



Log # 2023-0005333

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On November 12, 2023, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received an initiation report from the Chicago Police Department (CPD).² Sergeant John Fergus (Sgt. Fergus) alleged misconduct by a member of CPD that Police Officer Jeremiah Davis (Officer Davis) committed domestic battery against his [REDACTED], [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]).³ Following its investigation, COPA reached not sustained findings regarding the allegations of the verbal allegations and physical allegations against Officer Davis.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE⁴

[REDACTED] and Officer Davis have had an on-again and off-again relationship for approximately four years.⁵ [REDACTED] and Officer Davis [REDACTED]. At the time of the incident Officer Davis was not living at the residence [REDACTED]. Officer Davis did not consider [REDACTED] his girlfriend at the time of the incident, and both parties were attempting to [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] called the police on November 12, 2023, to her residence located at [REDACTED], Chicago, IL 60616 at approximately 7:28 PM. [REDACTED] alleged that there was a physical altercation between the two parties.⁶ [REDACTED] alleged that the verbal disagreement started due to Officer Davis not wanting to watch [REDACTED] while [REDACTED] went to work.⁷ [REDACTED] stated that the argument turned physical and both parties engaged in a physical altercation.⁸ [REDACTED] alleged that Officer Davis pulled her hair out during

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. 2

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 Body Worn Camera, police reports, civilian interviews, officer interviews.

⁵ Att. 16, pg. 4, lns. 22-23

⁶ Att. 5, at 6:54 to 7:00

⁷ Att. 5 at 6:19 to 6:54

⁸ Att. 5 at 6:54 to 7:00

the altercation,⁹ and punched her in the stomach while in the living room.¹⁰ During the altercation, ██████ stated that Officer Davis also attempted to sit on her while she was pinned on the floor and he struck her in the eye and face.¹¹ ██████ stated that Officer Davis choked her with her both hands and struck her in the face while he was on top of her.¹² ██████ stated after that, the physical incident ended and he left.¹³ ██████ stated that she said she was calling the police as he left the residence.¹⁴ ██████ wanted to move forward with criminal charges and Officer Davis was arrested on November 16, 2023.¹⁵ ██████ did not participate in the criminal proceedings and the criminal case was eventually dropped.¹⁶

██████ contacted COPA on December 5, 2023, to provide a statement about the incident that occurred on November 12, 2023.¹⁷ ██████ reported that she did not tell the truth about what occurred on November 12, 2023.¹⁸ ██████ stated that the incident did not become physical, and that Officer Davis did not choke, punch or hit her.¹⁹ ██████ repeated several times that she was angry and her emotions were escalated due to Officer Davis not wanting to watch ██████ while she was at work. ██████ stated that she did not tell Officer Davis that she was calling the police,²⁰ and that that the injuries that were observed by the Responding Officers on November 12, 2023 were from a previous incident with her Dad which occurred just a few days to a week prior.²¹

Officer Davis stated on the day of the incident, November 12, 2023, he was not with ██████ nor at the residence.²² Officer Davis provided text messages that show a timeframe of text messages conversations between 6:55 PM and 11:38 PM on November 12.²³ The text messages provided by Officer Davis do not contain any references of Officer Davis at the residence or any indication of a physical incident.²⁴ Officer Davis reported that he had not seen ██████ for approximately a week and half before the incident.²⁵ Officer Davis stated that when

⁹ Att. 5 at 8:39, there was visible strands of hair removed from ██████ head.

¹⁰ Att. 5 at 12:48 to 12:59

¹¹ Att. 5 at 13:29 to 13:43

¹² Att. 5 at 14:09 to 14:25 ██████ stated that she did not lose consciousness

¹³ Att. 5 at 14:20 to 14:26

¹⁴ Att. 5 at 14:20 to 14:26

¹⁵ Att. 3

¹⁶ Att. 21

¹⁷ Att. 13, ██████ provided two statements regarding another open log #, 2023-0004976.

¹⁸ Att. 13, pg. 20, lns. 16-19

¹⁹ Att.

²⁰ Att. 13, pg. 21, lns 11-13

²¹ Att. 19 & Att. 20, COPA interviewed the responding officers Officer Dobosz & Officer Wisz. Officer Dobosz and Officer Wisz did not complete a case report or make any arrests on the day of the incident with ██████ father. ██████ father admitted on Body Worn Camera of striking ██████ in the face during the incident. Officer Dobosz and Officer Wisz stated that they did not see any injuries on ██████ COPA could not determine if ██████ sustained any injury on her face.

²² Att. 16, pg. 51, lns 22-23

²³ Att. 15

²⁴ Att. 15 Officer Davis provided the text messages after his statement at COPA, so no additional questions were asked about the context of the text messages.

²⁵ Att. 16, pg. 50, lns 9-12

he was last with [REDACTED] she needed help moving out of her parents' house and moving back to her own residence located [REDACTED].²⁶ Officer Davis stated that he observed [REDACTED] with a bruised face from the altercation between [REDACTED] and her Father.²⁷

III. ALLEGATIONS

[Jeremiah Davis, Star #11614]:

1. *Engaging in a verbal altercation with [REDACTED]*
 - *Not Sustained*
2. *Engaging in a physical altercation with [REDACTED] and or choking [REDACTED] about the neck with his hands.*
 - *Not Sustained*

IV. CREDIBILITY ASSESSMENT

[REDACTED] provided two different accounts of an altercation during the investigation.²⁸ Those two stories have different explanations that occurred at the residence and painted two different stories. The constant in both stories is that Officer Davis was at the residence and at the minimum a verbal argument occurred between the two parties.²⁹ [REDACTED] reported to Responding Officers that an altercation ensued but was mutual and then in a statement to COPA any injuries were from an earlier incident with her Father and not with Officer Davis.³⁰ [REDACTED] also stated that the incident with Officer Davis never became physical, and it was strictly verbal. [REDACTED] credibility is difficult to determine due to her two statements being different from each other. COPA can acknowledge that there are many factors that can affect a victim recanting after their original statement, such as relying on the abuser for financial and emotional support. When [REDACTED] originally reported the incident, she had signs of being a victim to a physical battery, such as her hair being pulled out and the visible bruises to her face. But, when [REDACTED] provided her second statement, she stated those injuries were from a separate incident involving her father. Due to [REDACTED] recanting her original account and COPA was unable to establish proof of any external factors playing a part in her recanting, COPA finds that [REDACTED] has several issues with her credibility.

Officer Davis stated that he was never at the residence on the day of the incident.³¹ Officer Davis provided text messages as proof that he was not at the residence.³² Although the text

²⁶ [REDACTED] and her father were in a domestic violence incident in which [REDACTED] was in a physical fight with her father.

²⁷ Att. 16, pg. 54, lns. 23-24 & pg. 55, lns 1-3

²⁸ On scene after she called 911 and to COPA.

²⁹ Att. 13, Pg. 18, lns. 14-17

³⁰ Att. 13, Pg. 18, lns 19-23

³¹ Att. 16, pg. 51, lns 22-23

³² Att. 15

messages prove that ██████ was upset on the day of the incident, the text messages do not show he was at the residence or not at the residence. There are no direct references to the whereabouts of Officer Davis on the day of the incident. Also, there are long breaks in the text messages that do not account for Officer Davis's whereabouts.³³ Officer Davis's credibility is merely his word and that there is no proof of Officer Davis's actual whereabouts on the day of the incident.

V. ANALYSIS³⁴

COPA finds that the allegation that Officer Davis engaged in a verbal altercation with ██████ ██████ **not sustained**. COPA was unable to determine if the events occurred between the two parties, with ██████ two statements and Officer Davis stating that he was not there. Neither party has any evidence that could refute either party's stories. COPA reviewed the text messages provided by Officer Davis, which was used to address both sides credibility. There was no mention in the text messages about a physical or verbal fight between the two parties on the day of the incident. There was an ongoing electronic argument that was not solved. Further evidence was needed to firmly determine if Officer Davis was located at the residence.

COPA finds that that the allegation that Officer Davis engaged in a physical altercation and used his hands to choke ██████ **not sustained**. ██████ had visible injuries to her person, but she claimed in her statement to COPA that they were obtained during a different physical altercation. COPA interviewed the two officers responding to the incident with her father on 11-4-2023.³⁵ Officer Wisz and Officer Dobosz stated that they did not observe any visible injuries to ██████ after the physical incident. After reviewing their Body Worn Cameras (BWC), ██████ father and ██████ herself agree that ██████ father struck her during the incident.³⁶ Also, both parties agree that there was an ongoing physical incident between the two parties. COPA was unable to determine when ██████ sustained her injuries, and due to her own testimonies in her own statement to COPA, COPA could not contribute any of the injuries to the allegation brought against Officer Davis. Also, COPA was unable to determine if Officer Davis was actually at the residence and that the verbal disagreement that ██████ alleged escalated to a physical altercation between the two parties.

³³ Att. 15, 7:28pm to 8:13pm

³⁴ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, *see* Appendix B.

³⁵ Att. 25 and Att. 26

³⁶ Att. 19 and Att. 20

Approved:



September 30, 2025

Kimberly Edstrom Schiller
Director of Investigations – Chief Investigator

Date

Appendix A

Case Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	November 12, 2023 [REDACTED]
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	November 12, 2023
Involved Member #1:	Officer Jeremiah Davis, Star #11614, Male, Black
Involved Individual #1:	[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

- *[Directive #]: [Directive Name] (effective [date] to [date (or 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.³⁷ 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.”³⁸

³⁷ 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).

³⁸ *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