



Log # 2024-0006444

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On August 2, 2024, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received a web complaint from ██████████ reporting alleged misconduct by a member of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). ██████████ alleged that on July 26, 2024, Officer Larrick West forcefully took him to the ground and detained him without justification.²

Upon review of the evidence, COPA served additional allegations that Officer West failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) documenting his encounter with ██████████ failed to provide ██████████ with an Investigatory Stop Receipt, untimely activated his Body Worn Camera (BWC), and failed to properly document the force used on ██████████ in a Tactical Response Report (TRR). In addition, COPA served allegations on Officers David Morales, Adan Pedroza, Jr., Alexander David, and Michael Spilotro III³ for failing to complete an ISR and for not providing ██████████ with an Investigatory Stop Receipt.

Following its investigation, COPA reached sustained findings against the officers regarding their failure to complete an ISR and provide ██████████ with an Investigatory Stop Receipt. Additionally, with respect to Officer West, COPA exonerated the detention and TRR allegations, unfounded the use of force allegation, and found the BWC allegation to be not sustained.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE⁴

On July 26, 2024, at approximately 12:00 am, Officers David and Pedroza were traveling southbound on North Laramie, heading to the police station. Officer David noticed ██████████ riding

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 When COPA attempted to interview Officer Spilotro, it learned that he was on the medical roll due to an injury he sustained on duty. Subsequently, in January 2026, the Superintendent of CPD filed charges with the Chicago Police Board seeking Officer Spilotro's separation related to a fatal motor vehicle pursuit that occurred in 2023. See <https://www.chicago.gov/content/dam/city/depts/cpb/PoliceDiscipline/26PB3054Charges.pdf>. As a result, COPA was unable to obtain an interview from Officer Spilotro within the 18-month timeframe set forth in the relevant collective bargaining agreement. Therefore, COPA has elected to administratively close the allegations against Officer Spilotro. In the event that Officer Spilotro returns to active duty, COPA may consider re-opening this case to interview him and reach findings regarding the allegations against him.

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 BWC footage, an interview of ██████████ and officer interviews.

his bike on the sidewalk.⁵ Officer David attempted to engage ██████ regarding the violation from the driver's side of his CPD vehicle, but ██████ continued riding his bicycle, ultimately entering the intersection of Lake and Laramie, where he hit the rear of a civilian vehicle traveling northbound. Officers Spilotro, Morales, and West were driving behind Officers David and Pedroza when the incident occurred. Seeing ██████ enter the intersection after ignoring Officer David, Officer West exited his CPD vehicle and attempted to stop ██████

When ██████ collided with the civilian vehicle, he fell from his bike, and the bike flew in Officer West's direction, causing Officer West to trip and fall to the ground.⁶ As Officer West quickly rose to his feet, ██████ began to walk away from the scene of the crash, leaving his bike behind. Officer West was able to place ██████ in handcuffs, and the officers began their investigation.

Officer Morales told COPA that, to his understanding, the officers who initiate the stop are usually the ones who complete the necessary paperwork for "their investigatory stop." Officer David told COPA that the ISR is the responsibility of the officer conducting the stop and stated that he was the one who likely initiated the stop.⁷

Officer West⁸ stated to COPA that Officers David and Pedroza were driving in front of Officer West's vehicle, and those officers attempted to stop ██████⁹ who was riding his bike on the sidewalk. Officer West indicated that he initially tried to block ██████ path, but he was unsuccessful. As ██████ continued on his bike, Officer West explained, "I think he got hit by a car. And I - I went after of him and I think I - I fell and - and when I got up, I think I grabbed him and - - and we went back to the sidewalk."¹⁰ Officer West further explained that he fell over ██████ bike.¹¹ Officer West eventually detained ██████ and conducted a name check. ██████ was informed of the reason for the stop and that riding on the sidewalk violated a City ordinance. According to Officer West, Officers David and Pedroza agreed to complete the ISR.¹²

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer Larrick West:

1. Detaining ██████ without justification.
 - Exonerated.

2. Forcefully taking ██████ to the ground without justification.
 - Unfounded.

⁵ Att. 7 at 1:23.

⁶ Att. 6 at 1:50.

⁷ Att. 44, pg. 11, lns. 6 to 11.

⁸ Att. 45.

⁹ Att. 45, pg. 10, lns. 8 to 12.

¹⁰ Att. 45, pg. 7, lns. 15 to 18.

¹¹ Att. 45, pg. 11, ln. 10.

¹² Att. 45, pg. 15, lns. 17 - 19.

3. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report documenting the interaction with [REDACTED]
 - Sustained, Violation of rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10.
4. Failing to provide [REDACTED] with an Investigatory Stop Receipt.
 - Sustained, Violation of rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10.
5. Untimely activating his Body Worn Camera, without justification.
 - Not Sustained.
6. Failing to properly document the force used on [REDACTED] in a Tactical Response Report.
 - Exonerated.

Officers David Morales, Adan Pedroza, and Alexander David:

1. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report documenting the interaction with [REDACTED]
 - Sustained, Violation of rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10.
2. Failing to provide [REDACTED] with an Investigatory Stop Receipt.
 - Sustained, Violation of rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 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. In this case, [REDACTED] was inconsistent in his version of the events. In his web complaint, [REDACTED] stated that he was tackled by Officer West, but in his statement to COPA, he was not sure if he was tackled or pushed by Officer West.¹³ Additionally, during the incident, BWC captured [REDACTED] stating that he fell when he crashed into the rear of a vehicle.¹⁴ He never mentioned being tackled, nor did he mention being pushed. [REDACTED] also told COPA that Officer West grabbed him by the neck and said that he would "slam" him to the ground. BWC evidence refutes this. As a result of these inaccurate statements, COPA finds [REDACTED] account was not credible.

Officer West stayed consistent with his version of the event. In his statement to COPA, he said that after [REDACTED] crashed into the oncoming vehicle, [REDACTED] bike flung in his direction, causing Officer West to trip and fall.¹⁵ Officers David, Pedroza, and Morales also remained

¹³ Att. 1, pg. 3 of 7; Att. 2 at 5:50.

¹⁴ Att. 6 at 6:36 to 6:55.

¹⁵ Att. 45, pg. 11, lns. 16 to 17.

consistent in their accounts of the incident. Officers David and Pedroza both stated they were trying to get ██████ attention because he was riding his bike on the sidewalk. BWC footage shows the officers explaining this to ██████¹⁶ Additionally, the BWC footage is consistent with Officer Morales' statement that he assisted with ██████ detention after Officers David and Pedroza initiated the stop. As such, COPA lacks any reason to doubt the credibility of these officers.

V. ANALYSIS¹⁷

a. Detention of ██████

COPA finds the allegation that Officer West detained ██████ without justification is exonerated. The BWC footage clearly captured ██████ riding his bike on the sidewalk in violation of a City ordinance.¹⁸ ██████ then rode into oncoming traffic before crashing into the rear of a civilian vehicle that was traveling northbound.¹⁹ ██████ abandoned his bike after the crash and began walking away from officers.²⁰ Officer West, who did not initiate the stop, exited his CPD vehicle to assist in the detainment of ██████ Under the totality of these circumstances, COPA finds there is clear and convincing evidence that Officer West's participation in the stop was lawful and proper. As such, COPA finds this allegation against Officer West is **exonerated**.

b. Failure to Complete an Investigative Stop Report (ISR) and Provide an ISR Receipt

COPA finds the allegation that Officers West, Morales, David, and Pedroza failed to complete an ISR documenting the interaction with ██████ is sustained. Special Order S04-13-09 requires sworn members who conduct an investigatory stop to complete an ISR. The order further states that sworn members who conduct an investigatory stop, a probable-cause stop when no other document captures the reason for the detention, and, if applicable, a protective pat-down or other search in a public place are required to submit an ISR to the investigatory stop database.²¹

Here, it is undisputed that none of the officers completed an ISR. Officer West asserted that the uniformed officers (Officers David and Pedroza) agreed to do the ISR because it was their stop. Officer Morales told COPA that, to his understanding, the officers who initiate a stop are usually the ones who complete the necessary paperwork for "their" investigatory stop. Officer David told COPA that the ISR is the responsibility of the officer conducting the stop and stated that he was the one who first engaged with ██████²² Officer David's reason for not completing the ISR was that multiple officers were on scene, and he was not the last person who spoke with

¹⁶ Att. 7 at 2:21.

¹⁷ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, *see* Appendix B.

¹⁸ Att. 7 at 1:32; *see* Chicago Municipal Code § 9-52-020.

¹⁹ Att. 6 at 1:50.

²⁰ Att. 6 at 1:58.

²¹ Att. 46, S04-13-09 (VIII)(A)(1), Investigatory Stop System (effective July 10, 2017 to present).

²² Att. 44, pg. 11, lns. 6 to 11.

██████████ Officer Pedroza, however, stated that no officer completed an ISR because of miscommunication about who would do it. When asked why he did not complete the ISR, Officer Pedroza stated that because he did not physically grab ██████████ or run his name, it was not his responsibility to complete the ISR.²³

The evidence shows that Officers David and Pedroza initiated the stop, and Officers West and Morales assisted by conducting a protective pat-down of ██████████. Because all of the officers were involved in the stop, each officer was responsible for completing the ISR. Accordingly, COPA finds this allegation against Officers West, Morales, David, and Pedroza is **sustained** by a preponderance of the evidence.

COPA finds the allegation that Officers West, Morales, David, and Pedroza failed to provide ██████████ with an Investigatory Stop Receipt against is also sustained. Special Order S04-13-09 requires that, upon the completion of an investigatory stop that involves a protective pat-down or any other search, sworn members are required to provide the subject of the stop with a completed investigatory stop receipt.²⁴

Here, Officers West, Morales, David, and Pedroza admitted that they failed to provide ██████████ with an investigatory stop receipt. Furthermore, Officer David was captured on BWC asking Officer Pedroza about giving ██████████ a receipt.²⁵ Based on these admissions, as well as ██████████ statement and the BWC footage, COPA finds this allegation is **sustained**.

c. Untimely BWC Activation

COPA finds the allegation that Officer West untimely activated his BWC is not sustained. Special Order S03-14 requires CPD members to activate their BWCs to event mode at the beginning of an incident.²⁶ If exigent circumstances prevent activating the BWC at the beginning of an incident, the member will activate their BWC as soon as practical.

Here, Officer West activated his BWC when it was practical to do so. Officer West told COPA that he was a passenger in the CPD vehicle that was trailing another CPD vehicle back to the station. He said he was “in [his] own world” and not really paying attention until he saw ██████████ enter oncoming traffic on his bicycle. When Officer West exited the CPD vehicle to stop ██████████ it was too late, as ██████████ had crashed into the rear of a civilian vehicle, and his bike flung into Officer West, causing him to trip and fall.²⁷ Once Officer West was able to collect himself from the fall, he activated his BWC and ultimately detained ██████████. During his COPA statement, Officer West was able to articulate why his BWC activation was delayed, and he credibly asserted that he activated his camera as soon as it was safe and feasible. Therefore, based on the totality of

²³ Att. 43, pg. 11, lns. 11 to 22.

²⁴ Att. 46, S04-13-09 (VIII)(A)(3).

²⁵ Att. 7 at 8:19.

²⁶ Att. 51, S03-14 (V)(A)(2), Body Worn Cameras (effective December 29, 2023 to August 8, 2024).

²⁷ Att. 45, pg. 9, lns. 1 to 21.

the circumstances, COPA finds this allegation is **not sustained** by a preponderance of the evidence.

d. Failure to Complete a Tactical Response Report

COPA finds the allegation that Officer West failed to properly document the force used on ██████ in a TRR is exonerated. General Order G03-02-02 requires CPD members to complete a TRR documenting all reportable uses of force, including uses of force involving a person who is injured or alleges injury resulting from the CPD member's use of force.²⁸

Here, ██████ did not allege injury from an officer's use of force until he contacted COPA. In his web complaint, ██████ reported that Officer West tackled him into a moving vehicle. In his statement with COPA, ██████ stated he was not sure if he was pushed or tackled into the vehicle, but he did crash into the back of the vehicle. ██████ further told COPA that Officer West grabbed him by the neck and threatened to "slam" him. BWC footage refutes these claims. The footage shows that ██████ bike had struck the civilian vehicle and was already falling to the ground at the time that Officer West reached ██████²⁹ Further, ██████ admitted to COPA that his bike lacked brakes, which is why he left the sidewalk and entered the street to avoid hitting the CPD vehicle. In his statement to COPA, Officer West articulated that he did not push or tackle ██████ but rather tripped over ██████ fallen bike after ██████ crashed into the civilian vehicle. Officer West's statement is consistent with the available evidence. Because no reportable use of force occurred that would have required the completion of a TRR, this allegation is **exonerated** by clear and convincing evidence.

e. Excessive Force

COPA finds the allegation that Officer West forcefully took ██████ to the ground without justification is unfounded. As detailed earlier in this report, the evidence shows that ██████ crashed into an oncoming vehicle and was not pushed or tackled by Officer West. At no point did ██████ accuse Officer West of pushing/tackling him at the scene of the incident. In fact, when confronted about crashing into the civilian vehicle, ██████ did not assert that he was pushed or tackled. Instead, ██████ was captured on BWC stating that he fell after crashing into the vehicle.³⁰ ██████ also admitted on scene that he was on the phone and smoking cannabis when the officers attempted to stop him. He further stated that his bike did not have working brakes and, therefore, he could not prevent himself from crashing.³¹ As such, COPA finds this allegation is **unfounded** by clear and convincing evidence, as Officer West did not conduct a takedown of ██████

²⁸ Att. 52, G03-02-02 (III)(A)(1)(a), Incidents Requiring the Completion of a Tactical Response Report (effective June 28, 2023 to present).

²⁹ Att. 6 at 1:50.

³⁰ Att. 6 at 6:36 to 6:55.

³¹ Att. 6 at 6:48.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Complimentary and Disciplinary Histories

i. Officer Larrick West³²

Officer West has been employed by CPD since June 25, 2018. He has received 29 awards, including one Life Saving Award, six Department Commendation Awards, and 19 Honorable Mention Certificates.

Officer West has one prior sustained complaint for failing to timely activate his BWC, which resulted in a 1-day suspension (Log 2023-0002235). Additionally, Officer West has received two recent SPARs: one court appearance violation in January 2026 (Reprimand), and one violation for indebtedness to the city in September 2025 (1 day off).

ii. Officer David Morales³³

Officer Morales has been employed by CPD since August 16, 2019. He has received 49 awards, including one Top Gun Arrest Award, one Department Commendation Award, and 45 Honorable Mention Certificates.

Officer Morales has two prior sustained complaints. He received a Reprimand for failing to provide police service (Log 2021-0003808), and a Reprimand for failing to report his involvement in a minor traffic crash (Log 2022-0000222). Additionally, Officer Morales has received one recent SPAR for a preventable accident in March 2024 (Reprimand).

iii. Officer Adan Pedroza³⁴

Officer Pedroza has been employed by CPD since December 17, 2018. He has received 159 awards, including six Department Commendation Awards, two Life Saving Awards, two Top Gun Arrest Awards, one Police Officer of the Month Award, one Superintendent's Honorable Mention Certificate, and 142 Honorable Mention Certificates.

Officer Pedroza has no prior sustained complaints. He has received the following four recent SPARs: failing to have current IL license plates and/or City vehicle sticker in November 2025 (Reprimand), inattention to duty in August 2025 (1 Day off), being absent/leaving duty assignment in July 2025 (No Disciplinary Action), and a preventable accident in June 2025 (Reprimand).

³² Att. 49.

³³ Att. 50.

³⁴ Att. 48.

iv. Officer Alexander David ³⁵

Officer David has been employed by CPD since August 16, 2019. He has received 109 awards, including two Department Commendation Awards, two Life Saving Awards, two Top Gun Arrest Awards, one Police Officer of the Month Award, one Superintendent’s Honorable Mention Certificate, and 96 Honorable Mention Certificates.

Officer David has no prior sustained complaints. He has received the following three recent SPARs: inattention to duty in August 2025 (1 Day off), failing to perform assigned tasks in July 2025 (No Disciplinary Action), and a court appearance violation in March 2025 (No Disciplinary Action).

b. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officers West, Morales, Pedroza, and David violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10 when they failed to complete an ISR and failed to provide ██████ an ISR receipt. In mitigation, these violations appear to have arisen from a series of miscommunications and/or assumptions about which officer was responsible for completing the reports. Additionally, COPA recognizes that the officers communicated with ██████ in a manner that was respectful and de-escalated the situation. Further, none of the officers have any relevant prior discipline, and Officers Pedroza and David in particular have exemplary complimentary histories. For these reasons, COPA recommends that Officers West, Morales, Pedroza, and David each receive a **Reprimand** and **retraining** regarding CPD’s ISR and ISR receipt policy (S04-13-09).

Approved:

████████████████████

Steffany Hreno
Acting Deputy Chief Administrator

2/2/2026

Date

³⁵ Att. 47.

Appendix ACase Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	July 26, 2024 / 00:00 / 200 N. Laramie Ave.
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	August 2, 2024 / 4:21 pm
Involved Member #1:	Larrick West, Star# 17947, Employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment (DOA): June 25, 2018, Unit 008, Male, Black
Involved Member #2:	David Morales, Star# 16486, Employee ID# [REDACTED] DOA: August 16, 2019, Unit 025, Male, Hispanic
Involved Member #3:	Adan Pedroza, Jr., Star# 9584, Employee ID# [REDACTED] DOA: December 17, 2018, Unit 011, Male, Hispanic
Involved Member #4:	Alexander David, Star# 16271, Employee ID# [REDACTED] DOA: August 16, 2019, Unit 011, Male, Hispanic
Involved Member #5:	Michael Spilotro, III, Star# 17487, Employee ID# [REDACTED] DOA: August 16, 2019
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] Male, Hispanic

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.

Applicable Policies and Laws

- General Order G03-02-02, Incidents Requiring the Completion of a Tactical Response Report (effective June 28, 2023 to present).
- Special Order S03-14, Body Worn Cameras (effective December 29, 2023 to August 8, 2024).
- Special Order S04-13-09, Investigatory Stop System (effective 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.³⁶ 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.”³⁷

³⁶ 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).

³⁷ *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