CIVILIAN OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

INTEGRITY • TRANSPARENCY • INDEPENDENCE • TIMELINESS

Log # 2024-0008154

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT[1]

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On November 1, 2024, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received an Initiation Report from 24th District Lieutenant (Lt.) Joseph Schuler reporting alleged misconduct by a member of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). Lt. Schuler reported that, while conducting a review of a use of force incident, he spoke with arrestee [redacted] alleged that earlier that day, Officer Jake Glotzer used excessive force during [redacted] arrest by tackling him and causing an injury to his right eye area. Lt. Schuler also alleged that Officer Glotzer failed to timely activate his body-worn camera (BWC).[2]

Following its investigation, COPA reached sustained findings for both allegations against Officer Glotzer.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE[3]

On November 1, 2024, at approximately 3:38 pm, the Officer of Emergency Management and Communications (OEMC) received two 911 calls about an armed robbery at the Dollar General store located at 2341 West Howard Street.[4] Upon arrival at the store, officers were met by store manager [redacted] [redacted] who related that a Black male between the ages of 26 and 30, wearing a tan jacket, black pants, and a black face mask, was caught stealing merchandise.[5] [redacted] had confronted the unknown offender by taking away one of the items from his hand. The offender displayed a black handgun and stated, "Don't try me," and then placed the gun back into his backpack. [redacted] ran to the front of the store to have a co-worker call 911 while the offender ran out the back door with the stolen items.[6] A flash message with a description of the offender was given out over CPD radio zone 11.

---

[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 BWC video, third-party video, police reports, officer interviews, and medical records.
[4] Atts. 5 and 6.
[5] Atts. 6 and 11.
[6] Att. 11, pg. 3.

Roughly one hour later, Officer Gregory Stranski was monitoring Police Observation Device (POD) video in the 24th District when he observed an individual in black pants and a tan jacket (now known to be [redacted] standing on the sidewalk at 7616 North Paulina Street.[7] Officer Stranski called his old partner, Officer Joseph Stritzel, who was with Field Training Officer (FTO) Mariusz Chojnacki, to relay the information.[8] Officer Stranski's partner also notified Officer Max Keehn, who was on a tactical team partnered with Officer Jake Glotzer.

All four officers drove to the North Paulina Street address, where [redacted] was still located. BWC, third-party surveillance, and POD footage captured the officers' arrival and subsequent interaction with [redacted].[9] As the first CPD vehicle drove up the street, [redacted] pulled a piece of paper out of his pocket and moved across the sidewalk towards the street.[10] Simultaneously, Officer Glotzer exited the driver's side of his CPD vehicle and immediately ran towards [redacted].[11] As Officer Glotzer rushed towards him, [redacted] stopped moving.[12] Officer Glotzer ran into [redacted] and wrapped his arms around [redacted] torso.[13] [redacted] and took a step backwards while Officer Glotzer stepped forward, and then Officer Glotzer completed a takedown of [redacted].[14] As this was happening, Officer Stritzel and FTO Chojnacki arrived on scene. Officer Stritzel ran towards Officer Glotzer just as he was completing the takedown. As [redacted] fell face first towards the ground, Officer Stritzel's foot appeared to inadvertently catch [redacted] face, causing Officer Stritzel to trip and fall onto the sidewalk with [redacted] and Officer Glotzer.[15]

The officers began to place [redacted] in handcuffs as he immediately bled from his face and protested his arrest, explaining that he had paperwork in his hand.[16] CPD requested an ambulance, and a Chicago Fire Department (CFD) ambulance transported [redacted] to St. Francis Hospital, where he was initially diagnosed with a traumatic head injury and two lacerations above his right eye.[17] [redacted] reported to medical personnel that he had lost consciousness for an unspecified amount of time and was suffering from neck pain and body aches.[18] [redacted] was not admitted to the hospital, so he was transported to the 24th District for further processing.[19] Officer Glotzer did not seek medical attention but did sustain minor lacerations on his face and to his hands.[20]

---

[7] Att. 40 and Att. 60, pg. 7, lns. 6 to 10.
[8] Att. 60, pgs. 7 to 8.
[9] Atts. 16, 18, 20, 21, 25 and 40.
[10] Att. 16 at 59:20 to 59:26 and Att. 40 at 4:59:25 to 4:59:29.
[11] Att. 25 at 1:55 to 1:59.
[12] Att. 16 at 59:26, Att. 40 at 4:59:29, and Att. 25 at 1:57 to 1:59.
[13] Att. 16 at 59:26 to 59:27 and Att. 40 at 4:59:30.
[14] Att. 16 at 59:27 to 59:29 and Att. 40 at 4:59:29 to 4:59:31.
[15] Att. 16 at 59:29 to 59:30 and Att. 40 at 4:59:31 to 4:59:32.
[16] Att. 18 at 3:18 to 3:24. Note: this paperwork was related to a recent warrant for [redacted] arrest.
[17] Atts. 2 and 46; see also Att. 71, pgs. 2 and 5.
[18] Att. 71, pg. 4.
[19] Att. 2.
[20] Att. 64, pgs. 13, lns. 12 to 18 and pg. 20, lns. 3 to 6; Att. 2, pg. 3; Att. 45.

Officer Glotzer explained to COPA that when he exited the CPD vehicle, [redacted] appeared to take an athletic stance and square his body towards him.[21] According to Officer Glotzer, he immediately wrapped his arms around [redacted] to prevent him from reaching for a potential firearm.[22] Officer Glotzer related to COPA that he felt [redacted] pulling away. Officer Glotzer believed that this made [redacted] an active resister, so he performed an emergency takedown.[23]

Officer Keehn told COPA that he was aware of [redacted] identity and knew he had a serviceable warrant for robbery and failure to appear in court.[24] Officer Keehn further stated he saw [redacted] pull away from Officer Glotzer and, in his opinion, it appeared that [redacted] was trying to get away.[25] Officer Stritzel mentioned to COPA that he heard Officer Glotzer say "stop," and then saw him grab [redacted] and pull him down on his right side.[26] FTO Chojnacki told COPA he recalled seeing Officer Glotzer approach [redacted] "hug him," and then they ended up falling onto the ground.[27]

Lt. Schuler interviewed [redacted] as part of his review of Officer Glotzer's use of force. [redacted] complained that Officer Glotzer tackled him without reason and caused injury to his eye.[28] Lt. Schuler marked Officer Glotzer's Tactical Response Report (TRR) as "not in compliance," and indicated in his Initiation Report that he believed Officer Glotzer's use of force did not comply with CPD policy.[29]

A black backpack was recovered near the location where [redacted] was arrested, which had Febreze plugins and one other laundry item that was consistent with the merchandise taken from the Dollar General.[30] [redacted] did not have a firearm in his backpack or on his person. [redacted] was charged with one count of misdemeanor resisting a peace officer as a result of this incident; however, the Cook County State's Attorney dismissed that case in December 2024.[31] [redacted] has not been charged for the Dollar General robbery that occurred on November 1, 2024. Nevertheless, [redacted] pled guilty to one count of armed robbery that occurred in October 2024 and was sentenced to six years of incarceration in the Illinois Department of Corrections.[32]

[redacted] declined to cooperate with COPA's investigation; therefore, COPA did not interview him.[33]

---

[21] Att. 64, pg. 9, lns.1 to 2.
[22] Atts. 4, pg. 5; Att. 65, pg. 9, lns. 2 to 4; Att. 21 at 1:59 minutes.
[23] Att. 64, pg. 9, lns. 5 to 11 and pg. 18, lns. 7 to 11; Att. 16 at 59:20 minutes; Att. 40 at 4:59:25.
[24] Att. 51, pg. 10, lns. 19 to 24.
[25] Att. 51, pg. 13, lns 2 to 7.
[26] Att. 54, pg. 11, ln. 2 and pg. 10, lns. 10 to 18.
[27] Att. 57, pg. 13, lns. 1 to 3.
[28] Att. 1, pg. 2.
[29] Att. 4, pg. 3 and Att. 1, pg. 2.
[30] Att. 21 at 6:48 to 9:17 and Att. 67.
[31] Att. 29.
[32] Att. 69.
[33] Att. 37 and CMS Notes CO-1419736, CO-1422573, CO-1437520, and CO-1440705.

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer Jake Glotzer:

1. Performing a takedown of [redacted] without justification.
   - **Sustained, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.**

2. Failing to timely activate your body worn camera.
   - **Sustained, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10.**

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.

COPA interviewed Officers Keehn, Chojnacki, and Stritzel on January 15, 2025, Officer Stranski on February 5, 2025, and Officer Glotzer on February 18, 2025. The involved CPD members provided accounts of this incident that were largely consistent with each other and with the available video and reports. Thus, COPA finds the officers' statements about this incident generally credible. Furthermore, this investigation did not reveal any additional evidence that caused COPA to question the credibility of any of the sworn individuals who provided statements regarding the use of force allegations.

[redacted] did not participate in COPA's investigation; therefore, COPA is unable to fully assess his credibility.

V. ANALYSIS[34]

a. Use of Force

COPA finds that allegation #1 against Officer Glotzer, that he performed a takedown of [redacted] without justification, is **sustained**. CPD policy provides that, "Department members' use of force must be objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional under the totality of the circumstance, including using the minimum amount of force needed under the circumstances."[35] CPD members will continually assess the necessity of the 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.[36] Additionally, the policy defines an active resister as "a person who attempts to create distance between himself or herself and the member's reach with the intent

[34] For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, *see* Appendix B.
[35] Att. 72, G03-02-01(II)(C)(1), Response to Resistance and Force options (effective June 28, 2023, to present).
[36] Att. 72, G03-02-01(II)(C)(2).

to avoid physical control and/or defeat the arrest."[37] Officers are permitted to use takedowns on active resisters.[38]

Here, COPA finds that Officer Glotzer's takedown of [redacted] was a disproportionate and unjustified use of force. COPA begins by acknowledging that Officer Glotzer was acting on the good faith belief that [redacted] had just committed an armed robbery, and as such, may have been armed. However, that does not justify the level of force he used against [redacted]

In sustaining this allegation, COPA relies primarily on the videos and officer statements. Most notably, the third-party and POD videos show that [redacted] was walking towards the approaching officers when Officer Glotzer quickly rushed towards him. Officer Stritzel testified that he heard Officer Glotzer order [redacted] to "stop." The third-party and POD videos, along with Officer Glotzer's BWC (during the buffer period), show [redacted] doing exactly that: stopping in place as Officer Glotzer rushed towards him. Officer Glotzer then grabbed [redacted] around his midsection, which appears to have caused [redacted] to step backward and Officer Glotzer to continue moving forward, until they both fell to the ground. While Officer Glotzer may have been sincere in his belief that [redacted] was attempting to flee by stepping backwards, COPA finds that this belief was not objectively reasonable. Officer Glotzer had just forcefully grabbed [redacted] about his midsection; it was not unreasonable for [redacted] to have instinctively taken a step backward to maintain his balance, or for [redacted] to have taken the step backward in response to the force of Officer Glotzer grabbing him. COPA notes that Officer Glotzer also took steps after grabbing [redacted]

Furthermore, Officer Glotzer made no discernible attempt to de-escalate, beyond ordering [redacted] to "stop," prior to utilizing the takedown. Indeed, the period of time between when Officer Glotzer began stepping out of the vehicle until he wrapped his arms around [redacted] and began the takedown was approximately three seconds.[39] Despite the mere seconds Officer Glotzer afforded [redacted] before resorting to force, [redacted] appears to have complied with the order to "stop."

Because [redacted] followed Officer Glotzer's order to "stop," COPA finds that [redacted] was a cooperating subject and not an active resister when Officer Glotzer utilized the takedown. As such, Officer Glotzer's takedown was not an authorized use of force, and this allegation is sustained, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.

b. Late BWC Activation

COPA finds Allegation #2 against Officer Glotzer, that he failed to activate his BWC in a timely manner, is **sustained**. To increase transparency and improve the quality and reliability of investigations, Illinois law and CPD policy require law-enforcement-related activities to be

[37] Att. 72, G03-02-01(IV)(B)(2).
[38] Att. 72, G03-02-01(IV)(B)(2)(3).
[39] Att. 25 at 1:57 to 1:59.

electronically recorded.[40] Law-enforcement-related activities include, but are not limited to, calls for service, arrests, investigatory stops, use of force incidents, statements made by individuals in the course of an investigation, high risk situations, and any other instances when enforcing the law.[41] The decision to record is mandatory, not discretionary.[42] CPD members are required to activate their BWCs at the beginning of an incident and record the entire incident.[43] If circumstances prevent the activation of a BWC at the beginning of an incident, the member will activate their camera as soon as practical.[44]

Here, Officer Glotzer's BWC was not activated until after he exited his CPD vehicle, ordered [redacted] to "stop," and rushed at him. It was only when he wrapped his arms around [redacted] that his BWC activated. This may have been unintentional, given that Officer Glotzer did not appear to use his hand to activate the camera.[45] During his COPA statement, Officer Glotzer did not recall when he activated his BWC.[46] According to CPD policy, Officer Glotzer's BWC should have been turned on, at minimum, before he exited the CPD vehicle and engaged [redacted] As such, allegation #2 is **sustained**, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Officer Jake Glotzer

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History[47]

Officer Glotzer's complimentary history is comprised of 13 awards, the highlights of which include one Department Commendation and ten Honorable Mentions. His disciplinary history includes two SPARs: 1) an October 2024 Conduct Unbecoming incident, resulting in no disciplinary action, and 2) a March 2025 Illinois License Plate and/or City Sticker violation, resulting in a reprimand.

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officer Glotzer violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10 when he utilized a takedown without justification and failed to timely activate his BWC.

In aggravation, COPA notes that Officer Glotzer's unjustified use of force resulted in both [redacted] and Officer Glotzer sustaining injuries, including [redacted] bleeding from his head and needing transport to the hospital. In mitigation, COPA notes that Officer Glotzer's use of force

[40] Att. 73, S03-14(III)(A)(B), Body Worn Cameras (effective August 08, 2024, to present).
[41] Att. 73, S03-14(II)(I).
[42] Att. 73, S03-14(V)(A)(1).
[43] Att. 73, S03-14(V)(A)(2).
[44] Att. 73, S03-14(V)(A)(5)(b).
[45] Att. 25.
[46] Att. 64, pg. 16, lns. 12 to 16.
[47] Atts. 73 and 74.

seems to have been based on the good faith belief that [redacted] had recently committed a robbery and may have been armed. Officer Glotzer seems to have been well-intentioned, if not overeager. COPA also acknowledges Officer Glotzer's complimentary history, his minimal disciplinary history, and his relative inexperience as an officer (approximately three years) at the time of this incident.

In light of these factors, COPA recommends that Officer Glotzer receive a **1 to 29 day suspension** and **retraining** on CPD's Use of Force and BWC policies.

Approved:

[redacted]

8/31/2025

Steffany Hreno
Acting Deputy Chief Administrator

Date

Appendix A

Case Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	November 1, 2024 / 4:49 pm / 7616 North Paulina
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	November 1, 2024 / 7:39 pm
Accused Member #1:	Jake Glotzer, star #18730 employee ID#[redacted] DOA: April 16, 2021, Unit: 024, male, White
Involved Member #2:	Max Keehn, star #13978, employee ID#[redacted] DOA: August 29, 2016, Unit: 024, male, White
Involved Member #3:	Joseph Stritzel, star #16341, employee ID#[redacted] DOA: February 19, 2013, Unit: 016/024, male, White
Involved Member #4:	Mariusz Chojnacki, star #10161, employee ID#[redacted] DOA: May 22, 2006, Unit: 024, male, White
Involved Member 5:	Gregory Stranski, star #7907, employee ID#[redacted] DOA: February 19, 2013, Unit: 024, male, 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.

Applicable Policies and Laws

- G03-02-01, Response to Resistance and Force Options (effective June 28, 2023, to present).
- S03-14, Body Worn Cameras (effective August 08, 2024, 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.[48] 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."[49]

[48] *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).
[49] *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