



Log # 2024-0007946

## FINAL SUMMARY REPORT<sup>1</sup>

### I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On October 23, 2024, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received an initiation report<sup>2</sup>, which listed Officer Michael Ventura as the accused. The report further alleged that Officer Ventura may have kicked an arrestee.<sup>3</sup> Upon review of the evidence, COPA served additional allegations to several other officers as well as additional allegations against Officer Ventura. COPA served allegations against Officer Miguel Valadez for failing to notify OEMC of participation in a motor vehicle pursuit, failing to complete pursuit related reporting requirements and engaging in a motor vehicle pursuit where more than two CPD vehicles participated. COPA also served allegations against Officer Michael Laurie for failing to notify OEMC of participation in a motor vehicle pursuit, failing to complete pursuit related reporting requirements and engaging in a motor vehicle pursuit where more than two CPD vehicles participated. COPA served allegations against Officer Jacob Gies for failing to complete pursuit related reporting requirements and engaging in a motor vehicle pursuit where more than two CPD vehicles participated. COPA served allegations against Officer Fazan Khan for failing to notify OEMC of participation in a motor vehicle pursuit, failing to complete pursuit related reporting requirements and engaging in a motor vehicle pursuit where more than two CPD vehicles participated. COPA served allegations against Officer Michael Laurie for failing to notify OEMC of participation in a motor vehicle pursuit, failing to complete pursuit related reporting requirements and engaging in a motor vehicle pursuit where more than two CPD vehicles participated. COPA served additional allegations against Officer Ventura for failing to notify OEMC of a pointing incident, for being verbally abusive to an arrestee, failing to complete pursuit related reporting requirements and engaging in a motor vehicle pursuit where more than two CPD vehicles participated.

Following its investigation, COPA reached unfounded findings regarding all allegations against Officers Laurie and Khan. COPA reached not sustained findings for all allegations involving Officers Deumic, Valadez and Gies. COPA reached sustained findings against Officer Ventura regarding the allegations of failing to notify OEMC of a pointing incident, the kicking allegation and the verbal abuse allegation. COPA reached not sustained findings against Officer Ventura for failing to complete pursuit related reports and engaging in a motor vehicle pursuit where more than two CPD vehicles participated.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> Att. 4.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

## II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE<sup>4</sup>

COPA interviewed Officers Khan, Laurie, Gies, Ventura, Deumic and Valadez. Officer Laurie and Khan were partners on the date of the incident, and they were working beat 1663E.<sup>5</sup> They were riding in an unmarked squad vehicle.<sup>6</sup> They received information over the zone radio regarding multiple armed robberies in multiple districts, surrounding district 16.<sup>7</sup> They were given a description of the vehicle, which was a gray Hyundai.<sup>8</sup> Officer Laurie and his partner observed the gray Hyundai at approximately Narragansett and Belmont drive past them.<sup>9</sup> Officer Laurie made a U-turn to pursue the vehicle, Officer Laurie and his partner were the only vehicles in pursuit at this time.<sup>10</sup> Officer Laurie and his partner terminated the pursuit after about three minutes because they lost sight of the vehicle.<sup>11</sup> After they terminated the pursuit, they notified OEMC that the last place they saw the vehicle was Belmont and Major.<sup>12</sup> Both Officers Laurie and Khan were broadcasting to OEMC as they were involved in the pursuit.<sup>13</sup> OEMC was subsequently relaying their transmissions to other involved officers. A traffic pursuit report was completed by Officer Laurie, and the pursuit was determined to be in compliance by CPD.<sup>14</sup> Both Officers Laurie<sup>15</sup> and Khan<sup>16</sup> body-worn cameras supported their testimony to COPA.

Officers Deumic and Valadez were partners on the date of the incident, and they were on the 2563 team.<sup>17</sup> They were riding in an unmarked squad vehicle.<sup>18</sup> On the day of the incident, Officers Deumic and Valadez were responding to a call of multiple robberies in the area.<sup>19</sup> The officers also heard radio notifications that the vehicle involved was a gray four door sedan.<sup>20</sup> Once Officers Deumic and Valadez got to the general area there were several other units that were saturating the area looking for the vehicle.<sup>21</sup> As Officers Deumic and Valadez were in the area, they observed a vehicle that matched the offending vehicle somewhere on Parkside.<sup>22</sup> While in that area, they observed the offending vehicle side-swipe another vehicle and they got the people

---

<sup>4</sup> 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, and officer interviews.

<sup>5</sup> Att. 44, pg. 7, lns. 11 – 16.

<sup>6</sup> Att. 44, pg. 8, lns. 2 – 3.

<sup>7</sup> Att. 44, pg. 8, lns. 14 – 16.

<sup>8</sup> Att. 44, pg. 9, lns. 5 – 6.

<sup>9</sup> Att. 44, pg. 9, lns. 17 – 21.

<sup>10</sup> Att. 44, pg. 10, lns. 1 – 8.

<sup>11</sup> Att. 44, pg. 10, lns. 9 – 17.

<sup>12</sup> Att. 44, pg. 10, lns. 20 – 23.

<sup>13</sup> Att. 44, pg. 11, lns. 10 – 15.

<sup>14</sup> Att. 40.

<sup>15</sup> Att. 24.

<sup>16</sup> Att. 23.

<sup>17</sup> Att. 41, pg. 7, lns. 16 – 22.

<sup>18</sup> Att. 41, pg. 8, lns. 10 – 11.

<sup>19</sup> Att. 41, pg. 9, lns. 1 – 8.

<sup>20</sup> Att. 41, pg. 9, lns. 9 – 12.

<sup>21</sup> Att. 41, pg. 9, lns. 20 – 22.

<sup>22</sup> Att. 41, pg. 9, lns. 23 – 24; pg. 10, lns. 1.

out of the offending vehicle and placed them into custody.<sup>23</sup> Officer Deumic did not remember pursuing the offending vehicle.<sup>24</sup> Officer Valadez denied being in a pursuit with the offending vehicle.<sup>25</sup> Officer Deumic did not recall whether or not he notified OEMC of a pursuit.<sup>26</sup> Officer Valadez does not believe he notified OEMC either.<sup>27</sup> Neither Officers Deumic or Valadez completed any type of pursuit paperwork.<sup>28</sup> Officers Deumic and Valadez stated that they were the first vehicle behind the offending vehicle when they were on Parkside.<sup>29</sup> Both Officers Valadez and Deumic had their body-worn camera activated.<sup>30</sup>

Officers Ventura and Gies were partners on the date of the incident, and they were working beat 2563D.<sup>31</sup> They were in an unmarked squad vehicle and they both had body-worn cameras.<sup>32</sup> Officers Ventura and Gies were dispatched to a call for multiple armed robberies, so they began touring the area trying to anticipate the next robbery.<sup>33</sup> According to Officer Ventura, there were multiple CPD units in the area.<sup>34</sup> All the involved officers were in the area looking for the offending vehicle.<sup>35</sup> As Officers Ventura and Gies were driving eastbound on Wellington, there was a roundabout and as they were going around it to make a U-turn, the offending vehicle was coming right toward them, but it turned off and went onto Parkside.<sup>36</sup> When they saw the offending vehicle coming towards them, there were a couple squad cars behind it.<sup>37</sup> Officer Ventura saw the offending vehicle crash into a parked car.<sup>38</sup> Both Officers Ventura and Gies did not recall pursuing the offending vehicle at any time.<sup>39</sup> Both Officers Ventura<sup>40</sup> and Gies<sup>41</sup> body-worn cameras support their testimony to COPA regarding the pursuit. Officers Ventura and Gies also did not call in the pursuit to OEMC or do any type of pursuit paperwork.<sup>42</sup>

After the offending vehicle crashed, Officer Ventura exited the squad vehicle and ran up to the passenger side of the offending vehicle.<sup>43</sup> Officer Ventura admitted to pointing his firearm

---

<sup>23</sup> Att. 41, pg. 10, lns. 1 – 4.

<sup>24</sup> Att. 41, pg. 10, lns. 10 – 11.

<sup>25</sup> Att. 42, pg. 18, lns. 10 – 11.

<sup>26</sup> Att. 41, pg. 12, lns. 3 – 6.

<sup>27</sup> Att. 42, pg. 12, lns. 1 – 5.

<sup>28</sup> Att. 41, pg. 13, lns. 12 – 15; Att. 42, pg. 13, lns. 11 – 13.

<sup>29</sup> Att. 41, pg. 10, lns. 22 – 24; Att. 42, pg. 10, lns. 23 – 24; pg. 11, lns. 1 – 2.

<sup>30</sup> Atts. 3 and 9.

<sup>31</sup> Att. 31, pg. 7, lns. 10 – 15.

<sup>32</sup> Att. 31, pg. 8, lns. 3 – 12; Att. 30, pg. 8, lns. 4 – 12.

<sup>33</sup> Att. 31, pg. 8, lns. 16 – 23; Att. 30, pg. 8, lns. 16 – 23.

<sup>34</sup> Att. 31, pg. 9, lns. 6 – 10.

<sup>35</sup> Att. 30, pg. 14, lns. 2 – 8.

<sup>36</sup> Att. 30, pg. 14, lns. 18 – 24, pg. 15, lns. 6 – 9.

<sup>37</sup> Att. 30, pg. 15, lns. 14 – 15.

<sup>38</sup> Att. 31, pg. 12, lns. 9 – 10.

<sup>39</sup> Att. 31, pg. 12, lns. 19 – 21; Att. 30, pg. 18, lns. 12 – 15.

<sup>40</sup> Att. 2.

<sup>41</sup> Att. 8.

<sup>42</sup> Att. 31, pg. 12, lns. 22 – 24; Att. 30, pg. 19, lns. 10 – 13.

<sup>43</sup> Att. 31, pg. 22, lns. 7 – 12.

at the passenger, ██████████, as he was approaching the offending vehicle.<sup>45</sup> However, he did not recall if he notified OEMC of that pointing.<sup>46</sup> Officer Ventura also admitted to stating words to the effect of "I will blow your fucking face off" and/or "shut the fuck up, I will blow your fucking head off."<sup>47</sup> Officer Ventura stated that he would never normally use that language, but that this was a stressful situation and he used that language to show ██████████ that he meant business and to quell the situation.<sup>48</sup> Officer Ventura's body-worn camera depicts him exit the squad vehicle and run over to the passenger side of the offending vehicle, where ██████████ was pulled out of the vehicle and placed on the ground.<sup>49</sup> While ██████████ was on the ground Officer Ventura stood over him and moved his foot in a kicking motion, while ██████████ asked "why are you kicking me."<sup>50</sup> Officer Ventura denied kicking ██████████ but stated he was trying to get his footing and that he could have accidentally stepped on ██████████ or Officer Valadez in the process of trying to place his foot on the ground.<sup>51</sup>

### III. ALLEGATIONS

#### **Officer Michael Laurie:**

1. Failing to notify OEMC of participation in a motor vehicle pursuit, in violation of G03-03-01.
  - Unfounded
2. Failing to complete pursuit related reporting requirements following participation in a motor vehicle pursuit, in violation of G03-03-01.
  - Unfounded
3. Engaging in a motor vehicle pursuit where more than two CPD vehicles participated in the pursuit, in violation of G03-03-01.
  - Unfounded

#### **Officer Fazan Khan:**

1. Failing to notify OEMC of participation in a motor vehicle pursuit, in violation of G03-03-01.
  - Unfounded
2. Failing to complete pursuit related reporting requirements following participation in a motor vehicle pursuit, in violation of G03-03-01.
  - Unfounded

---

<sup>44</sup> COPA attempted to interview ██████████ about this incident, but he did not want to provide a statement. Note CO-1431004.

<sup>45</sup> Att. 31, pg. 22, lns. 16 – 21.

<sup>46</sup> Att. 31, pg. 22, lns. 22 – 24.

<sup>47</sup> Att. 31, pg. 23, ln. 24; pg. 24, lns. 1 – 3.

<sup>48</sup> Att. 31, pg. 24, lns. 5 – 18.

<sup>49</sup> Att. 2 at 2:00 to 2:14.

<sup>50</sup> Att. 2 at 2:15 to 2:18.

<sup>51</sup> Att. 31, pg. 26, lns. 5 – 18.

3. Engaging in a motor vehicle pursuit where more than two CPD vehicles participated in the pursuit, in violation of G03-03-01.
  - Unfounded

**Officer Miguel Valadez:**

1. Failing to notify OEMC of participation in a motor vehicle pursuit, in violation of G03-03-01.
  - Not Sustained
2. Failing to complete pursuit related reporting requirements following participation in a motor vehicle pursuit, in violation of G03-03-01.
  - Not Sustained
3. Engaging in a motor vehicle pursuit where more than two CPD vehicles participated in the pursuit, in violation of G03-03-01.
  - Not Sustained

**Officer Admir Deumic:**

1. Failing to notify OEMC of participation in a motor vehicle pursuit, in violation of G03-03-01.
  - Not Sustained
2. Failing to complete pursuit related reporting requirements following participation in a motor vehicle pursuit, in violation of G03-03-01.
  - Not Sustained
3. Engaging in a motor vehicle pursuit where more than two CPD vehicles participated in the pursuit, in violation of G03-03-01.
  - Not Sustained

**Officer Jacob Gies:**

1. Failed to complete pursuit related reporting requirements following participation in a motor vehicle pursuit, in violation of G03-03-01.
  - Not Sustained
2. Engaged in a motor vehicle pursuit where more than two CPD vehicles participated in the pursuit, in violation of G03-03-01.
  - Not Sustained

**Officer Michael Ventura:**

1. Failed to notify OEMC of a pointing incident.
  - Sustained, in violation of rules 2, 3, 5, 6 and 10.
2. Was verbally abusive to [REDACTED] by stating words to the effect of "I will blow your fucking face off" and/or "shut the fuck up, I will blow your fucking head off."
  - Sustained, in violation of rules 2, 3, 5, 8 and 9.
3. Kicked and/or placed your foot on [REDACTED] multiple times, without justification.

- Sustained, in violation of rules 2, 3, 5, 8 and 9.
- 4. Failed to complete pursuit related reporting requirements following participation in a motor vehicle pursuit, in violation of G03-03-01.
  - Not Sustained
- 5. Engaged in a motor vehicle pursuit where more than two CPD vehicles participated in the pursuit, in violation of G03-03-01.
  - 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 recall the event from memory. Here, all the officers involved gave statements to COPA regarding their respective allegations. Officers Laurie and Khan admitted that they were involved in a pursuit, and they completed the necessary paperwork and notified OEMC of the pursuit. Officers Valadez and Deumic admitted to being the first vehicle behind the offending when the vehicle was on Parkside, but they did not recall being in a pursuit with the vehicle. Officer Gies and Ventura denied they were in pursuit, but they also admitted that they observed the offending vehicle when it was on Parkside. Officer Ventura admitted that he used profanity when speaking with [REDACTED] and that he pointed his weapon at him. COPA finds that all involved officers were being truthful when providing their statements.

#### V. ANALYSIS<sup>52</sup>

COPA finds the allegations of failing to notify OEMC of a pursuit, failing to complete pursuit related reports and engaging in a pursuit with more than two CPD vehicles, against both Officers Laurie and Khan, **Unfounded**. General Order G03-03-01 governs Emergency vehicle operations-eluding and pursuing.<sup>53</sup> Under the order, Department members will only engage in a motor vehicle pursuit when notification has been made to the OEMC dispatcher regarding the facts concerning the pursuit.<sup>54</sup> The order goes on to state that an active motor vehicle pursuit will involve no more than a primary and secondary pursuit unit unless otherwise authorized by a supervisor.<sup>55</sup> Upon a termination order, a voluntary termination, or the apprehension of the offender, if acting as the primary pursuit unit, obtain a pursuit tracking number from the major accident investigation unit and submit a clear pursuit report and attach relevant documents.<sup>56</sup> If not acting as the primary pursuit unit, complete a traffic pursuit supplemental report.<sup>57</sup> In this case, Officers Laurie and Khan, made the required notification

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

<sup>53</sup> Att. 45.

<sup>54</sup> Att. 45 General Order G03-03-01(VII)(A)(3).

<sup>55</sup> Att. 45 General Order G03-03-01(VII)(B).

<sup>56</sup> Att. 45 General Order G03-03-01(XI)(B)(2).

<sup>57</sup> Att. 45 General Order G03-03-01(XI)(B)(3).

to OEMC, they were the only vehicle involved in the pursuit and they completed the required paperwork regarding the pursuit, as such, these allegations are unfounded.

COPA finds allegations of failing to notify OEMC of a pursuit, failing to complete pursuit related reports and engaging in a pursuit with more than two CPD vehicles, against both Officers Valadez and Deumic, **Not Sustained**. In this case both Officers Valadez and Deumic did not recall or deny being in pursuit. They admitted to being the first vehicle behind the offending vehicle when the vehicle was on Parkside. However, that is not determinative that they were involved in the pursuit. The officers were in an unmarked squad vehicle so there was no in-car camera footage regarding the incident. While both officers had their body-worn cameras activated. It cannot be determined from the footage whether they engaged in a pursuit. Officers Valadez and Deumic admitted not completing any type of paperwork regarding the pursuit nor did they notify OEMC. They did not do these things because they did not consider themselves to have participated in a pursuit on the date of the incident. COPA does not have any determinative evidence to prove or dispel that on the date of the incident Officers Valadez and Deumic were involved in the pursuit. Accordingly, COPA finds these allegations not sustained against both officers.

COPA finds the allegations of failing to complete pursuit related reports and engaging in a pursuit with more than two CPD vehicles, against both Officers Gies and Ventura, **Not Sustained**. Both Officers Gies and Ventura denied participating in a pursuit. They relocated to the area to saturate the area (to be on the lookout for the vehicle that could be involved in the armed robberies). While they did see the offending vehicle drive onto Parkside, they were in front of the vehicle and not behind it. The officers were in an unmarked squad vehicle so there was no in-car camera footage regarding the incident. While both officers had their body-worn cameras activated, it cannot be determined from the footage whether they engaged in a pursuit. Officers Gies and Ventura admitted to not completing any type of paperwork regarding the pursuit. They did not do any paperwork because they did not consider themselves to have participated in a pursuit on the date of the incident. Since they did not participate in the pursuit, they were not more than two vehicles behind the offending vehicle. COPA does not have any determinative evidence to prove or dispel that on the date of the incident Officers Valadez and Deumic were involved in the pursuit. Accordingly, COPA finds these allegations not sustained against both officers.

COPA finds the allegations of failing to notify OEMC of a pointing incident, being verbally abusive to ██████ and kicking ██████ against Officer Ventura, **Sustained**. Department Notice D19-01 states that whenever a department member points a firearm at a person while in the performance of his or her duties, the member is required to make the appropriate notification consistent with the procedures and exceptions outlined in the directive.<sup>58</sup> Here, Officer Ventura admitted to pointing his firearm at ██████ and he did not recall whether or not he made the notification. OEMC has no record of the notification being made. Rule 9 prohibits department members from engaging in any unjustified verbal or physical altercation

---

<sup>58</sup> Att. 46 Department Notice D19-01(II)(A).

with any person, while on or off duty. Officer Ventura admitted to using profanity while interacting with [REDACTED] Officer Ventura denied kicking [REDACTED] but he stated while he was attempting to regain his footing he could have accidentally stepped on [REDACTED] Officer Ventura’s body-worn camera footage shows him moving his foot up and down in a kicking motion and [REDACTED] yelling “why are you kicking me”. Accordingly, COPA finds these allegations sustained against Officer Ventura.

**VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION**

**a. Michael Ventura**

**i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History<sup>59</sup>**

As of August 27, 2025, Officer Ventura has received a total of 144 awards, including two Department Commendation Award, one Honorable Mention Ribbon Award, one Unit Meritorious Performance Award, and 130 Honorable Mention Certificate. In the last five years, Officer Ventura has one Sustained Complaints History (2021-0001828), resulting in Reprimand. In the last five years, Officer Ventura has a Spar History showing 1 Sustained Findings for Preventable Accident, resulting in Reprimand.

**ii. Recommended Discipline**

COPA has found that Officer Ventura violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10 when he failed to notify OEMC of a pointing incident; was verbally abusive to [REDACTED] by stating words to the effect of "I will blow your fucking face off" and/or "shut the fuck up, I will blow your fucking head off;" and kicked and/or placed his foot on [REDACTED] multiple times, without justification. Officer Ventura admitted to pointing his firearm at [REDACTED] Officer Ventura admitted to using profanity while interacting with [REDACTED] Officer Ventura denied kicking [REDACTED] but he stated while he was attempting to regain his footing he could have accidentally stepped on [REDACTED]

Based on the above information, COPA recommends 1 to 29 Days Suspension for Officer Ventura.

Approved:

[REDACTED]

8-31-2025

Angela Hearts-Glass

Date

<sup>59</sup> Attachment 47

Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator

Appendix ACase Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	January 11, 2024/ 10:39 pm/ 2842 N. Parkside Ave
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	October 23, 2024/ 9:47 am
Involved Member #1:	Officer Michael Laurie, star# 15108, employee# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: January 26, 2004, Unit 016, Male, Spanish
Involved Member #2:	Officer Fazan Khan, star# 11553, employee# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: June 29, 2015, Unit 016, Male, Asian Pacific Islander
Involved Member #3:	Officer Miguel Valadez, star# 14270, employee# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: June 16, 2021, Unit 025/185, Male, White Hispanic
Involved Member #4:	Officer Admir Deumic, star# 7160, employee# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: September 18, 2017, Unit 025, Male, White
Involved Member #5:	Officer Jacob Gies, star# 18021, employee# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: February 19, 2019, Unit 025, Male, White
Involved Member #6:	Officer Michael Ventura, star# 14706, employee# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: July 27, 2018, Unit 025, Male, White
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] Male, Spanish

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.

**Applicable Policies and Laws**

---

- G03-03-01: Emergency Vehicle Operations-Eluding and Pursing (effective August 15, 2020 to present)
- D19-01: Firearm Pointing Incident (effective November 1, 2019 to April 15, 2025)

## 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.<sup>60</sup> 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.”<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> 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).

<sup>61</sup> *People v. Coan*, 2016 IL App (2d) 151036, ¶ 28 (quoting Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions, Criminal, No. 4.19 (4<sup>th</sup> 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