



Log # 2024-0000053

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On January 3, 2024, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received an Initiation Report² from Sergeant Gonzalez reporting alleged misconduct by a member of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). Complainant [REDACTED] informed Sergeant Gonzalez that on January 3, 2024, Officer [REDACTED] Ventura improperly stopped and searched her brother, [REDACTED] and her vehicle, which was being operated by [REDACTED] damaging the radiator and dashboard of the vehicle.³

Upon review of the evidence, COPA served allegations that Officers Ventura and Kyle Huber improperly searched and detained [REDACTED] as well as searched the vehicle he was operating. COPA also served allegations that Officer Admir Deumic failed to timely activate and prematurely deactivated his body-worn camera (BWC). Finally, COPA served allegations that Officers Stive Rodriguez Mondragon, Pietro Angelica, Rudy Villa, and Georgios Sintos-Mantelas improperly searched and failed to document the search of unknown individuals' vehicles.

Following its investigation, COPA reached sustained findings regarding the allegations of improper search and detainment of [REDACTED] BWC activation/deactivation, as well as improper search of the unknown individuals' vehicles, and failing to document those searches.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE⁴

On January 3, 2024, a 911 caller reported that a person had placed a gun inside the trunk of a vehicle in the proximity of the Subway at Grand and Monticello.⁵ The caller also provided a description of the alleged offender, as a Black male wearing a dark hoodie, light colored jeans, and tan boots, who placed a gun inside the trunk of a black sedan at 3661 W Grand. Officers Ventura and Huber responded to the location and observed [REDACTED] matching the description of

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 Att. 16.

³ 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.

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, BWC footage, police reports, officer interviews, and OEMC transmissions.

⁵ Att. 28, 911 call.

the alleged offender.⁶ Officer Ventura immediately approached ██████ conducted a protective pat-down, and searched inside the pockets of ██████⁷ ██████ stated to the officers that he did not have any weapons on him and was just in the area to smoke cannabis. Officer Huber then relocated to his marked CPD vehicle and searched his vehicle's computer for ██████ name.

██████ did not have a valid Firearm Owner's Identification Card (FOID) or Concealed Carry License (CCL). Officer Ventura then approached ██████ and with the assistance of Officer Huber, placed ██████ into handcuffs. Officers Huber and Ventura then proceeded to search the vehicle ██████ was driving, including the trunk and passenger compartments. The officers located multiple small black bags that contained suspect cannabis.⁸ They did not issue any citations to ██████ and later completed an Investigatory Stop Report, which documented the stop.⁹ Additionally, ██████ was issued an ISR receipt.¹⁰

During COPA's investigation into the complaint filed on behalf of ██████ COPA found evidence of potential misconduct by other CPD officers. Officer Deumic did not timely activate or deactivate his BWC while on scene. Additionally, after reviewing Sgt. Garcia's BWC,¹¹ COPA discovered that Officers Angelica, Sintos-Mantelas, Mondragon, and Villa were investigating the same 911 call related to an individual who placed a gun inside a black sedan.

The evidence shows that on January 3, 2024, Officers Mondragon, Sintos-Mantelas, and Angelica responded to 1152 N. Lawndale, around the corner from the address of 3661 W Grand.¹² Officer Villa located a dark green SUV parked on the street at 1152 N. Lawndale and searched the vehicle.¹³ Officers Mondragon, Sintos-Mantelas, and Angelica located a grey sedan bearing IL plate number ██████ also parked on the street at 1152 N. Lawndale, and searched that vehicle. The grey sedan appeared to have a broken front passenger window, which was wrapped with plastic. Temporary registration tags were located on the vehicle. The green SUV, which Officer Villa searched, did not appear to have any license plates affixed to it. COPA was unable to locate any ISRs or reports completed by the officers in relation to the searches conducted on these two vehicles.

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer ██████ Ventura:

1. Detaining ██████ without justification.
 - Not Sustained.
2. Searching ██████ without justification.
 - Sustained, Rules 1, 2, 3, 6

⁶ Att. 5 and Att. 6, at 2:00.

⁷ Att. 5, at 2:15.

⁸ Att. 17, pg. 2.

⁹ Att. 17

¹⁰ Att. 5, at 22:50.

¹¹ Att. 4

¹² Att. 4, at 7:20 to 9:40.

¹³ Att. 44, at 1:52.

3. Searching the vehicle operated by [REDACTED] without justification.
 - Not Sustained.

Officer Kyle Huber:

1. Detaining [REDACTED] without justification.
 - Not Sustained.
2. Searching the vehicle operated by [REDACTED] without justification.
 - Not Sustained.

Officer Admir Deumic:

1. Untimely activating his body-worn camera, without justification.
 - Sustained, Rules 2, 3, 6, 10
2. Prematurely deactivating his body-worn camera, without justification.
 - Sustained, Rules 2, 3, 6, 10

Officer Rudy Villa:

1. Failing to timely activate his body worn camera.
 - Sustained, Rules 2, 3, 6, 10
2. Searching an unknown individual's green Ford SUV, without justification.
 - Sustained, Rules 1, 2, 3, 6
3. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop report documenting the search of the unknown individual's vehicle.
 - Sustained Rules 2, 3, 6, 10

Officer Pietro Angelica:

1. Failing to activate his body-worn camera.
 - Sustained, Rules 2, 3, 6, 10
2. Searching an unknown individual's vehicle, bearing temporary license plate number, [REDACTED] without justification.
 - Sustained, Rule 1, 2, 3, 6
3. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report documenting the search of the unknown individual's vehicle.
 - Sustained, Rules 2, 3, 6, 10

Officer Georgios Sintos-Mantelas:

1. Failing to activate his body worn camera.
 - Sustained, Rules 2, 3, 6, 10
2. Searching an unknown individual's vehicle, bearing temporary license plate number, [REDACTED] without justification.
 - Sustained, Rules 1, 2, 3, 6
3. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop report documenting the search of the unknown individual's vehicle.
 - Sustained, Rules 2, 3, 6, 10

Officer Stive Rodriguez-Mondragon:

1. Failing to timely activate his body worn camera.
 - Sustained, Rules 2, 3, 6, 10
2. Searching an unknown individual's vehicle, bearing temporary license plate number, [REDACTED] without justification.
 - Sustained, Rules 1, 2, 3, 6
3. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop report documenting the search of the unknown individual's vehicle.
 - Sustained Rules 2, 3, 6, 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.

In this case, factors are present that give cause to question the reliability of all the accused officers' accounts. The officers had trouble recalling specific facts or events, due to the time that passed from the date of the incident to the date of their interviews. COPA does not believe the officers were untruthful in their statements, but they lacked a full recollection of the events, even after being shown BWC from the event.

COPA made contact with [REDACTED] the vehicle's owner, but was unsuccessful in obtaining a statement from [REDACTED]. The complaints made by [REDACTED] regarding officers causing damage to her vehicle, specifically the radiator and head unit, were proven to be unsubstantiated based on the available evidence obtained by COPA.

V. ANALYSIS¹⁴**A. Allegations from the stop of [REDACTED]****i. Searching allegations**

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Ventura searched [REDACTED] without justification is **sustained**. CPD policy prohibits officers from detaining, patting down, or searching the subject of an investigatory stop absent specific and articulable facts which, combined with rational inferences from those facts, give rise to reasonable articulable suspicion that criminal activity is afoot. Further, officers may not perform a protective pat down or further search of a subject's clothing absent reasonable articulable suspicion that the subject is armed and dangerous or presents a danger of attack to the officer or others.¹⁵

¹⁴ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, *see* Appendix B.

¹⁵ Att. 36, SO04-13-09(III)(B) and (VI), Investigatory Stop System (effective July 10, 2017, to present).

Upon the initial stop of ██████ Officer Ventura immediately searched ██████ beyond the scope of a pat down by going inside ██████ front pockets. Officers Ventura and Huber had reason to be in the area due to the 911 call. However, Officer Ventura did not have sufficient evidence to justify the search of ██████ person. ██████ matched the description of the alleged offender, provided by the 911 caller, giving Ventura cause to stop and question ██████. A protective pat down for weapons was appropriate due to the 911 caller stating the person matching ██████ description had placed a gun inside a trunk. However, Officer Ventura's search exceeded the scope of a protective pat-down as soon as he searched ██████ pockets. There was no verifiable evidence that would have justified the search of ██████ person at the time of the search, unless Officer Ventura had felt an object, which he suspected to be a weapon, during the pat down of ██████. Officer Ventura, however, never made such a claim, either in his report or his statement to COPA. Thus, the allegation is **sustained**.

ii. Detainment allegations

COPA finds the allegations that Officers Ventura and Huber improperly detained ██████ and searched the vehicle ██████ was operating, are both **not sustained**. After Officer Ventura completed the search of ██████ Officer Huber ran ██████ name for a valid FOID or CCL, confirming that ██████ did not have either. The officers then detained ██████ in handcuffs and subsequently searched the vehicle ██████ was operating. ██████ matched the description provided by the 911 caller, was in the location provided by the 911 caller, and had just been seen by Officers Ventura and Huber exiting a black sedan, which the 911 caller had relayed as the vehicle's description. ██████ told the officers he did not have a weapon on him or in the vehicle he was operating, and claimed he was just in the area to "smoke."

After the protective pat-down and search of ██████ Officers Ventura and Huber dispelled any suspicion that ██████ possessed a weapon on his person; however, due to the 911 call, it was logical for the officers to suspect the firearm was located inside the trunk. The act of placing a firearm inside a trunk is not inherently illegal, but placing a firearm inside a trunk without proper licenses, such as a FOID or CCL, would make it illegal. After the officers learned ██████ did not have a FOID or CCL, they knew it would have been illegal for ██████ to place a firearm inside the trunk of the vehicle, as they suspected. Therefore, COPA finds the preponderance of the evidence shows that the officers were justified in detaining ██████ and searching his vehicle; however, COPA lacks clear and convincing evidence to reach exonerated findings. Thus, COPA finds these allegations are **not sustained**.

iii. BWC allegations

COPA finds the allegations that Officer Deumic failed to timely activate and prematurely activated his BWC, are both **sustained**. Officer Deumic's BWC shows that he arrived on scene and began to exit his CPD vehicle at 8:52:32 pm, but he did not activate his BWC until 8:52:53

pm.¹⁶ Officer Deumic also deactivated his BWC at 9:06:00 pm, while he was still on scene.¹⁷ The last frame of Officer Deumic's BWC captured [REDACTED] standing in front of the officer, still in handcuffs.

Officers are required to activate their BWCs at the beginning of an incident and record the entire incident for all law enforcement-related activities.¹⁸ Under the policy, Officer Deumic was required to activate his BWC when he responded to the scene, and to continue recording until all law enforcement related activities were completed. The evidence shows that he failed to do either. Therefore, both BWC allegations against Officer Deumic are **sustained**.

B. Allegations regarding the search of unoccupied vehicles at 1152 N Lawndale.

i. Searching allegations

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Villa searched an unknown individual's green Ford SUV without justification, is **sustained**. Officer Villa, along with other CPD officers, responded to the area of 1152 N Lawndale after a 911 caller reported seeing a Black male place a gun inside the trunk of a black sedan near 3661 W Grand. Officer Villa told COPA he did not recall why he responded to that area.¹⁹ Without any reports documenting the search, COPA's investigation relied upon Officer Villa's statement and the BWC from the incident.

After arrival at 1152 N Lawndale, Officer Villa searched an unoccupied green Ford SUV. In his statement to COPA, Officer Villa said he searched the vehicle because it appeared abandoned and did not have any license plates, as well as because it was in an area known for narcotics trafficking.²⁰ Officer Villa claimed his justification for searching the vehicle was based on the vehicle being located in an area known for narcotics trafficking, having no license plates or registration, and being unlocked.²¹ When questioned by COPA if he had verified whether the vehicle was stolen or abandoned, he could not recall.

There was no reason for Officer Villa to have searched the vehicle when he did. The vehicle did not match the description provided by the 911 caller. Officer Villa, having suspected that the vehicle had been stolen or abandoned, could have taken additional steps to verify those inferences, but he did not; therefore, neither were valid justifications for the search. An unlocked vehicle in an area known for narcotics trafficking, with no license plates, does not necessarily indicate any specific crime, except for the lack of license plates. Additionally, the vehicle was unoccupied, and Officer Villa did not have a search warrant or any valid exceptions to the warrant requirement. Officer Villa's justifications for the search would not lead a reasonable person to believe the vehicle contained a weapon or narcotics. Moreover, the community caretaking exception would

¹⁶ Att. 8, at 1:40.

¹⁷ Att. 8, at 15:09.

¹⁸ Att. 57, S03-14.

¹⁹ Att. 50 at Pg. 11, lines 14-19.

²⁰ Att. 50, Pg. 13, lines 20-24 and Pg. 14, lines 1-5.

²¹ Att. 50, Pg 12, lines 11-17.

not apply here, as the vehicle was not reported as abandoned (or, at least, Officer Villa did not verify it was abandoned), and there were no obvious safety concerns. The vehicle was parked on the street legally, and Officer Villa mentioned numerous times to COPA that he searched the vehicle based on drug activity and crime patterns in the area. These vague and unsubstantiated suspicions were legally insufficient to search the vehicle without a warrant. Therefore, COPA finds the allegation that Officer Villa improperly searched the green Ford SUV vehicle is **sustained**.

COPA finds the allegation that Officers Angelica, Sintos-Mantelas, and Mondragon searched an unoccupied grey sedan without justification, is also **sustained**. The officers were in the area of 1152 N. Lawndale due to a 911 caller stating a person had placed a gun inside the trunk of a black sedan. The officers searched the unoccupied grey sedan, which did not match the description relayed by the caller. Additionally, at the time of the search, there was no indication that any specific crime had been committed. The officers stated that they did not observe any civilians outside the vehicle before or after they conducted the search. Officer Angelica also stated that he searched based on public safety concerns. Officer Angelica explained that he had to ensure no drugs or guns were in the vehicle, in case local kids attempted to enter the vehicle.²² Police officers, however, cannot search vehicles merely to dispel the possibility that they contain contraband. Officers need to develop specific articulable facts that would lead a reasonable person to believe that a crime had been committed. Here, the officers searched the grey sedan to dispel the possibility that contraband was in the vehicle, and they claimed the unlocked vehicle posed a danger to the community. COPA does not accept that justification. There is no indication that the vehicle possessed anything dangerous. As stated above, the community caretaking exception also did not apply here, as the officers claimed the search of the vehicle was based on an investigation into potential criminal activity. Thus, this allegation is **sustained**.

ii. ISR allegations

COPA finds the allegations that Officers Villa, Angelica, Sintos-Mantelas, and Mondragon failed to complete an ISR, without justification, are **sustained**. Here, the officers failed to complete any reports documenting the search of the vehicles. Officer Villa stated to COPA that he thought, since a sergeant was present on scene, the sergeant would have told him if he was supposed to complete an ISR.²³ When asked by COPA if he had any conversations with the sergeant prior to or after the search of the vehicle, Officer Villa said he did not recall.²⁴ Per his BWC, Officer Villa clearly entered the vehicle and searched the driver's seat area, as well as the rear passenger area, and he did not have any conversation with Sergeant Garcia prior to or after the search. Additionally, the other officers' BWC videos captured Sergeant Garcia telling the officers that he did not have the 911 caller's information to include in the ISR for the search, indicating that an ISR should have been completed.

Here, the officers should have documented the search of both the green Ford SUV and the grey sedan. The most relevant report would have been an ISR, and even if there was not a specific

²² Att. 56, Pg. 12, lines 11-17.

²³ Att. 50, Pg. 24, lines 4-14.

²⁴ Att. 50, Pg. 24, lines 4-14.

person to reference in the report, the officers could have completed the ISR using the generic name John Doe. Per CPD policy, “Sworn members who conduct an Investigatory Stop, Probable Cause stop when no other document captures the reason for the detention, and, if applicable, a Protective Pat Down or other search in a public place, are required to submit an Investigatory Stop Report into the Investigatory Stop Database.”²⁵ Nothing other than BWC captured the search, and nothing other than the officers’ statement to COPA outlined any justification for the vehicle searches. Therefore, COPA finds these allegations are **sustained**.

iii. BWC Allegations

COPA finds the allegation that Officers Villa and Mondragon failed to timely activate their BWCs, is sustained. Officers are required to activate their BWCs at the beginning of an incident and record the entire incident for all law enforcement-related activities.²⁶ In this case, the officers were conducting law enforcement-related activities prior to activating their BWCs. Officer Villa arrived at the green SUV and began to search it prior to activating his BWC. He told COPA that he thought he activated his camera when he exited his CPD vehicle, but he later realized that it was not recording. For this part, Officer Mondragon admitted that his BWC activation was untimely, and he should have begun recording when he arrived at the scene. Thus, these allegations are **sustained**.

Additionally, COPA finds the allegation that Officers Angelica and Sintos-Mantelas failed to activate their BWCs, is **sustained**. As stated above, all officers are required to activate their BWCs at the beginning of law-enforcement-related activities. Here, Officer Angelica never activated his BWC. There were multiple activations by Officer Angelica prior to the searches as well as after, but none that documented the search of the vehicle at 1152 N Lawndale. Officer Angelica relayed to COPA it was an honest mistake. Officer Angelica affirmed the allegation and took responsibility for not having activated his camera. Officer Sintos-Mantelas also took responsibility and affirmed the allegation that he did not activate his BWC.²⁷ Therefore, these allegations are **sustained**.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Officer Michael C. Ventura

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History²⁸

Officer Ventura has received a total of 144 awards, including one Complimentary Letter, 130 Honorable Mentions, one Crime Reduction Award, and one Unit Meritorious Performance Award. Officer Ventura has one sustained complaint (verbal abuse) in the last five years, for which

²⁵ Att. 36, S04-13, (VIII)(A)(1).

²⁶ S03-14.

²⁷ Att. 55, Pg. 35, lines 11-19.

²⁸ Att. 59.

he received a reprimand. Additionally, he has received two SPARs, for a preventable accident (reprimand) and conduct unbecoming (three day suspension).

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officer Ventura violated CPD policies, and Rules 1, 2, 3, and 6, when he searched [REDACTED] without justification. Based on the evidence collected during this investigation, and Officer Ventura's complimentary and disciplinary history, COPA recommends he receive a **reprimand** and **retraining** regarding the Fourth Amendment (search of persons).

b. Officer Admir Deumic

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History²⁹

Officer Deumic received a total of 167 awards, including two Complimentary Letters, 150 Honorable Mentions, one Crime Reduction Award, one Life Saving Award, and one Police Officer of the Month Award. Officer Deumic has not had any sustained complaints in the last five years. He has received SPARs for a preventable accident and inattention to duty, both of which resulted in reprimands.

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officer Deumic violated CPD policies, and Rules 2, 3, 6, and 10, when he failed to timely activate and prematurely deactivated his BWC. Based on the evidence collected during this investigation, and Officer Deumic's complimentary and disciplinary history, COPA recommends he receive a **reprimand** and **retraining** regarding CPD's BWC policy.

c. Officers Rudy Villa, Pietro Angelica, Georgios Sintos-Mantelas, and Stive Rodriguez-Mondragon

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary Histories

Officer Villa³⁰ has received a total of 19 awards, including one Department Commendation, 16 Honorable Mentions, and one Unit Meritorious Performance Award. Officer Villa has not had any sustained complaints in the last five years. He has received one SPAR for parking vehicles, for which he received a reprimand.

Officer Angelica³¹ has received a total of 29 awards, including 22 Honorable Mentions, one Life Saving Award, two Police Officer of the Month Awards, and one Unit Meritorious Performance Award. Officer Angelica has not had any sustained complaints in the last five years.

²⁹ Att. 63.

³⁰ Att. 60.

³¹ Att. 61.

He has received two SPARs for failing to timely activate his BWC, both of which resulted in reprimands.

Officer Sintos-Mantelas³² has received a total of 35 awards, including 29 Honorable Mentions, one Life Saving Award, two Police Officer of the Month Awards, and one Unit Meritorious Performance Award. Officer Sintos-Mantelas has not had any sustained complaints in the last five years. He has received three SPARs for preventable accidents and one SPAR for failing to timely activate his BWC, all of which resulted in reprimands.

Officer Rodriguez-Mondragon³³ has received a total of 13 awards, including one Department Commendation, and 10 Honorable Mentions. Officer Rodriguez-Mondragon has not had any sustained complaints in the last five years. He has received one SPAR for failing to timely activate his BWC and one SPAR for inattention to duty, both of which resulted in reprimands.

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officers Villa, Angelica, Sintos-Mantelas, and Mondragon violated CPD policies, and Rules 1, 2, 3, 6, and 10, during this incident. All four officers committed BWC violations, improperly searched an unoccupied vehicle, and failed to document the search in any reports. In aggravation, COPA notes that all of the officers except Officer Villa have prior BWC violations. Additionally, the officers' searches violated the constitutional rights of the vehicles' owners, and they were a clear violation of CPD policy. Based on the evidence collected during this investigation, and the officers' complimentary and disciplinary histories, COPA recommends that Officers Villa, Angelica, Sintos-Mantelas, and Mondragon all receive a **1 to 29 day suspension and retraining** regarding the Fourth Amendment (vehicle searches) and CPD's BWC policy.

Approved:



Steffany Hreno
Acting Deputy Chief Administrator

7/18/2025

Date

³² Att. 58.

³³ Att. 62.

Appendix A

Case Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	January 3, 2024/ 9:00 PM/ 3661 W. Grand Avenue
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	January 3, 2024/ 11:24 PM
Involved Member #1:	Michael Ventura, star# 14706, employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: 27 July 2018, Unit of Assignment: 025, male, Caucasian
Involved Member #2:	Kyle Huber, star# 9319, employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: 25 July 2018, Unit of Assignment: 025, male, Caucasian
Involved Member #3	Admir Deumic, star# 7160, employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: 18 September 2017, Unit of Assignment: 025, male, Caucasian
Involved Member #4	Stive Rodriguez Mondragon, star# 8160, employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: 27 December 2021, Unit of Assignment: 011, male, Hispanic
Involved Member #5	Rudy Villa, star# 8212, employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: 27 December 2021, Unit of Assignment: 011, male, Hispanic
Involved Member #6	Pietro Angelica, star# 11523, employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: 30 November 2021, Unit of Assignment: 011, male, Caucasian
Involved Member #7	Georgios Sintos-Mantelas, star# 19309, employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: 16 February 2021, Unit of Assignment: 011, male, Caucasian
Involved Individual #1:	[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 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

- S04-13-09: Investigatory Stop System, 10 July 2017 to present
- S03-14: Body Worn Cameras, 29 December 2023 to 8 August 2024

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.³⁴ 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.”³⁵

³⁴ 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).

³⁵ *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