



Brandon Johnson
Mayor

Department of Police · City of Chicago
3510 S. Michigan Avenue · Chicago, Illinois 60653

Larry B. Snelling
Superintendent

October 2, 2024

Andrea Kersten
Chief Administrator
Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA)
1615 West Chicago Avenue, 4th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60622

Re: Superintendent's Partial Non-Concurrence with Findings and
Superintendent's Concurrence with Penalty Recommendations
Complaint Log No. 2023-0005710
Officer Gerardo Silva, Star No. 19281
Officer Jordan Coil, Star No. 17440

Dear Chief Administrator Kersten:

After a careful review of the above referenced complaint log number investigation, the Chicago Police Department (Department) does not concur with one of the recommended sustained finding but does concur with the penalty recommendations as they pertain to Officer Gerardo Silva, Star No. 19281, and to Officer Jordan Coil, Star No. 17440. Pursuant to the Municipal Code of Chicago, the Department provides the following comments.

The COPA investigation recommended a penalty of a suspension of up to 30-days as well as retraining on Fourth Amendment principles as applied to investigatory stops and searches for both Officer Gerardo Silva, Star No. 19281, and Officer Jordan Coil, Star No. 17440 after concluding that they both:

1. Detained [REDACTED] without justification;
2. Handcuffed [REDACTED] without justification;
3. Conducted a patdown of [REDACTED] without justification;
4. Failed to deescalate the encounter with [REDACTED] without justification.

The Department does concur with the sustained findings for Allegation #1, #2 and #3. But the Department does not concur with the sustained finding for Allegation #4 and recommends a finding of Unfounded. COPA's statement that, "The officers simply treated [REDACTED] entirely lawful decision not to speak with them as suspicious, approached [REDACTED] almost immediately grabbed him, handcuffed him, and then conducted a pat-down search" is not evidence that the officers failed to utilize de-escalation techniques. In most instances, an officer may determine a person's actions are suspicious, which may result in grabbing and handcuffing a person to conduct a protective pat-down. None of this is relevant to a determination that de-escalation techniques were not used. During the entire interaction with Mr. [REDACTED] both officers remained calm, professional, and offered to explain the reason for their actions.

Emergency and TTY: 9-1-1 · Non Emergency and TTY: (within city limits) 3-1-1 · Non Emergency and TTY: (outside city limits) (312) 746-6000

E-mail: police@cityofchicago.org · Website: www.cityofchicago.org/police

The entire interaction lasted just over three and a half minutes and Mr. [REDACTED] was provided an ISR receipt to document the stop. The allegation that the officers failed to utilize de-escalation techniques is false. The officers treated Mr. [REDACTED] with courtesy and dignity from the beginning of the interaction to the end and used minimal force at all times.

The Department believes that the violations that occurred were due to large part to the inexperience of the two officers. The seniority of both officers was less than three years at the time of the incident. The Department agrees that both members would benefit greatly from additional training on the 4th Amendment and the Investigatory Stop System and this training will be provided to both members. The penalty recommendation for both accused members is a suspension up to 30 days. As such, and consistent with the penalty recommendation, a 1-day suspension will be implemented for both members.

The Department looks forward to discussing this matter with you pursuant to MCC 2-78-130(a)(iii).

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Larry B. Snelling
Superintendent
Chicago Police Department