



Log # 2024-0007622

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On October 8, 2024, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received a telephone complaint from ██████████ reporting alleged misconduct by a member of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). ██████████ alleged that on October 7, 2024, Officer Lucas Michaels searched the vehicle he was driving without justification,² and he handcuffed³ him without justification.⁴ Following its investigation, COPA reached a sustained finding for the handcuffing allegation and a not sustained finding regarding the searching allegation.⁵

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE⁶

Officer Michaels and his partner performed a traffic stop on the vehicle ██████████ was driving.⁷ They observed the vehicle without a front license plate attached, and the rear registration sticker was expired.⁸ ██████████ admitted that there was no front license plate on the vehicle.⁹ Officer Michaels exited his squad vehicle and ██████████ immediately exited the vehicle he was driving.¹⁰ ██████████ threw his keys and phone down to the ground as we walked over to Officer Michaels.¹¹ Officer Michaels asked ██████████ for his driver's license and informed him of the two reasons for the traffic stop.¹² Officer Michaels asked ██████████ for his driver's license again and ██████████ replied that he did not have one and subsequently provided Officer Michaels with an identification card.¹³ Officer Michaels went back to his squad vehicle to run ██████████

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 Att. 19, pg.7, lns. 13 – 21.

³ Att. 19, pg. 7, lns. 7 – 9.

⁴ 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.

⁵ ██████████ also noted during his interview that he told the officers that his handcuffs were too tight, but he later added that one of the officers asked him if he wanted the handcuffs loosened and ██████████ told him no. Att. 19, pg. 7, lns. 22 – 24; pg. 8, lns. 1 – 12; pg. 19, lns. 17 – 18.

⁶ 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, civilian interviews, and officer interviews.

⁷ Att. 18, pg. 7, lns. 16 – 17.

⁸ Att. 18, pg. 7, lns. 22 – 24.

⁹ Att. 19, pg. 17, lns. 5 – 13.

¹⁰ Att. 1 at 2:00 to 2:06.

¹¹ Att. 1 at 2:09 to 2:12.

¹² Att. 1 at 2:10 to 2:24.

¹³ Att. 1 at 2:27 to 2:50.

identification through the PDT system.¹⁴ After checking [REDACTED] information, Officer Michael exited the squad vehicle and placed [REDACTED] into handcuffs.¹⁵ Officer Michaels told [REDACTED] he had a suspended driver's license and asked him why he got out of the vehicle; he also told [REDACTED] that the way he got of the vehicle made him think that [REDACTED] was armed and dangerous.¹⁶

Officer Michaels asked [REDACTED] if he could search the vehicle and [REDACTED] told Officer Michaels that he does not have anything, and his background is clean; [REDACTED] also informed Officer Michaels that he has a gun card in his wallet but that he does not carry the gun.¹⁷ Officer Michaels asked [REDACTED] if he has any weapons on himself or in the vehicle; [REDACTED] told Officer Michaels that he does not have anything.¹⁸ Officer Michaels asked [REDACTED] again if he could search the vehicle, and [REDACTED] told him no because the vehicle belongs to someone else.¹⁹ Officer Michaels opened the door to the vehicle and he started searching the vehicle, while his partner maintained control of [REDACTED].²⁰ Officer Michaels provided [REDACTED] with a receipt for the stop.²¹

Officer Michaels was interviewed by COPA on February 26, 2025.²² According to Officer Michaels, he observed [REDACTED] immediately exit the vehicle and drop items out of his hands.²³ As Officer Michaels approached [REDACTED] he looked back and forth and appeared to be nervous, which made Officer Michaels believe he could be armed and dangerous.²⁴ Officer Michaels also mentioned that the stop occurred in a known high-crime area.²⁵ Officer Michaels stated that through his training and experience [REDACTED] immediately actions of exiting the vehicle and looking back and forth made him think [REDACTED] was looking for a route to escape.²⁶ For all the above reasons, Officer Michaels eventually detained [REDACTED] in handcuffs believing him to be armed and dangerous.²⁷ Officer Michaels also stated that he was going to search the vehicle and it would be safer for him to do so when [REDACTED] was handcuffed.²⁸ Officer Michaels searched the vehicle [REDACTED] was driving for weapons.²⁹ Officer Michaels searched the vehicle because through his training and experience, individuals who immediately exited the vehicle and exhibit

¹⁴ Att. 1 at 3:03 to 3:52.

¹⁵ Att. 1 at 5:40 to 6:11.

¹⁶ Att. 1 at 6:16 to 6:23.

¹⁷ Att. 1 at 6:24 to 6:37.

¹⁸ Att. 1 at 6:36 to 6:39.

¹⁹ Att. 1 at 6:39 to 6:44.

²⁰ Att. 1 at 6:50 to 10:20.

²¹ Att. 1 at 10:20 to 12:05.

²² Atts. 17 and 18.

²³ Att. 18, pg. 8, lns. 7 – 9.

²⁴ Att. 18, pg. 8, lns. 9 – 12.

²⁵ Att. 18, pg. 8, lns. 12 – 14.

²⁶ Att. 18, pg. 8, lns. 23 – 24; pg. 9, lns. 1 – 3.

²⁷ Att. 18, pg. 9, lns. 3 – 6.

²⁸ Att. 18, pg. 14, lns. 13 – 19.

²⁹ Att. 18, pg. 16, lns. 1 – 3.

similar behaviors as ██████ did try to direct the officer's attention away from the vehicle and what may be inside the vehicle.³⁰

Officer Chaarawi was also interviewed by COPA.³¹ According to Officer Chaarawi, ██████ was handcuffed because of the way he was acting in terms of getting out of the vehicle.³² He also seemed nervous, he dropped his phone and keys to the ground, which Officer Chaarawi considered abnormal.³³ Officer Chaarawi felt ██████ actions was an attempt to lead the officers away from the car.³⁴ ██████ also brought up that nothing was in the car even though the officers has not asked him that question yet.³⁵ Officer Chaarawi also stated ██████ was uncooperative and when he asked him to step back he responded, no, he was just going to sit right here.³⁶

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer Lucas Michaels:

1. Handcuffed ██████ without justification.
 - Sustained, Violation of Rules 2, 3, and 8
2. Searched the vehicle ██████ was driving, without justification.
 - 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 recall the event from memory. Here, Officer Michaels admitted to his actions and provided reasons for why he took those actions. Officer Chaarawi also provided similar reasons for the actions taken in this situation. COPA does not find any untruthfulness in their answers, nor does COPA doubt the credibility of ██████ COPA finds that all parties were being truthful when providing their respective statements.

³⁰ Att. 18, pg. 11, lns. 1 – 21.

³¹ Att. 20.

³² Att. 21, pg. 9, lns. 1 – 3.

³³ Att. 21, pg. 9, lns. 3 – 5.

³⁴ Att. 21, pg. 9, lns. 6 – 8.

³⁵ Att. 21, pg. 9, lns. 14 – 17.

³⁶ Att. 21, pg. 11, lns. 15 -17.

V. ANALYSIS³⁷

COPA finds the allegation of handcuffing ██████ without justification, **Sustained**. Illinois courts have recognized that there are situations in which concerns for the safety of the police officer, or the public justify handcuffing the detainee for the brief duration of an investigatory stop.³⁸ The critical question is whether the use of such restraints is reasonably necessary for safety under the specific facts of the case.³⁹ Here, Officer Michaels performed a traffic stop on the vehicle ██████ was driving and before the officers could direct ██████ out of the vehicle, he exited the vehicle on his own. As he exited the vehicle, he dropped his phone and keys to the ground. Officer Michaels asked ██████ for his driver's license, which he was not able to provide but he provided an identification card instead. Officer Michaels ran ██████ name and a couple minutes later, he placed ██████ into handcuffs. Officer Michaels asserted that he handcuffed ██████ because he believed he was armed and dangerous due to the actions he took during the traffic stop. Officer Michaels also stated ██████ looked back and forth and appeared to be nervous, and the stop occurred in a high-crime area. Lastly, Officer Michaels mentioned that he was going to search the vehicle, and it would be safer for him to do so when ██████ was handcuffed. Officer Chaawari seconded these assertions made by Officer Michaels. While Officer Michaels asserted that he thought ██████ was armed and dangerous and that is why he handcuffed him; COPA could not corroborate this assertion. Officer Michaels also did not handcuff ██████ immediately but waited until he ran his name which took several minutes and then he handcuffed ██████. As such, COPA finds this allegation sustained.

COPA finds the allegation of searching the vehicle ██████ was driving, without justification, **Not Sustained**. Officers are not permitted to conduct a limited search for weapons during every valid investigatory stop.⁴⁰ When officers perform a traffic stop, they may search the passenger compartment for weapons if they possess an articulable and objectively reasonable belief that the suspect is potentially dangerous.⁴¹ Here, Officer Michaels searched the vehicle ██████ was driving for weapons. According to Officer Michaels, he searched the vehicle because through his training and experience, individuals who immediately exit the vehicle and exhibit similar behaviors as ██████ did, usually try to direct officers' attention away from the vehicle and what may be inside the vehicle. ██████ immediately exited the vehicle without being asked to and immediately started dropping items from his hand. ██████ also admitted to Officer Michaels that he had a gun card, but he told him he did not carry the gun. Officer Michaels had not previously mentioned anything about a gun. While Officer Michaels training and previous experience must be taken into consideration and ██████ actions were abnormal, it is unclear whether ██████ was potentially dangerous, so COPA finds this allegation not sustained.

³⁷ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, see Appendix B.

³⁸ *People v. Arnold*, 394 Ill. App. 3d 63, 71 (2009).

³⁹ *People v. Arnold*, 394 Ill. App. 3d 63, 71 (2d Dist. 2009).

⁴⁰ *People v. Sorenson*, 196 Ill. 2d 425, 433 (2001).

⁴¹ *Michigan v. Long*, 463 U.S. 1032, 1051 (1983).

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Officer Lucas Michaels

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History

As of June 10, 2025, Officer Michaels has received a total of 42 awards, including two Department Commendation Award, one Attendance Recognition Award, one Democratic Convention Service Award and 33 Honorable Mention Certificate. In the last five years, Officer Michaels has no Sustained Complaints History. In the last five years, Officer Michaels has a Spar History showing 2 Sustained Findings for non-compliance with motor vehicle pursuit requirements and preventable accident resulting in disciplinary recommendation of Reprimand.

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officer Michaels violated Rules 2, 3, and 8 when he handcuffed [REDACTED] without justification. Based on the above information, COPA recommends **REPRIMAND and TRAINING (handcuffing)**.

Approved:

[REDACTED]

8-31-2025

Deputy Chief Angela Hearts-Glass

Appendix A

Case Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	October 7, 2024/ 4:55 pm/ 5804 S. Morgan Street
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	October 8, 2024/ 1:09 pm
Involved Member #1:	Officer Lucas Michaels, star# 13013, emp.# [REDACTED] DOA: December 27, 2021, 007, Male, White
Involved Member #2:	Officer Omar Chaarawi, star# 12976, emp.# [REDACTED] DOA: February 27, 2023, 006, 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 8:** Disrespect to or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty.

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.⁴² 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.”⁴³

⁴² 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).

⁴³ *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