



Log # 2024-0006118

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On July 13, 2024, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received a CPD initiated complaint from Lt. Ryan Doherty reporting alleged misconduct by a member of the Chicago Police Department (CPD) on behalf of Mr. ██████████ (██████████² Lt. Doherty alleged that on July 13, 2024, Officer Guiliano Buckner used excessive force to gain control of ██████████ prior to forcefully placing him on a hospital gurney.³

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE⁴

On July 13, 2024, at approximately 12:23 am, Officers Buckner and Ganczewski responded to a call for service about an individual's nephew (now known as ██████████ who has diagnosed depression and was attempting to walk into traffic.⁵ When officers arrived, they located ██████████ (██████████ in the alley near 124th St. and Lowe Ave., and placed him into their squad car.⁶ Officer Ganczewski called ██████████ aunt and told her to meet them at ██████████ Hospital.⁷ Prior to arriving at ██████████ Hospital, ██████████ attitude shifted from cooperative to argumentative and combative, eventually leading to a physical struggle in the hospital.⁸

According to Officer Buckner's statement, ██████████ complained the handcuffs were too tight, and when he tried to check his grip was compromised.⁹ At that point, Officer Buckner claimed ██████████ "push[ed] at" or "elbow[ed]" him. Officer Buckner told COPA he used the wall as a brace to gain a better grip so ██████████ could not "get away" or "try to do anything else to harm" him.¹⁰ As Officer Buckner attempted to regain control, he alleged ██████████ tried to "lunge back" causing him to lose leverage of ██████████ who fell onto the bench.¹¹ Officer Buckner then physically restrained

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.

³ Att. 1, Initiation Report

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, TRRs, crisis intervention reports, case reports, and Officer interviews.

⁵ Att. 8, OEMC Event Query

⁶ Att. 6, Case Report, and Att. 2, PO Buckner BWC at 7:55 to 11:20

⁷ Att. 2, at 12:30 to 13:15

⁸ Att. 2, at 17:00 to 22:42; and Att. 3, PO Buckner 2 at 0:00 to 0:35

⁹ Att. 15, Officer Buckner's COPA statement, Pg. 7, Lns. 2 to 10

¹⁰ Att. 15, at Pg. 7, Lns. 7 to 10

¹¹ Att. 15, at Pg. 7, Lns. 11 to 15

██████████ and with hospital security, placed him on a hospital bed.¹² Soon after, ██████████ aunt (now known as ██████████ ██████████) arrived and told officers that ██████████ suffers from depression and anger episodes.¹³

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer Guiliano Buckner:

1. Forcefully moving ██████████ onto a gurney without justification.
 - 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. In this case, Officer Buckner's account largely matched the available evidence COPA reviewed. Furthermore, Officer Buckner's account did not reveal anything that caused COPA to question his credibility.

V. ANALYSIS¹⁴

a. Officer Buckner's Use of Force

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Buckner used force without justification is Not Sustained. CPD members are permitted to use force to overcome resistance.¹⁵ When members encounter a citizen who attempts to create distance from a member with an intent to avoid physical control and/or defeat arrest, that citizen is an active resister.¹⁶ Members are permitted to respond to active resistance with presence; verbal directions; holding and compliance techniques; control instruments; deployment of oleoresin capsicum; stunning; takedowns; canine use; and taser deployment.¹⁷

In this case, ██████████ initial interaction with the officers was compliant and cooperative. However, once he arrived at ██████████ Hospital his tone shifted, and he became verbally combative and eventually physically resistant.¹⁸ Indeed, ██████████ appeared to create space between him and Officer Buckner – who similarly claimed ██████████ “lunged,” “push[ed] at,” and “elbow[ed]” him.¹⁹ As a result, Officer Buckner was likely within policy to respond to an active resister with, among other options, holding and compliance techniques, and takedowns. While COPA finds Officer

¹² Att. 3, at 0:15 to 1:20

¹³ Att. 7, Crisis Intervention Report (CIT)

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

¹⁵ *See* G03-02-01 generally.

¹⁶ G03-02-01 IV(B)(2), Response to Resistance and Force Options (effective June 23, 2023 to current).

¹⁷ G03-02-01 IV(B)(2)(c), Response to Resistance and Force Options (effective June 23, 2023 to current).

¹⁸ Att. 2, at 17:00 to 22:42; and Att. 3, PO Buckner 2 at 0:00 to 0:35

¹⁹ Att. 3, at 0:00 to 1:00; and Att. 15, at Pg. 7, Lns. 7 to 15

Buckner’s actions were likely within policy by a preponderance of the evidence, there is not enough evidence available to meet the clear and convincing standard required to exonerate the allegation. Therefore, COPA finds the allegation is **Not Sustained**.

Approved:



9-30-2025

Angela Hearts-Glass
Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator

Date

Appendix ACase Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	July 13, 2024 / 12:50 AM / [REDACTED].
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	July 13, 2024 / 6:05 AM
Involved Officer #1:	Guiliano Buckner, Star# 13778, Employee# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: September 30, 2022, Unit of Assignment: 005, Male, Black.
Involved Officer #2:	Androniki Ganczewski, Star# 6177, Employee# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: March 26, 2001, Unit of Assignment: 005, Female, White.
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] Male, 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

- *G03-02: De-Escalation, Response to Resistance and Use of Force. (June 2023 – Present)*
- *G03-02-01, Response to Resistance and Force Options (effective June 28, 2023 to current)*
- *G02-05: Interactions with Youth and Children (December 2023 – Present)*
- *S04-20: Recognizing and Responding to Individuals in Crisis (August 2023 – Present)*
- *720 ILCS 5/7-1: Use of Force in Defense of a Person*

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.²⁰ For example, if the evidence gathered in an investigation establishes that it is more likely that the conduct complied with Department 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.”²¹

²⁰ 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).

²¹ *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