



Log # 2021-0003826

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On September 26, 2021, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received an Initiation Report from Sergeant Raul Alvarez reporting alleged misconduct by a member of the Chicago Police Department (CPD).² ██████████ alleged that Officer Cornelius Davis contacted him on multiple occasions threatening to disclose ██████████ sexuality and the nature of their relationship to ██████████ friends and family.³ Upon review of the evidence, COPA served additional allegations that Officer Davis punched ██████████ and continued to contact ██████████ after ██████████ instructed him to cease all contact. Following its investigation, COPA reached a **Sustained** finding regarding the allegation of contacting ██████████ on multiple occasions, threatening to disclose his sexuality and nature of their relationship to friends and family. COPA reached a finding of **Not Sustained** for the remaining allegations.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE⁴

██████████ and Officer Cornelius Davis met on LinkedIn in late 2019.⁵ Their relationship quickly transitioned from friendship to a sexual relationship after meeting online.⁶ Both ██████████ and Officer Davis reported to COPA that their relationship became complicated and fraught as it progressed. On September 26, 2021 at approximately 1:30 pm, ██████████ contacted CPD and alleged that Officer Davis repeatedly contacted him throughout the month of August, 2021.⁷ According to ██████████ Officer Davis called him approximately 18 to 19 times and texted him eight to nine times between August 5, 2021 to August 24, 2021.⁸ ██████████ reported to CPD that he instructed Officer Davis to stop contacting him; however, Officer Davis continued to text and call.⁹ ██████████ also alleged that Officer Davis attempted to anonymize his calls by hiding

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 Sergeant Alvarez resigned from CPD on December 12, 2022.

³ 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.

⁴ The following is a summary of what COPA finds most likely occurred during this incident. This summary utilized information from several different sources, including CPD Reports, Involved Party Statements, and Involved Party Text Conversations with each other and family and friends.

⁵ Att. 9, pg. 30, lns. 12 to 19; and Att. 29, pg. 7, ln. 15 to pg. 8, ln. 3.

⁶ Att. 9, pg. 30, ln. 20 to pg. 32, ln. 10; and Att. 29, pg. 7, ln. 21 to pg. 8, ln. 17.

⁷ Att. 6, pg. 2.

⁸ Att. 6, pg. 2.

⁹ Att. 6, pg. 2 and Att. 9, pg. 74, lns. 13 to 23.

his phone number from caller ID, yet ██████████ recognized Officer Davis' voice.¹⁰ That said, in his statement to COPA, Officer Davis claimed that he also instructed ██████████ to stop contacting him; yet, ██████████ did not respect his instruction.¹¹ Therefore, both men claimed that the other violated boundaries each set on their channels of communication. In addition, ██████████ claimed that Officer Davis, on numerous occasions, contacted his friends and family with the intention to disclose his same-sex, sexual activity as well as the details of his and Office Davis' intimate relationship.¹² Officer Davis discussed these matters with ██████████ mother-in-law, as well as ██████████ friends.¹³

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer Cornelius Davis:

1. The accused contacted and/or threatened to contact ██████████ friends and family members to inform them that ██████████ was bisexual and/or he was sexually involved with ██████████
 - **Sustained**, in Violation of CPD Rules 2, 3, 8, and 9.
2. In the summer of 2021, in the vicinity of Hyde Park, Chicago, IL vicinity, the accused punched ██████████ about the body.
 - **Not Sustained**
3. Between August 5, 2021, through August 24, 2021, the accused repeatedly contacted ██████████ and ██████████ via telephone and text, after ██████████ instructed him not to do so.
 - **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 perceive the event at the time of the incident and then accurately recall the event from memory. The investigation did not reveal evidence that caused COPA to question the credibility of any of the involved individuals. Although Officer Davis engaged in behavior that violated ██████████ boundaries, he did admit to contacting ██████████ family and friends to discuss their relationship and ██████████ sexuality.

¹⁰ Att. 6, pg. 2.

¹¹ Att. 29, pg. 69, lns. 16 to 23 and Att. 11, pg. 5.

¹² Att.29, pg. 17, ln. 22 to pg. 18, ln. 10; and Att. 29 pg. 27, ln. 20 to pg. 29, ln. 9.

¹³ Atts. 11, 34, and 35.

V. ANALYSIS¹⁴

a. Threatened to Disclose Sexuality and Nature of Relationship

COPA finds that **Allegation #1** against Officer Davis, that he contacted and/or threatened to contact ██████████ friends and family members to inform them that ██████████ was bisexual and/or he was sexually involved with ██████████ is **Sustained**. Officer Davis admitted to contacting ██████████ family and friends with the explicit intent to discuss the nature of their relationship as well as ██████████ sexuality.¹⁵ However, Officer Davis denied that his intention to speak to ██████████ friends and family was vindictive.¹⁶ Rather, Officer Davis rationalized his actions as an opportunity to be honest.¹⁷ That said, Officer Davis undeniably contacted ██████████ family and friends without ██████████ consent, and he discussed intimate and private details of ██████████ life.¹⁸ Therefore, based on the available evidence, COPA has determined that **Allegation #1** is **Sustained**.

b. Punched Complainant

COPA finds that **Allegation #2** against Officer Davis, in the summer of 2021, in the vicinity of Hyde Park, Chicago, IL vicinity, the accused punched ██████████ about the body, is **Not Sustained**. COPA believes both Officer Davis and ██████████ provided statements that were truthful and reflective of their experiences. However, their accounts diverged on significant details of their relationship. For instance, ██████████ recalled an incident in the vicinity of Hyde Park when Officer Davis punched ██████████¹⁹ Whereas, Officer Davis claimed that he did not recall punching ██████████²⁰ COPA was unable to locate evidence that supported either ██████████ or Officer Davis' accounts. Therefore, COPA has determined that **Allegation #2** is **Not Sustained**.

c. Repeatedly Contacted Complainant after Complainant Instructed to Stop

COPA finds that **Allegation #3** against Officer Davis, Between August 5, 2021, through August 24, 2021, the accused repeatedly contacted ██████████ and ██████████ via telephone and text, after ██████████ instructed him not to do so, is **Not Sustained**. Again, COPA believes both Officer Davis and ██████████ provided statements that were truthful and reflective of their experiences. However, as stated in the previous section of the Analysis, their accounts diverged significantly. Both ██████████ and Officer Davis claimed that they instructed the other to cease contact with the other.²¹ Officer Davis provided a text message exchange that supported his

¹⁴ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, *see* Appendix B.

¹⁵ Att. 29, pg. 17, ln. 22 to pg. 18, ln. 10.

¹⁶ Att. 29, pg. 21, ln. 16 to pg. 22, ln. 7.

¹⁷ Att. 29, pg. 34, lns. 3 to 12.

¹⁸ Atts. 26, 32, 34, and 35.

¹⁹ Att. 9, pg. 55, ln. 17 to pg. 56, ln. 8.

²⁰ Att. 29, pg. 70, ln. 15 to pg.

²¹ Att. 6, pg. 2; Att. 9, pg. 74, lns. 13 to 23; Att. 29, pg. 69, lns. 16 to 23; and Att. 11, pg. 5.

claim.²² However, COPA did not locate evidence that corroborated [REDACTED] account. Therefore, COPA has determined that **Allegation #3** is **Not Sustained**.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Officer Cornelius Davis

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History²³

Officer Dais has received 1 crime reduction award, 3 departmental commendations and 35 honorable mentions over the course of his 12-year career with the Department. Within the last 5 years, Officer Davis had a sustained finding of operating personnel violation insubordination with a 1-day suspension.

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has considered Officer Davis’ complimentary and disciplinary histories. COPA has also considered the sustained allegations against Officer Davis and the totality of the circumstances surrounding the multiple incidents. As previously mentioned, Officer Davis was less than forthcoming about his actions and did not take accountability for his actions. COPA has considered the harassing nature of his contact with family and friends of the complainant. This conduct is not in line with Department policies and undermines trust in the Department. COPA recommends a suspension of up to 30 days.

Approved:

[REDACTED]

Sharday Jackson
Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator

July 25, 2024

Date

²² Att. 11, pg. 5.

²³ Attachment __.

Appendix ACase Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	Numerous dates/times (reported to CPD on September 26, 2021) / Chicago & Milwaukee, WI
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	September 27, 2021
Involved Member #1:	Cornelius Davis, star #: 16503, employee #: [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: November 30, 2012, Unit of Assignment: 124, Male, Black
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.
- Rule 14:** Making a false report, written or oral.
- Rule 38:** Unlawful or unnecessary use or display of a weapon.
- Rule __:** *[Insert text of any additional rule(s) violated]*

Applicable Policies and Laws

- N/A

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.²⁴ 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.”²⁵

²⁴ 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).

²⁵ *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