



Log # 2025-0002055

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On May 1, 2025, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received an Initiation Report from Sergeant Arshanette Chambers, which documented a complaint from ██████ against members of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). ██████ alleged that on April 27, 2025, Officers Orlando Hernandez and Daniel Mangan detained ██████ and searched his vehicle without justification.² ██████ was a passenger in ██████ vehicle at the time of the stop. Upon review of the evidence, COPA served an additional allegation that Officers Hernandez and Mangan failed to complete and/or issue an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) Receipt to ██████. Following its investigation, COPA reached sustained findings regarding the ISR allegation.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE³

On April 27, 2025, at approximately 8:55pm, ██████ was double-parked at approximately 7230 S. Luella Avenue, when Officers Hernandez and Mangan conducted a traffic stop of ██████ vehicle.⁴ Officer Hernandez, who was the driver of the marked CPD vehicle, observed that ██████ vehicle had a broken taillight.⁵ Officer Mangan yelled out the window, “Hey, your taillight’s not working. Did you know that?”⁶ He then exited the CPD vehicle and approached the parked vehicle where ██████ was seated in the driver’s seat and ██████ was the front passenger. Officer Mangan asked for ██████ identification, and ██████ responded that he thought it was in the back seat. Officer Mangan asked ██████ to step out of the vehicle, patted him down, placed him in handcuffs, and moved ██████ to the back of the CPD vehicle, while he verified his license.⁷ Officer Hernandez approached ██████ vehicle and began a brief search of the driver’s area, which included the center console.⁸ ██████ questioned Officer Hernandez’s search of the vehicle.

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 footage, ICC Footage, police reports, civilian interview and officer interviews.

⁴ Att. 2 beginning at 02:00.

⁵ Att. 19 at 00:10 to 00:16.

⁶ Att. 2 at 02:05.

⁷ Att. 2 at 2:39 to 2:51.

⁸ Att. 3 at 2:46 to 3:38.

Officer Hernandez responded, “Cause when I pulled up... I mean, you didn’t see it, but he was moving around.”⁹

As this occurred, Officer Mangan used the portable data terminal (PDT) inside the CPD vehicle to verify [REDACTED] identity by his name and date of birth.¹⁰ After Officer Mangan discovered that [REDACTED] driver’s license was valid, he took [REDACTED] out of the CPD vehicle, removed the handcuffs, and told [REDACTED] he was free to leave.¹¹ Officer Mangan advised [REDACTED] to keep his identification readily available in the future, while Officer Hernandez told [REDACTED] “When the police stops you, like, you can’t be moving around.”¹² [REDACTED] apologized and said he had been looking for his wallet. The officers did not issue any citations or provide an ISR receipt to [REDACTED]

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer Orlando Hernandez:

1. Searching [REDACTED] vehicle without justification.
 - Not Sustained
2. Detaining [REDACTED] without justification
 - Exonerated
3. Failing to complete and or issue an Investigatory Stop Receipt to [REDACTED]
 - Sustained; Violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10

Officer Daniel Mangan:

1. Searching [REDACTED] vehicle without justification.
 - Unfounded
2. Detaining [REDACTED] without justification
 - Exonerated
3. Failing to complete and or issue an Investigatory Stop Receipt to [REDACTED]
 - Sustained; 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 to accurately recall the event from memory.

COPA’s investigation did not reveal any evidence that called into question the credibility of [REDACTED] Officer Hernandez, or Officer Mangan. COPA found all involved parties to be

⁹ Att. 3 at 3:19.

¹⁰ Att. 28, pg. 10, lns. 21 to 23.

¹¹ Att. 2 at 4:01 to 4:53.

¹² Att. 2 at 4:25.

credible and consistent in their respective accounts, and they had no difficulty recalling the details of the incident, which were corroborated by the Body Worn Camera (BWC) footage.

V. ANALYSIS¹³

a. Detaining ██████ without justification

COPA finds the allegation that Officers Hernandez and Mangan detained ██████ without justification is exonerated. A lawful traffic stop requires “at least [an] articulable and reasonable suspicion that the particular person stopped is breaking the law,” including traffic law.¹⁴ Articulable and reasonable suspicion means that the police “must be able to identify some particularized and objective basis for thinking that the person to be stopped is or may be about to engage in unlawful activity,” amounting to more than a hunch.¹⁵

In this instance, the BWC and In Car Camera (ICC) footage shows that ██████ vehicle was double-parked, with a broken left taillight.¹⁶ These traffic violations provided Officers Hernandez and Mangan with justification to stop ██████ vehicle. Additionally, after initiating the traffic stop, Officer Hernandez observed ██████ making furtive movements inside the vehicle, and ██████ was unable to immediately produce a driver’s license upon Officer Mangan’s request. In his interview at COPA, Officer Hernandez explained that the officers did not know who the driver (█████) was, and therefore they needed to secure him to identify him.¹⁷ Officer Hernandez added that he had observed ██████ making furtive movements towards the center console, and the safest course of action was to place ██████ in handcuffs while the officers verified his identity.¹⁸ Although the BWC video did not capture ██████ movements inside his vehicle, ██████ was subsequently recorded telling Officer Hernandez that he had been searching for his wallet.¹⁹

During Officer Mangan’s COPA statement, he explained that they detained ██████ in handcuffs because he did not have identification on him, it was nighttime, they were in a high crime area, and Officer Hernandez signaled to Officer Mangan to get ██████ out of his vehicle. Officer Mangan reasonably believed that Officer Hernandez may have seen something that he did not, which required ██████ to be handcuffed and temporarily detained.²⁰

¹³ For a definition of COPA’s findings and standards of proof, see Appendix B.

¹⁴ *United States v. Rodriguez-Escalera*, 884 F.3d 661, 667-68 (7th Cir. 2018) (citing *Delaware v. Prouse*, 440 U.S. 648, 663 (1979)).

¹⁵ *United States v. Miranda-Sotolongo*, 827 F.3d 663, 666 (7th Cir. 2015) (quoting *United States v. Cortez*, 449 U.S. 411, 417 (1981)).

¹⁶ Att. 2 beginning at 2:02; Att. 19 at 00:10; see also Att. 22, pg. 15, ln. 15 to pg. 16, ln. 2.

¹⁷ Att. 31, pg. 16, lns. 7 to 22.

¹⁸ Att. 31, pg. 7, lns. 17 to 23, and pg. 16, lns. 7 to 22.

¹⁹ Att. 2 at 4:37.

²⁰ Att. 28, pg. 14, lns. 9 to 16.

The evidence shows that Officers Mangan and Hernandez had lawful justification to detain ██████ while they verified his identity. Therefore, this allegation is **exonerated** by clear and convincing evidence.

b. Searching ██████ vehicle without justification

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Hernandez searched ██████ vehicle without justification is not sustained. During a traffic stop, officers may conduct a protective sweep of the passenger compartment of a vehicle if they reasonably believe a person is “dangerous and could gain control of a weapon.”²¹ This type of search must be limited “to those areas to which [the person] would generally have immediate control, and that could contain a weapon.”²²

Here, Officers Hernandez and Mangan curbed ██████ vehicle due to the back taillight being out. The officers then requested that ██████ provide his driver’s license, which ██████ could not immediately produce and said was in the back seat of his vehicle.²³ Additionally, Officer Hernandez told COPA that he observed ██████ making furtive movements towards the center console of the vehicle, which made him suspicious that ██████ might be concealing a weapon.²⁴ Officer Hernandez further explained that he limited his search to a cursory search of the driver’s area of the vehicle, including the center console.²⁵

As discussed above, although ██████ movements inside his vehicle were not captured on video, he later acknowledged to Officer Hernandez that he had been searching for his wallet.²⁶ Additionally, ██████ told COPA that just before the officers approached his vehicle window, he looked for his wallet in the front seat area, where he normally kept it.²⁷ In hindsight, ██████ movements appear to be the innocent actions of a person trying to locate his driver’s license. At the time, however, Officer Hernandez had no way of knowing that. Officer Hernandez reasonably believed that ██████ movements were indicative of someone who might be concealing a firearm or contraband. Therefore, COPA finds that Officer Hernandez had justification to conduct a protective sweep of ██████ vehicle, and this allegation is **not sustained** by a preponderance of the evidence.²⁸

With respect to Officer Mangan, the BWC footage confirms that he did not participate in the search of ██████ vehicle. At the time of the search, Officer Mangan had escorted ██████ to

²¹ *People v. Colyar*, 2013 IL 111835, ¶ 39 (citing *Michigan v. Long*, 463 U.S. 1032, 1049-50 (1983)). This is the same requirement for specific and articulable facts officers need to perform a protective pat down during an investigatory stop. Thus, COPA finds the pat down of ██████ was permissible for the same reasons as the protective sweep of ██████ vehicle.

²² *Michigan v. Long*, 463 U.S. 1032, 1050 (1983).

²³ Att. 2 at 2:21 to 2:23.

²⁴ Att. 31, pg. 7, lns. 17 to 23, and pg. 11, lns. 15 to 20.

²⁵ Att. 31, pg. 10, ln. 18-24; Att. 3 at 2:46 to 3:38.

²⁶ Att. 2 at 4:37.

²⁷ Att. 22, pg. 4, ln. 18 to pg. 5, ln. 5.

²⁸ While the preponderance of the evidence shows that Officer Hernandez’s actions were justified, COPA lacks clear and convincing evidence to exonerate this allegation.

the CPD vehicle to verify ██████ identity. Officer Mangan told COPA that he did not search ██████ vehicle and did not witness his partner conducting the search.²⁹ For these reasons, COPA finds that this allegation against Officer Mangan is **unfounded** by clear and convincing evidence.

c. Failing to complete and/or issue an Investigatory Stop Receipt to ██████

COPA finds the allegation that Officers Hernandez and Mangan failed to complete and/or issue an Investigatory Stop Receipt to ██████ is sustained. CPD policy requires officers to complete an ISR following an investigatory stop, a probable cause stop for which no other document captures the reason for the detention, and a protective pat down or other search in a public place. Officers must document all of the factors supporting reasonable articulable suspicion to temporarily detain an individual for investigation, and, if applicable, to perform a protective pat down.³¹ Additionally, officers who conduct a probable cause stop must document all the factors supporting probable cause in the narrative portion of the ISR if “no other document captures the reason for the detention.”³² The policy further requires officers to provide the subject of the stop with an ISR receipt if the stop involved a protective pat down or any other search.³³

The evidence shows that the officers temporarily detained ██████ conducted a protective pat down of ██████ person and vehicle, and subsequently released ██████ without charges or citations. Thus, CPD policy required the officers to both complete an ISR and provide an ISR receipt to ██████ COPA’s search of the ISR database, however, revealed that no ISR was completed.³⁴ Further, ██████ told COPA that he did not receive a receipt or any other paperwork from the officers, which is confirmed by the BWC footage.³⁵

In their interviews with COPA, both officers admitted to these failures. Officer Hernandez acknowledged that he should have provided ██████ with an ISR receipt, and that he was also responsible for ensuring an ISR was completed.³⁶ In his statement at COPA, Officer Mangan relayed that his understanding at the time was that his partner would complete the ISR and receipt; however, they did not discuss it. Ultimately, Officer Mangan admitted, “We absolutely should have done an ISR...and given a receipt.”³⁷

For these reasons, COPA finds this allegation is **sustained** against Officers Hernandez and Mangan as a violation of Rule 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10.

²⁹ Att. 28, pg. 11, lns. 10 to 14 and pg. 13, lns. 1 to 14.

³⁰ This allegation pertains to both the completion of an ISR and the issuance of an ISR receipt to ██████ In retrospect, COPA recognizes the allegation is inartfully worded; however, the record shows that the officers were properly notified of the allegation and questioned about both issues, without objection from their attorney.

³¹ Att. 23, S04-13-09 (VIII)(A)(1), Investigatory Stop System (effective July 10, 2017, to present).

³² Att. 23, S04-13-09 (VIII)(A)(1).

³³ Att. 23, S04-13-09(V)(III)(3). The ISR receipt will include the event number, the reason for the stop, and the officer’s name and star number.

³⁴ Atts. 11, 12, 17, and 18.

³⁵ Att. 22, pg. 11, lns. 10 to 24.

³⁶ Att. 31, pg. 11, ln. 21 to pg. 12, ln. 20, and pg. 13, ln. 20 to pg. 14, ln. 3.

³⁷ Att. 28, pg. 12, lns. 13 to 24.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Officer Hernandez’s Complimentary and Disciplinary History³⁸

Officer Hernandez has been with CPD since July 15, 2013. In that time, he has received 100 various awards, including one Arnold Mireles Special Partnership Award, four Department Commendations, one Life Saving Award, two Unit Meritorious Performance Awards, and 79 Honorable Mentions. Officer Hernandez has two prior sustained complaints, which are summarized below:

- A 10-day suspension for engaging in an unauthorized vehicle pursuit, failing to inform dispatch of the pursuit, and failing to activate his BWC in a timely manner. (2021-0674.)
- A 2-day suspension for failing to comply with the City’s vaccination policy. (2021-4602.)

Additionally, Officer Hernandez has received two recent SPARs, for failing to perform assigned tasks in May 2025 (reprimand), and failing to timely activate his BWC in March 2025 (no disciplinary action).

b. Officer Mangan’s Complimentary and Disciplinary History³⁹

Officer Mangan has been with CPD since December 17, 2018. In that time, he has received 65 various awards, including two Department Commendations and 61 Honorable Mentions. Officer Mangan does not have any recent SPARs or sustained complaints in the past five years.

c. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officers Hernandez and Mangan violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10 when they failed to complete an ISR and failed to provide an ISR receipt to [REDACTED]. In mitigation, COPA notes that both officers admitted to these failures, acknowledged their misconduct, and accepted responsibility for their actions. Additionally, Officer Mangan has no prior disciplinary history. While Officer Hernandez does have two sustained complaints from 2021, those cases involved different types of misconduct than the present case. Therefore, COPA recommends that both Officers Hernandez and Mangan receive a **Reprimand** and **retraining** on ISR procedures (S04-13-09).

Approved:

[REDACTED]

Steffany Hreno
Acting Deputy Chief Administrator

12/30/2025

Date

³⁸ Att. 34
³⁹ Att. 35

Appendix A

Case Details

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Date/Time/Location of Incident: | April 27, 2025/ 8:55 pm/7230 S. Luella Ave., Chicago, IL 60649 |
| Date/Time of COPA Notification: | May 1, 2025/10:46 pm |
| Involved Member #1: | Daniel Mangan, Star # 9004, Employee ID # [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: December 17, 2018, Unit of Assignment: 008, Male, White |
| Involved Member #2: | Orlando Hernandez, Star#19839, Employee ID # [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: July 15, 2013, Unit of Assignment: 008, Male, White Hispanic |
| Involved Individual #1: | [REDACTED] Female, 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

- S04-13-09: Investigatory Stop System (July 10, 2017, 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.⁴⁰ 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.”⁴¹

⁴⁰ 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).

⁴¹ *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