]

When Officers Nelson and Washinton appeared at COPA offices on April 30, 2025 to provide statements, Officer Nelson brought with him copies of Investigatory Stop Reports for [redacted] and [redacted] (as John Doe) for this incident.[37] Both Investigatory Reports were marked "Preliminary."[38] Neither report indicated that a supervisor reviewed and approved them. Officer Nelson stated that the reports were completed on February 12, 2024 but were not submitted and he did not recall why.[39]

[24] Att. 3 at 5:04 to 6:19.
[25] Att. 29, Statement of Officer Kobe Nelson, Jr. (transcript), pg. 14, lns. 8 to 11, and pg. 17, lns. 6 to 12.
[26] Att. 15, Statement of [redacted] (transcript), pg. 10, lns. 13 to 19.
[27] Att. 3 at 6:21 to 6:33.
[28] Att. 15, pg. 15, ln. 23 to pg. 16, ln. 5.
[29] Att. 29, pg. 17, lns. 19 to 23.
[30] Att. 3 at 6:41 to 6:51.
[31] Att. 29, pg. 14, lns. 18 to 23.
[32] Att. 28, Statement of Officer William Washington, Jr. (transcript), pg. 14, lns, 5 to 13.
[33] Att. 29, pg. 14, ln. 18 to pg. 15, ln. 19.
[34] Att. 29, pg. 12, lns. 2 to 4.
[35] Att. 29, pg. 15, ln. 21 to pg. 16, ln. 3.
[36] Att. 28, pg. 14, ln. 23 to pg. 15, ln. 9.
[37] Att. 23, [redacted] ISR and Att. 24, J. Doe ISR.
[38] Att. 23 and Att. 24.
[39] Att. 29, pg. 7, lns. 15 to 24.

III. ALLEGATIONS

Kobe Nelson Jr.:

-Detaining [redacted] and [redacted] (without justification).
- Exonerated

-Handcuffing Ashanwte [redacted] and [redacted] (without justification).
- Exonerated

-Searching the handbag of [redacted] (without justification).
- Sustained in violation of Rules 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10 and 11.

-Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report.
- Sustained in violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10 and 11.

-Conducting a protective pat-down of [redacted] without justification.
- Sustained in violation of Rules 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10 and 11.

William Washington Jr.:

-Detaining [redacted] and [redacted] (without justification).
- Exonerated

-Handcuffing [redacted] [redacted] and [redacted] (without justification).
- Exonerated

-Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report.
- Sustained in violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, and 11.

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 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, the facts concerning the incident were not in material dispute. This investigation did not reveal any evidence that caused COPA to doubt the truthfulness of any of the individuals (sworn or unsworn) who provided statements.[40] COPA also finds that the CPD members' accounts were corroborated by the video evidence and are therefore reliable.

[40] However, the investigation did reveal evidence indicating that Ms. [redacted] was mistaken in her belief, made in her statement, that officers pointed firearms at the vehicle. The evidence supports that the officers were in fact

V. ANALYSIS[41]

a. Officer Nelson and Officer Washington were justified in detaining [redacted] and [redacted]

Clear and convincing evidence supports that Officers Nelson and Washington were justified in detaining [redacted] and [redacted] Pursuant to Special Order S04-13-09, a CPD member may detain a person based on a Reasonable Articulable Suspicion that the person is committing, is about to commit, or has committed a criminal offense.[42] "Reasonable Articulable Suspicion depends on the totality of the circumstances which the sworn member observes and the reasonable inferences that are drawn based on the sworn member's training and experience."[43]

Based on the totality of the circumstances Officers Nelson and Washington observed, and the information they had before the stop, the officers had an adequate basis for Reasonable Articulable Suspicion.[44] Discharging a firearm in a reckless manner is a felony.[45] Officers Nelson and Washington were responding to a Shot Spotter report, transmitted minutes before the stop, that four rounds were discharged in the area. The ShotSpotter report was followed by a transmission that the shots came from a backyard. Upon receiving a ShotSpotter transmission, responding members were required to "canvass the precise location identified via the ShotSpotter system for victims, evidence and witnesses."[46] The canvass area recommended under the directive was an approximate 25 meter (82 foot) radius.[47]

Here, [redacted] and [redacted] were observed in an idling vehicle within the recommended range of the Shot Spotter and within minutes of the report. Their vehicle was also located at the rear of the property, in line with the shots being reported from the backyard. The area in which the vehicle was idling was poorly lit. Moreover, Officer Nelson observed [redacted] wearing outer wear in an unusual manner. Although the fact that [redacted] and [redacted] vehicle was not located at the exact address of the ShotSpotter and that a child was in their vehicle made it less likely that they were the source of the shots, on balance, the evidence is sufficient to support the officers' Reasonable Articulable Suspicion and decision to detain. COPA finds this allegation against **Officers Nelson and Washington** to be **Exonerated.**

b. Officers Nelson and Washington were justified in handcuffing Nelson and [redacted]

pointing flashlights. Given the dark conditions, COPA believes that Ms. [redacted] ability to accurately perceive what the officers were pointing was limited but that this mistake did not negatively impact Ms. [redacted] general credibility.

[41] For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, *see* Appendix B.
[42] Att. 19, S04-13-09(II)(A), Investigatory Stop System (effective July 10, 2017 to present).
[43] Att. 19, S04-13-09 (II)(C).
[44] Att. 19, S04-13-09(II)(A).
[45] Att. 31, 720 ILCS 5/24-1.5.
[46] Att. 14, S03-19(VII)(C)(5).
[47] Att. 14, S03-19(VII)(C)(5).

Similarly, clear and convincing evidence supports the handcuffing of [redacted] and [redacted] Upon detaining a subject, an officer may handcuff a subject if "an officer reasonably believed that an Investigative Stop could be effectuated safely in this manner."[48] Also, when responding to ShotSpotter, Special Order S03-19 required CPD members to "take a safe and strategic approach while responding to the incident, being aware that the offender or multiple offenders may be on scene."[49] In light of the information Officers Nelson and Washington had prior to arriving on scene, what they observed on scene, and the poor lightening conditions, taking a safe approach to the scene and safely effectuating the stop reasonably included handcuffing [redacted] and [redacted] Also, Officers Nelson and Washington unhandcuffed them immediately after determining that there were no weapons in the vehicle or in possession of [redacted] or [redacted] COPA finds that this allegation against **Officers Nelson and Washington** to be **Exonerated.**

c. Officer Nelson conducted a protective pat down of [redacted] without justification.

A preponderance of the evidence supports that the protective pat down of [redacted] was unjustified. Under S04-13-09, "an Investigatory Stop and a Protective Pat Down are two distinct actions" and require independent Reasonable Articulable Suspicion.[50] for a protective pat-down to be justified, there must be a reasonable suspicion of criminal activity and a reasonable suspicion that the person is armed and dangerous or presents a danger of attack.[51] The reasonable suspicion must be based on specific and articulable facts.[52] Performing a pat down without both Reasonable Articulable Suspicion of criminal activity and that the person is armed and dangerous or presents danger of attack is a violation of the 4th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and CPD Rules 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, and 11. When Officer Nelson was asked if he suspected [redacted] to be armed and dangerous, Officer Nelson responded that he had reasonable suspicion that a weapon was in the vehicle. A suspicion that a weapon was in the vehicle, while sufficient for the detention, does not set forth a sufficient basis to support the suspicion that [redacted] was armed and dangerous. Moreover, Officer Nelson could not recall [redacted] saying or doing anything threatening during the stop. COPA finds this allegation against **Officer Nelson** to be **Sustained**.

d. Officer Nelson was not justified in searching the bag of [redacted]

A preponderance of the available evidence supports the fact that Officer Nelson searched [redacted] bag, without justification. A complete search of [redacted] property without probable cause is prohibited under the Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and is violative of CPD Rules 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10 and 11. Probable cause exists where the officer has facts that would lead a reasonable person to believe that a crime occurred and that the subject committed it. Here, Officer Nelson's claim that he searched [redacted] handbag because handguns are commonly

[48] See *United States v. Glenna*, 878 F.2d 967, 972 (7th Cir. 1989).
[49] Att. 14, S03-19 (VII)(C)(2).
[50] Att. 19, S04-13-09(II) (C).
[51] Att. 19, S04-13-09(II)(C)(2).
[52] Att. 19, S04-13-09(II)(C)(2).

concealed in handbags, is unavailing. While Officer Nelson had permission to search the compartment areas in the vehicle that were in the immediate control of [redacted] and [redacted][53] a broader search, without explicit permission, required that Officer Nelson establish probable cause. Here, the officers' initial suspicions that [redacted] and [redacted] had a weapon and discharged it were made less likely with the additional information gathered during the pat-down and compartment searches, specifically that no weapon was found on [redacted] or in the passenger compartments. There was insufficient evidence to support probable cause that [redacted] and [redacted] committed a crime and, therefore, no basis for the search of [redacted] bag. COPA finds this allegation against Officer Nelson to be **Sustained**.

e. Officers Nelson and Washington failed to complete Investigatory Stop Reports.

A preponderance of the evidence shows that Officers Nelson and Washington failed to complete Investigatory Stop Reports for this incident. Sworn members are required to complete an Investigatory Stop Report for all Investigatory Stops.[54] The reasons for completing an Investigatory Stop Report include ensuring "supervisors review the facts and circumstances of Investigatory Stops, Probable Cause stops, Protective Pat Downs or other searches."[55] Failure to complete an Investigatory Stop Report violates CPD Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10 and 11. Here, Officer Nelson brought copies of Investigatory Stop Reports marked "Preliminary" for [redacted] and [redacted] to his statement with COPA. Although completed contemporaneously, the reports were not submitted and therefore did not appear when COPA investigators searched for them. Officer Nelson was also unable to provide a reason why the reports were not submitted. Without submission, an important purpose of the Investigatory Report as stated in S04-13-09 is not met and the Investigatory Stop Report cannot be considered complete. COPA finds the allegations that **Officers Nelson and Washington** failed to complete Investigatory Stop Reports to be **Sustained**.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Officer Kobe Nelson, Jr.

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History[56]

As of July 25, 2025, Officer Nelson Jr. has received a total of 67 awards, including one Annual Bureau Award of Recognition, one Life Saving Award, four Department Commendation Award, one Attendance Recognition Award, one Democratic Convention Service Award and 56 Honorable Mention Certificate. In the last five years, Officer Nelson Jr. has one Sustained

[53] See *Michigan v. Long*, 463 U.S. 1032, 1033 (1983) Search of the passenger compartment of a vehicle limited to those areas where a weapon may be placed or hidden is permissible if the officer possesses a Reasonable Articulable Suspicion that a suspect is dangerous and may gain immediate control of weapons.
[54] Att. 19, S04-13-09 (III)(C).
[55] Att. 19, S04-13-09 (III)(D)(3).
[56] Attachment 33

Complaints History (2023-0000977) resulting in Reprimand. In the last five years, Officer Nelson Jr. has a Spar History showing two Sustained Findings for Failure to Perform Assigned Tasks and Current IL License Plates and/or City Vehicle Sticker resulting in Reprimand (2x).

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officer Nelson Jr. violated Rules 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10 and 11 when he searched the handbag of [redacted](without justification); failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report; and conducted a protective pat-down of [redacted]without justification. Officer Nelson Jr stated that he searched the handbag because in his experience, a handbag is commonly used to conceal a firearm. This is insufficient for requisite probable cause. Officer Nelson Jr. stated that the requisite ISR had been completed but had not been submitted as required and dictated by CPD policy. Officer Nelson Jr did not articulate or evince requisite both Reasonable Articulable Suspicion of criminal activity and that the person is armed and dangerous or presents danger of attack to justify the protective pat-down. Based on the above information, COPA recommends **Reprimand and Re-training**.

b. Officer William M. Washington, Jr.

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History[57]

As of July 25, 2025, Officer Wahington Jr. has received a total of 28 awards, including one Life Saving Award, one Attendance Recognition Award, one Democratic Convention Service Award, four Emblem of Recognition – Physical Fitness and 20 Honorable Mention Certificate. In the last five years, Officer Washington Jr. has no Sustained Complaints History and no Spar History.

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officer Washington Jr violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10 and 11 when he failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report. used vulgarity, engaged in conduct unbecoming, failed to document an investigatory stop and detention, failed to issue an ISR. Officer Nelson Jr. stated that the requisite ISR had been completed but had not been submitted as required and dictated by CPD policy. CPD policy also requires and dictates that involved officers share the responsibility to ensure the requisite ISR is both completed and submitted for review. Based on the above information, COPA recommends a **Violation Noted**.

[57] Attachment 32

Approved:

[redacted]

8-7-2025

Angela Hearts-Glass
Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator

Date

Appendix A

Case Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	February 10, 2024/11:35 pm/7619 S. St. Lawrence
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	February 13, 2024/3:15 pm
Involved Member #1:	Kobe Nelson, Jr., Star No. 5116, Employee ID No. [redacted] Date of Appointment: November 16, 2017, Unit of Assignment:006, male, Black
Involved Member #2:	William Washington, Jr, Star No. 19598, Employee ID No. [redacted] Date of Appointment: December 19, 2019, Unit of Assignment:005, male, Black
Involved Individual #1:	[redacted]female, Black
Involved Individual #2:	[redacted]male, Black

Applicable Rules

☒ **Rule 1:** Violation of any law or ordinance.
☒ **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.

Applicable Policies and Laws

- United States Constitution, Fourth Amendment
- 720 ILCS 5/24-1.5.
- S03-19: ShotSpotter Flex Program (effective July 2017 to September 22, 2024 (system decommissioned).
- S04-13-09: Investigatory Stop System (effective July 10, 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.[58] 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."[59]

[58] *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).
[59] *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