



Log # 2024-0006354

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On June 29, 2024, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received complaints from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] alleging that Chicago Police Department (CPD) Officers Juan Moreno, Alcides Bernal, Ivan Aramburo, Cristian Bermudez, Matthew Coyle, and Ryan Harrison committed misconduct. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] alleged that, on June 27, 2024, these officers stopped them without justification, used excessive force, and failed to provide them with an investigative stop receipt.² Following its investigation, COPA reached not sustained allegations for all accused Officers.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE³

Officers Moreno and Bernal were on routine patrol when they observed a vehicle [REDACTED] was driving fail to stop at a stop sign located at or near 57th and Aberdeen.⁴ Officer Moreno approached the vehicle and interacted with [REDACTED].⁵ There was some dispute whether or not the underlying offense occurred.⁶ Officer Moreno requested [REDACTED] driver's license and insurance and inquired if cannabis was located inside of the vehicle.⁷ [REDACTED] opened the center console which revealed cannabis packaged inside of a glass container and a multicolored bag.⁸

Officer Moreno instructed [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to step out of the vehicle for a narcotics search and Officer Moreno placed [REDACTED] in handcuffs. Officer Coyle began to place [REDACTED] in handcuffs, but Officer Bernal was the one who eventually did so. The handcuffs were applied in a manner that caused [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] some discomfort,⁹ [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] mentioned this to the officers at the time. Officer Bermudez adjusted [REDACTED] handcuffs when he saw [REDACTED] bracelets were interfering with the handcuffs, and continued adjusting when he saw [REDACTED] was

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 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 footage, officer statements and police reports.

⁴ Att. 11.

⁵ Att. 11.

⁶ Att. 35, pg. 5 at lns. 9 to 15.

⁷ Att. 4 at 02:22 to 03:11.

⁸ Atts. 40, 41, 42.

⁹ Att. 35 at pg. 8, lns. 14 to 22. See also pg. 12 at lns. 14 to 21.

in pain.¹⁰ The officers did not conduct a pat down search of either man.¹¹ Officer Moreno told the men they would not be leaving at all unless the car was searched,¹² but that they would be free to go if the narcotics search of the vehicle turned up no additional narcotics.¹³

Officer Moreno and Officer Bernal performed a narcotics search on the vehicle and did not recover additional cannabis or contraband.¹⁴ Officer Bernal and Officer Bermudez removed the handcuffs from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] upon the completion of the vehicle search.¹⁵

Officer Moreno issued [REDACTED] a citation for failure to stop at the stop sign and for the improper transportation of cannabis.¹⁶ [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] requested that all officers on scene identify themselves and each officer did so.¹⁷ As they did, the officers said they would give a receipt to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] but they engaged in a conversation about how to properly transport cannabis in a motor vehicle and everyone ultimately left the area without an investigatory stop receipt having been provided.¹⁸

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officers Juan Moreno, Alcides Bernal, Ivan Aramburo, Christian Bermudez, Matthew Coyle, and Ryan Harrison

1. Performing a traffic stop without justification.
 - Not sustained
2. Failing to provide an ISR receipt.
 - Not Sustained
3. Using excessive force 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

¹⁰ Att. 7 at 2:30 to 4:30. Officer Bermudez left only one side of the handcuffs attached to [REDACTED] right wrist for approximately 45 seconds before removing the cuff entirely.

¹¹ Att. 32 at pg. 14, lns. 15 to 16.

¹² Att. 32 at pg. 7, lns. 21 to 22.

¹³ Att. 4 at 05:43 to 06:01. Att. 5 at 05:04 to 06:01.

¹⁴ Att. 4 at 06:05 to 07:14. Att. 5 at 06:04 to 07:42.

¹⁵ Att. 7 at 03:54 to 05:12. Att. 5 at 08:27 to 08:43.

¹⁶ Att. 11.

¹⁷ Atts. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

¹⁸ Att. 5, starting at 8:40; Att. 37, pg. 11, lns. 10 to 13.

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. The complainants and the accused officers provided statements to COPA. This investigation did not reveal any evidence that would cause COPA to question the credibility of any of the individuals who provided statements.

V. ANALYSIS¹⁹

COPA finds the allegation that the accused Officers stopped [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] without justification to be **Not Sustained**. S04-13-09 permits the temporary detention and questioning of a person in the vicinity of where the person was stopped based on reasonable articulable suspicion that the person is committing, is about to commit, or has committed a criminal offense. The suspect may be detained only for the length of time necessary to confirm or dispel the suspicion of criminal activity.

In this case, the Officers stopped [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] failing to stop at a stop sign located at or near 57th and Aberdeen; this was documented in the officers' contemporaneous report.²⁰ The driver of the vehicle denied the offense in his statement to COPA.²¹ In the circumstances, given the dispute in the evidence, COPA determines there is insufficient evidence to conclude that the officers committed misconduct in initiating the traffic stop. Thus, COPA finds this allegation **Not Sustained**.

COPA finds the allegation that the accused officers failed to provide [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] an investigatory stop receipt to be **Not Sustained**. Per S04-13-09:

“Upon the completion of an Investigatory Stop that involves a Protective Pat Down or any other search, sworn members are required to provide the subject of the stop a completed Investigatory Stop Receipt. The Investigatory Stop Receipt will include the event number, the reason for the stop, and the sworn member's name and star number.”²²

In this case, the officers said they would give the required stop receipt to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] but another conversation intervened, and the officers and the two men left the stop location without an investigatory stop receipt having been provided. From [REDACTED] perspective it seemed both that the officers were reluctant in identifying themselves and obstructed the process²³ and, later, as though he and [REDACTED] “were waiting for the receipt” but did not receive

¹⁹ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, *see* Appendix B.

²⁰ Att. 11.

²¹ Att. 35, at pg. 5, lns. 9-15.

²² S04-13-09 VIII.A.3.

²³ Att. 32, at pgs. 17 to 18. BWC recordings show the officers providing their names and star numbers as [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] recorded them on scene.

one, as the officers “got in their car and drove off.”²⁴ Although this aspect of the interaction was not handled in an ideal way by the officers, in the circumstances there is insufficient evidence that the officers’ actions constituted misconduct. Thus, COPA finds this allegation **Not Sustained**.

COPA finds the allegation of excessive force against ██████████ and ██████████ to be **Not Sustained**. G03-02 states department members may only use force that is objectively reasonable, necessary and proportional under the totality of the circumstances in order to ensure 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.

In this case, it does not appear that a use of force incident occurred during the stop. ██████████ and ██████████ exited the vehicle freely and were not forcibly removed by Officers. ██████████ and ██████████ complained of pain and discomfort. ██████████ appeared especially affected by this during the incident, and BWC shows officers adjusting and ultimately removing his handcuffs. Although ██████████ reported to COPA “I got detained illegally because you're not supposed to put me in handcuffs,”²⁵ it is not clear whether the application of handcuffs amounted to a use of force. Thus, COPA finds this allegation **Not Sustained**.

Approved:

██████████

November 28, 2025

Shannon Hayes
Acting Deputy Chief Administrator

Date

²⁴ Att. 32, at pg. 12, lns. 13 to 17.

²⁵ Att. 35, pg. 42 at lns 17 to 18.

Appendix A**Case Details**

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	July 27, 2024 / 5:40 pm / 1055 W Garfield BLVD, Chicago, IL 60609.
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	July 29, 2024 / 01:38 pm.
Involved Member #1:	Officer Juan Moreno, Star: 11143, Employee ID # [REDACTED] DOA: October 25, 2021, Unit: 007, Male, White.
Involved Member #2:	Officer Alcides Bernal, Star: 4997, Employee ID # [REDACTED] DOA: June 05, 1995, Unit: 007, Male, White Hispanic.
Involved Member #3:	Officer Ivan Aramburo, Star: 10440, Employee ID # [REDACTED] DOA: June 05, 1995, Unit: 007, Male, White Hispanic.
Involved Member #4:	Officer Cristian Bermudez, Star: 11257, Employee ID # [REDACTED] DOA: December 02, 2022, Unit: 007, Male, White Hispanic.
Involved Member #5:	Officer Matthew Coyle, Star: 9717, Employee ID # [REDACTED] DOA: June 16, 2017, Unit: 007, Male, White.
Involved Member #6:	Officer Ryan Harrison, Star: 7331, Employee ID # [REDACTED] DOA: January 31, 2022, Unit: 007, Male, White
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] Male, Black
Involved Individual #2:	[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.

Applicable Policies and Laws

- G03-02: De-Escalation, Response to Resistance, and Use of Force, Effective June 28, 2023
- G03-02-01: Response to Resistance and Force Options, Effective June 28, 2023
- S04-13-09: Investigatory Stop System, Effective July 10, 2017

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.²⁶ 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.”²⁷

²⁶ 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).

²⁷ *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