



Log # 2024-5891

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On July 1, 2024, Lieutenant (Lt.) Karlene Gurtowski initiated a complaint reporting possible misconduct by a member of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). Lt. Gurtowski reported that on July 1, 2024, Officer Angela Jacobs kicked ██████████ in the head while placing him into custody.² Lt. Gurtowski referred the incident for further investigation by the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) to determine if Officer Jacobs's actions were in accordance with CPD policy.

Following its investigation, COPA reached a **sustained** finding regarding the allegation against Officer Jacobs.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE³

On the morning of July 1, 2024, officers responded to a battery-in-progress call at ██████████. The caller, ██████████ related that her ex-husband, ██████████ showed up at her residence intoxicated and battered her and her daughter, ██████████⁴ ██████████ fled the scene prior to the officers' arrival. Approximately thirty minutes later, ██████████ dialed 911 and reported that ██████████ had returned and was outside the residence.⁶ Officers Angela Jacobs and Yonny Alvarez responded to the second call.⁷ Officers Jacobs and Alvarez contacted the initial responding officers, who relayed that ██████████ should be placed into custody on signed complaints.⁸

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. 1. This allegation falls 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 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 Atts. 21, 27.

⁵ Attempts to interview ██████████ and ██████████ were unsuccessful. See CMS notes: CO-1400695; CO-1400697; and CO-1400716.

⁶ Atts. 7, 9, 10, 11 and 23.

⁷ Atts. 2 and 7.

⁸ Att. 2.

Officers Jacobs and Alvarez observed [REDACTED] walking from the residence and told him to come here.⁹ [REDACTED] ignored the officers and kept walking. As Officer Alvarez approached, [REDACTED] turned toward Officer Alvarez and said, “Don’t run up on me.”¹⁰ The officers told [REDACTED] he was being detained and to put his hands behind his back. [REDACTED] pulled away, held onto an iron gate, and stiffened and flailed his arms to avoid being handcuffed.¹¹ He told Officer Alvarez, “I’ll knock you out.”¹²

Officer Alvarez repeatedly told [REDACTED] he was being detained and to put his hands behind his back. Officer Jacobs handcuffed [REDACTED] right wrist and attempted to handcuff his left wrist.¹³ [REDACTED] then told Officer Alvarez a second time that he would knock him out.¹⁴ Officer Alvarez replied, “You ain’t gone do shit.”¹⁵ [REDACTED] flailed his arms and kicked Officer Alvarez in the shin.¹⁶ At that point, Officer Alvarez delivered an elbow/mechanical strike to [REDACTED] upper body¹⁷ and performed an emergency takedown.¹⁸

[REDACTED] who was partially handcuffed, rolled on top of Officer Alvarez and pinned him to the ground.¹⁹ Officer Alvarez struggled to get [REDACTED] off him.²⁰ Officer Jacobs tried to pull [REDACTED] off Officer Alvarez and told him, “Get the fuck off my partner.”²¹ Officer Jacobs then delivered two hand strikes to [REDACTED] head.²² Officer Alvarez rolled [REDACTED] onto his stomach and repositioned himself on top of [REDACTED] back.²³ As [REDACTED] lay face down with his arms extended in front of him, Officer Jacobs kicked him twice on the back of the head, repeating, “Get the fuck off my partner.”²⁴

⁹ Att. 13 at 3:21 to 3:29; Att. 44.

¹⁰ Att. 13 at 3:30 to 3:34.

¹¹ Att. 14 at 3:32 to 3:37, and 3:46 to 3:54; Att. 44; Att. 46, pg. 15, lns. 2 to 8.

¹² Att. 2; Att. 13 at 3:34 to 3:45.

¹³ Att. 14 at 4:13.

¹⁴ Att. 14 at 4:18 to 4:20.

¹⁵ Att. 13 at 4:20 to 4:23.

¹⁶ Atts. 2, 5 and 6; Att. 14 at 18:27 to 18:42; Att. 19 at 5:09:43 to 5:10:08; Att. 46, pg. 15, lns. 16 to 21. Att. 50, pg. 9, lns. 7 to 10. The kick is not clearly captured on the BWC footage; however, [REDACTED] told the responding sergeant that she observed [REDACTED] kick Officer Alvarez. Att. 19 at 9:20 to 10:06.

¹⁷ Officer Alvarez’s BWC fell to the ground.

¹⁸ Att. 5; Att. 14 at 4:23 to 4:26; Att. 50, pg. 17, lns. 10 to 20.

¹⁹ Att. 14 at 4:26 to 4:38; Att. 50, pg. 9, lns. 11 to 15; and pg. 19, lns. 9 to 20.

²⁰ Att. 50, pg. 20, lns. 15 to 19.

²¹ Att. 14 at 4:35. Officer Jacobs also told [REDACTED] to, “Shut the fuck up,” during the incident. See Att. 14 at 8:32 to 8:34. COPA did not serve allegations regarding Officer Jacobs’s use of profanity, as a Tactical Response Report notes that a CPD supervisor had already admonished Officer Jacobs for her language. Att. 6.

²² Att. 6; Att. 14 at 4:38 to 4:39; Att. 50, pg. 21, lns. 9 to 17.

²³ Att. 50, pg. 19, lns. 12 to 24.

²⁴ Att. 14 at 4:40 and 4:42.



Figure 1: A screenshot from Officer Jacobs's BWC showing her kick [REDACTED] on the head, with Officer Alvarez on the left.²⁵



Figure 2: A screenshot from Officer Jacobs's BWC showing her kick [REDACTED] on the head a second time, with Officer Alvarez on the left.²⁶

²⁵ Att. 14 at 4:40.

²⁶ Att. 14 at 4:42.

Officer Alvarez then retrieved a second set of cuffs and handcuffed [REDACTED]²⁷ When [REDACTED] questioned Officer Alvarez's actions, Officer Alvarez stated that all [REDACTED] had to do was cooperate; but instead, "You kicked me, so I busted your shit."²⁸ Assisting officers arrived on the scene and transported [REDACTED] to the 008th District for processing. [REDACTED] was charged with Aggravated Battery to a Peace Officer; two counts of Resisting/Obstructing a Peace Officer; Animal Cruelty; and two counts of Aggravated Battery/Great Bodily Harm.²⁹

[REDACTED] was later transported to [REDACTED] Hospital³⁰ by ambulance for minor lacerations to his head.³¹ A Chicago Fire Department (CFD) Patient Care Report notes that [REDACTED] told CFD personnel that he was in a "scuffle" with police and hit his head while being arrested.³² [REDACTED] sustained an abrasion to his forehead and lacerations to his forehead and under his chin.³³ Officer Alvarez sustained an abrasion to his bottom lip during the incident.³⁴ In a statement to COPA, [REDACTED] said he sustained the injury to his head when Officer Alvarez pushed him against an iron gate.³⁵ [REDACTED] further stated that he did not initially comply because he was unaware that the police were trying to get his attention.³⁶ [REDACTED] denied resisting arrest and added that he has a bad memory and did not recall all the details surrounding the incident.³⁷

Regarding the excessive force allegation, Officer Jacobs stated that [REDACTED] was on top of Officer Alvarez, hitting and beating him, and swinging the handcuff as a weapon.³⁸ Officer Jacobs added that Officer Alvarez was bleeding from his nose or mouth, and she could not tell whether Officer Alvarez was conscious because [REDACTED] was on top of him.³⁹ Officer Jacobs continued, "I got a little traumatized in the moment... I was very nervous. I'm like, my partner's dead, you know?"⁴⁰

Upon watching Body Worn Camera (BWC) footage during her interview, Officer Jacobs stated that she believed Officer Alvarez was unconscious or dead when [REDACTED] was on

²⁷ Att. 14 at 4:55 to 5:07.

²⁸ Att. 14 at 8:31 to 8:44. COPA served an allegation that Officer Alvarez engaged in unprofessional conduct by making that remark to [REDACTED] but later withdrew the allegation after discovering Officer Alvarez had already been admonished for his language by a CPD supervisor. Att. 5.

²⁹ Att. 2.

³⁰ Medical records from [REDACTED] Hospital note that [REDACTED] requested medication for longstanding, chronic back pain with radiation to his right hip due to a previous injury he had sustained during a traffic accident. Att. 35, pg. 7.

³¹ Att. 3.

³² Att. 35, pgs. 32 to 35.

³³ Att. 32; Att. 35, pgs. 32 to 35.

³⁴ Atts. 3, 29 and 32.

³⁵ Att. 45, pg. 16, ln. 20 to pg. 19, ln. 20.

³⁶ Att. 45, pg. 10, ln. 17 to pg. 15, ln. 13.

³⁷ Att. 45, pg. 25, ln. 8 to pg. 28, ln. 16; and pg. 34, lns. 19 to 24.

³⁸ Att. 6; Att. 46, pg. 16, lns. 2 to 4.

³⁹ Att. 46, pg. 16, lns. 5 to 13; pg. 17, lns. 2 to 3; and pg. 18, ln. 22 to pg. 19, ln. 3.

⁴⁰ Att. 46, pg. 17, lns. 3 to 8; and pg. 41, ln. 16 to pg. 42, ln. 20.

top of him, and it appeared that [REDACTED] had attempted to choke Officer Alvarez. After conferring with counsel during the interview, Officer Jacobs stated that “unconscious” was a better characterization than “dead” with respect to her observations of Officer Alvarez.⁴¹

According to Officer Jacobs, once Officer Alvarez was able to get on top of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] legs were still on Officer Alvarez. Officer Jacobs felt [REDACTED] pushing himself up off the ground and believed he would “kill” her too, or swing the loose handcuff at her.⁴² Officer Jacobs further asserted that Officer Alvarez was lying there and unresponsive,⁴³ so she pulled and kicked [REDACTED] to stop him from swinging the handcuff and to prevent him from disarming her or Officer Alvarez.⁴⁴ According to Officer Jacobs, she was aiming at [REDACTED] right hand/arm to prevent the handcuffs from striking her or Officer Alvarez, but due to [REDACTED] rapid movements and flailing, at least one of Officer Jacobs’s kicks landed on his head.⁴⁵ Officer Jacobs said she did not intentionally kick [REDACTED] on his head.⁴⁷ Officer Jacobs later clarified that the only time [REDACTED] actually swung the loose handcuff was right before Officer Alvarez took him to the ground.⁴⁸

Both officers completed Tactical Response Reports regarding the incident.⁴⁹ Lt. Gurtowski’s review of the incident during the Tactical Response Report review process noted that Officer Jacobs’s actions were not in compliance with CPD policy and directives.⁵⁰

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer Angela Jacobs:

1. Kicking [REDACTED] on or about the head without justification.
 - Sustained, violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9

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. In contrast, 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.

⁴¹ Att. 46, pg. 43, ln. 16 to pg. 45, ln. 22. See Att. 14 at 4:31 to 4:41.

⁴² Att. 46, pg. 17, ln. 14 to pg. 18, ln. 3; pg. 22, lns. 20 to 23; and pg. 53, ln. 23 to pg. 54, ln. 14.

⁴³ Officer Jacobs explained that Officer Alvarez’s eyes were open but not moving.

⁴⁴ Att. 46, pg. 18, lns. 4 to 17; and pg. 19, ln. 4 to pg. 20, ln. 11.

⁴⁵ Att. 6; Att. 46, pg. 22, ln. 17 to pg. 23, ln. 20; and pg. 25, lns. 4 to 13.

⁴⁶ Officer Alvarez did not recall seeing Officer Jacobs kick [REDACTED] on the head. Att. 50, pg. 29, lns. 16 to 19.

⁴⁷ Att. 46, pg. 38, ln. 5 to pg. 40, ln. 15; and pg. 49, lns. 4 to 8.

⁴⁸ Att. 46, pg. 52, ln. 3 to pg. 53, ln. 10.

⁴⁹ Atts. 5 and 6.

⁵⁰ Att. 6, pg. 3.

██████████ was reportedly intoxicated at the time of the incident. During his statement to COPA, ██████████ took no responsibility for his involvement in the domestic incident with his wife and daughter. ██████████ also failed to acknowledge his actions when approached by the officers. His lack of memory surrounding key details of the incident, his assertion that he did not know the officers were trying to get his attention, and his overall failure to accept responsibility for his actions, coupled with his intoxication/impairment, diminishes his credibility.

This investigation did not reveal any evidence that caused COPA to doubt the credibility of Officer Alvarez. Officer Alvarez was forthcoming in his statement to COPA, and his account of the incident was consistent with video footage.

In Officer Jacobs's statement to COPA, she described observing ██████████ hitting, beating, and swinging a handcuff at Officer Alvarez while he was on the ground, and ██████████ was on top of him. Officer Jacobs also asserted that at one point she thought Officer Alvarez was dead, or at the very least unconscious, and that ██████████ would kill her, too. None of this was captured on BWC footage or alleged by Officer Alvarez.⁵¹ Officer Jacobs's statement was replete with exaggerations and hyperbole, raising concerns about her overall truthfulness. The stark contrast between Officer Jacobs's version of events, compared with Officer Alvarez's account and the available video footage, substantially diminishes Officer Jacobs's credibility.

V. ANALYSIS⁵²

COPA finds Allegation #1 against Officer Jacobs, that she kicked ██████████ on or about the head without justification, is **sustained**. Pursuant to CPD policy, force must be objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional. CPD members are permitted to use force to overcome resistance.⁵³ When members encounter an individual who attempts to create distance from a member with the intent to avoid physical control and/or defeat arrest, that individual is an active resister.⁵⁴ Members are permitted to respond to active resistance with police presence, verbal directions, holding and compliance techniques, control instruments, OC spray, stunning, takedowns, canine use, and taser deployment.⁵⁵ Additionally, when a member encounters an individual who is using or threatening the use of force against another person which is likely to cause injury, that individual is an assailant.⁵⁶ If the individual's actions are aggressively offensive with or without weapons, in addition to the force options allowed for active resisters, members are permitted to respond with direct mechanical strikes, impact weapons, and impact munitions.⁵⁷

⁵¹ To the contrary, Officer Alvarez responded "no" when a COPA investigator asked him if he felt his life was in danger at any point during the incident. Att. 50, pg. 29, lns. 20 to 22.

⁵² For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, see Appendix B.

⁵³ See generally Att. 54, G03-02-01, Response to Resistance and Force Options (effective June 28, 2023 to present).

⁵⁴ Att. 54, G03-02-01 (IV)(B)(2).

⁵⁵ Att. 54, G03-02-01 (IV)(B)(2)(c).

⁵⁶ Att. 54, G03-02-01 (IV)(C).

⁵⁷ Att. 54, G03-02-01 (IV)(C)(1)(a).

However, the force they use must be objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional, in order to provide for the safety of a member or third person, stop an attack, make an arrest, bring a person or situation safely under control, or prevent escape.⁵⁸ Further, CPD members must continually assess the necessity of any use of force and whether alternatives may be employed, including the use of de-escalation techniques, other response options, and the availability of other resources.⁵⁹

Here, the BWC footage shows that at the onset of the incident, [REDACTED] was an active resister who failed to comply with verbal direction, stiffened, pulled away, and attempted to avoid physical control and/or defeat arrest. [REDACTED] became an assailant when he kicked Officer Alvarez. Officer Alvarez responded to [REDACTED] actions by striking him and performing an emergency takedown. While on the ground, with one wrist handcuffed, [REDACTED] rolled on top of Officer Alvarez and attempted to hold him down. Officer Jacobs responded by attempting to pull [REDACTED] off Officer Alvarez, and by delivering two open hand strikes to [REDACTED] head. Officer Alvarez then rolled [REDACTED] onto his stomach and regained control, at which point Officer Jacobs kicked [REDACTED] twice on the back of his head. At this point, [REDACTED] offered less resistance and was, at most, an active resister. Because [REDACTED] was only an active resister, CPD policy prohibited Officer Jacobs from kicking [REDACTED]. As the circumstances of an event change, CPD members are expected to modify their use of force to adapt to the needs of the situation, including decreasing the amount or type of force when an individual offers less resistance.⁶⁰

While Officer Jacobs was certainly authorized to use force against [REDACTED] to place him into custody, her decision to kick [REDACTED] on the head at that moment was not reasonable, necessary, or proportional to the threat he posed. Officer Jacobs's argument that she kicked [REDACTED] because Officer Alvarez was lying there unresponsive, [REDACTED] was swinging a handcuff, and she believed he would disarm her and/or Officer Alvarez, and "kill" her too, is not consistent with what was captured on the BWC.

COPA finds that Officer Jacobs did not reasonably believe that Officer Alvarez was unconscious or unresponsive when she kicked [REDACTED] in the head, as Officer Alvarez had repositioned himself on [REDACTED] back, and [REDACTED] was lying face down with his arms extended in front of him. The available evidence suggests that Officer Jacobs exaggerated her observations of Officer Alvarez and [REDACTED] to justify her actions. Officer Alvarez told COPA that [REDACTED] pinned him to the ground, but he never said that [REDACTED] hit, beat, or swung a handcuff at him while he was on the ground. These actions were also not depicted on BWC. Officer Alvarez attested, and the BWC confirms, that Officer Alvarez was pushing [REDACTED] off him when Officer Jacobs claimed to think that Officer Alvarez was unconscious. Her description of the incident—specifically her assertion that she believed Officer Alvarez was dead or unconscious—was disingenuous and self-serving.

⁵⁸ Att. 53, G03-02 (III)(B), De-escalation, Response to Resistance, and Use of Force (effective June 28, 2023 to present).

⁵⁹ Att. 53, G03-02 (III)(B)(2).

⁶⁰ Att. 53, G03-02(II)(D)(2) and (III)(B)(3).

Additionally, a CPD lieutenant's review of the incident during the Tactical Response Report review process also noted that Officer Jacobs's actions were not in compliance with CPD policy and directives. For these reasons, COPA finds the preponderance of the evidence shows that Officer Jacobs's actions violated CPD policy and Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Officer Angela Jacobs

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History⁶¹

Officer Jacobs has received a total of 13 awards, including one Crime Reduction Award, one Democratic Convention Service Award, and 11 Honorable Mentions. Officer Jacobs has one sustained complaint for a BWC violation in 2022, for which she received a three-day suspension. She has one SPAR for a preventable accident in 2023, which resulted in a reprimand.

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officer Jacobs used excessive force when she kicked [REDACTED] on the head, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9. Officer Jacobs admitted to the conduct but maintained that she only kicked [REDACTED] because she believed Officer Alvarez's life was in imminent danger. The BWC footage, however, shows that by the time of the kicks, Officer Alvarez had regained control of [REDACTED] who was lying on his stomach with his hands extended in front of him. Officer Jacobs's actions were reckless, dangerous, and not in compliance with CPD's policies and directives. Additionally, Officer Jacobs's COPA statement was replete with self-serving exaggerations and hyperbole that undermined her credibility.

Based on the evidence collected during this investigation, as well as Officer Jacobs's complimentary and disciplinary history, COPA recommends she receive a **1 to 29 day suspension** and **retraining** regarding CPD's use of force policy.

Approved:

[REDACTED]

Steffany Hreno
Acting Deputy Chief Administrator

6/26/2025

Date

⁶¹ Atts. 55, 56.

Appendix A

Case Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	July 1, 2024/ 4:58 am/ [REDACTED].
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	July 1, 2024/ 9:11 am
Accused Member #1:	Angela Jacobs/ Star #19013/ Employee ID # [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: December 19, 2019/ Unit 001/172/ Female, White
Involved Member #1:	Yonny Alvarez/ Star #3745/ Employee ID # [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: November 16, 2017/ Unit: 008/ Male, Hispanic
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] 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

- General Order G03-02: De-escalation, Response to Resistance, and Use of Force (effective June 28, 2023 to present)
- General Order G03-02-01: Response to Resistance and Force Options (effective June 28, 2023 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.⁶² 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.”⁶³

⁶² 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).

⁶³ *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