



Log # 2024-0008922

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On December 19, 2024, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received an Initiation Report² from Sergeant (Sgt.) Anthony Onesto reporting alleged misconduct by a member of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). The Initiation Report documented that Probationary Police Officer (PPO) Tyler Waggle deployed his Taser at a fleeing individual, now identified as ██████████. Upon review of the evidence, COPA served allegations against PPO Waggle for unjustifiably discharging his Taser and failing to promptly notify the Office of Emergency Management and Communications (OEMC) about the Taser deployment. Additionally, both PPO Waggle and his partner, Field Training Officer (FTO) Daniel Piell, received allegations related to their decision to engage in a foot pursuit of ██████████. Finally, COPA served an allegation against FTO Piell for pointing a firearm at ██████████ without justification.

Following its investigation, COPA reached a sustained finding regarding the allegation that PPO Waggle discharged his Taser at ██████████ without justification.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE³

On December 19, 2024, at approximately 7:49 a.m., Officers Piell and Waggle were on routine patrol when they observed ██████████ and two unknown individuals⁵ trespassing and loitering in the fenced-in backyard of an abandoned building located at 624 West Englewood. Officers Piell and Waggle decided to conduct an investigatory stop, and they stopped ██████████ and the two unknown individuals as they walked towards the Aldi's parking lot located at 620 West 63rd Street.⁶ FTO Piell exited his squad car, approached ██████████ first, and began questioning him about the flashlight in his hand and the reason he was loitering in the backyard of an abandoned building.⁷

██████████ responded to the officers, stating that he had seen his flashlight on the ground in the backyard and had gone to retrieve it. FTO Piell informed ██████████ that the building was

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. 1.

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, a civilian interview, and officer interviews.

⁴ Atts. 2 and 13.

⁵ One of the individuals is possibly named Joseph (312-955-2323). Attempts to contact Joseph were unsuccessful.

⁶ Att. 4, at 2:03. Att. 5, at 2:10.

⁷ Att. 4, at 2:06.

abandoned, requested his identification, and asked whether he had any weapons.⁸ ██████ denied having identification but indicated that he had tools on him.⁹ FTO Piell grabbed ██████ right arm to stop him from reaching into his pockets, and he conducted a protective pat-down on ██████ outer garments.¹⁰ ██████ accused the officers of harassment and requested a sergeant.¹¹ He became argumentative with FTO Piell, informing him that he was on his way to work. FTO Piell told ██████ that he was trespassing at an abandoned building and continued conducting his protective pat-down.¹²

FTO Piell then questioned ██████ again about his identification.¹³ ██████ denied having any identification with him; therefore, FTO Piell requested his first and last name.¹⁴ ██████ responded by providing the false name of ██████ ██████,¹⁵ a date of birth of ██████, 1976, and stating that he was 48 years old.¹⁶

FTO Piell informed ██████ that he would conduct a name check, then returned to his squad car to do so.¹⁷ The name check revealed that ██████ had given false information regarding his identity.¹⁸ FTO Piell exited his squad, questioned ██████ again about his identity, and attempted to verify his identity through his tattoos.¹⁹ ██████ however, continued to provide false information. FTO Piell informed ██████ that ██████ was deceased and had a tattoo on his neck. ██████ responded to the officers by stating that he originally had a tattoo on his neck, but had it removed. FTO Piell then questioned ██████ about his last arrest. ██████ replied that he had been arrested for aggravated battery and domestic battery.²⁰ FTO Piell then returned back to his squad car and again attempted to verify ██████ identity.²¹

As FTO Piell began to exit his squad car, ██████ took off running southbound in the direction of the post office.²² Officers Piell and Waggle gave chase and notified OEMC of the foot pursuit and ██████ path of flight.²³ ██████ ran towards the USPS staging area, where postal employees were present.²⁴ As PPO Waggle unholstered his Taser, he ordered ██████ to stop running, but ██████ continued to flee and ignore the verbal commands.²⁵ ██████ ran in front of

⁸ Att. 4, at 2:10 to 2:47.

⁹ Att. 4, at 2:35 to 2:42.

¹⁰ Att. 4, at 2:52.

¹¹ Att. 4, at 2:55 to 3:00.

¹² Att. 4, at 3:20.

¹³ Att. 4, at 3:45.

¹⁴ Att. 4, at 4:17 to 4:30.

¹⁵ Att. 20. ██████ is the deceased brother of ██████ originally denied having a form of identification, but the officers found his identification card inside of his wallet. ██████ actual date of birth is ██████, 1997, and he resides at ██████, Markham, Illinois 60428.

¹⁶ Att. 4, at 4:17 to 4:30. Att. 20.

¹⁷ Att. 4, at 5:00 to 11:30.

¹⁸ Att. 4, at 11:30. Att. 2. Att. 20.

¹⁹ Att. 4, at 11:55.

²⁰ Att. 4, at 14:10.

²¹ Att. 4, at 12:40 to 20:40.

²² Att. 4, at 20:40.

²³ Att. 4, at 20:45.

²⁴ Att. 4, at 20:55.

²⁵ Att. 4, at 21:20. Att. 5, at 21:00 to 21:18.

a parked postal vehicle in an attempt to escape. FTO Piell then unholstered his firearm and pointed it in [REDACTED] direction as he fled, while ordering [REDACTED] to stop running and get on the ground.²⁶ PPO Waggle also told [REDACTED] to stop running and warned him that he would be Tased. [REDACTED] however, continued to flee. PPO Waggle announced his intent to use the Taser and deployed his Taser in the direction of [REDACTED].²⁷

The Taser failed and only attached to [REDACTED] outer garments.²⁸ [REDACTED] continued to flee as the officers followed behind him. PPO Waggle then conducted an emergency takedown on [REDACTED].²⁹ Once on the ground, Officers Piell and Waggle were able to detain and handcuff [REDACTED].³⁰ Assisting officers arrived at the scene, and FTO Piell notified OEMC that [REDACTED] was in custody.³¹ Officer Brian Lopez and PPO Waggle conducted a custodial search of [REDACTED] and located his identification card and two bottles of Methadone in his pocket.³² Officer Lopez placed [REDACTED] inside the squad car,³³ and FTO Piell requested an ambulance via his radio.³⁴ FTO Piell then retrieved [REDACTED] identification and went back to his squad car to conduct a name check via his radio.³⁵ OEMC confirmed that [REDACTED] had an active warrant for burglary.³⁶ Sgt. Anthony Onesto questioned PPO Waggle about the Taser deployment, notified OEMC, and then approached [REDACTED] to remove the Taser prongs from his winter coat.³⁷ [REDACTED] was placed under arrest and transported by Chicago Fire Department Ambulance 36 to [REDACTED] Hospital.³⁸

On March 27, 2025, [REDACTED] provided a statement to COPA. In that statement, he alleged that the officers stopped, detained, and arrested him without justification. [REDACTED] account of the incident was essentially the same as that captured on the officers' BWCs, except that he never told COPA he had given the officers a false name.³⁹

Both officers provided statements to COPA.⁴⁰ FTO Piell explained in his statement that he and his partner were on routine patrol when they observed [REDACTED] and two unknown individuals trespassing in the backyard of an abandoned building. They conducted an investigatory stop on [REDACTED] during which [REDACTED] gave a fictitious name in an attempt to deceive, obstruct, and conceal his identity. The stop resulted in a foot pursuit and Taser deployment, with [REDACTED] being taken into custody for an active burglary warrant out of Cook County.

²⁶ Att. 4, at 21:30. Att. 5, at 21:33.

²⁷ Att. 4, at 21:40 to 21:48. Att. 5, at 21:20 to 21:48.

²⁸ Att. 4, at 21:47. Att. 4, at 21:48.

²⁹ Att. 4, at 22:04. Att. 5, at 21:50 to 22:05.

³⁰ Att. 4, at 22:10 to 22:49. Att. 5, at 22:22.

³¹ Att. 4, at 22:55. Att. 5, at 22:58.

³² Att. 4, at 23:45 to 25:19. Att. 5, at 23:17 to 25:16. Att. 7, at 2:00 to 4:30.

³³ Att. 7, at 5:13. Att. 4, at 26:38. Att. 5, at 26:38.

³⁴ Att. 4, at 23:50.

³⁵ Att. 4, at 26:48. Att. 4, 28:15

³⁶ Att. 4, at 26:48 to 27:45. Att.5, at 28:16. Cook County Warrant # W24H2718.

³⁷ Att. 6.

³⁸ Att. 4 at 31:28. Att. 35 - COPA requested and reviewed [REDACTED] medical records from [REDACTED] Hospital. [REDACTED] complained of lower back pain as a result of a fall. He also informed paramedics that during the police interaction, he was Tased in the back, but the Taser prongs did not penetrate his winter coat. Dr. [REDACTED] diagnosed [REDACTED] with back pain and prescribed him acetaminophen.

³⁹ Att. 44

⁴⁰ Att. 38. Att. 42.

PPO Waggle also provided a statement that was substantially similar to that of his Field Training Officer. PPO Waggle explained that on the date of the incident, it was his first week on patrol and he felt inexperienced. PPO Waggle recalled that he and his partner were driving through the alley when they observed ██████ and two other individuals in the backyard of an abandoned building, trespassing, and the officers decided to conduct an investigatory stop.

Upon initiating the stop, the officers informed ██████ that he was being stopped for trespassing. ██████ denied having identification but provided a false name to conceal his identity. FTO Piell conducted a protective pat-down on ██████ and attempted to verify his identity through NCIC and LEADS,⁴¹ but he had difficulty locating any records, only finding ██████ deceased brother. During the stop, ██████ admitted to being arrested for aggravated battery and domestic violence, which classified him as a violent offender. As FTO Piell exited the squad car, ██████ decided to flee from the officers. They initiated a foot pursuit⁴² of ██████ across 63rd Street and into a USPS staging area. Despite multiple verbal commands to stop and a warning that a Taser would be utilized, ██████ continued to flee. PPO Waggle told COPA that he announced his warning to use the Taser to deter ██████ from escaping, by saying “Taser, Taser,” per protocol; however, the Taser deployment did not affect ██████ because he was wearing a large, puffy jacket.

PPO Waggle then notified his partner that the Taser was ineffective, while ██████ continued to flee from the officers. PPO Waggle eventually caught up with ██████ conducted an emergency takedown, and placed him into custody. PPO Waggle believed ██████ may have been in possession of a weapon during the encounter, even though FTO Piell had previously searched him.⁴³ According to PPO Waggle, he pursued and eventually Tased ██████ because ██████ provided a false name, could have been in possession of a weapon, and said he had previously been arrested for aggravated battery and domestic abuse.⁴⁴

III. ALLEGATIONS

Field Training Officer (FTO) Daniel Piell

1. Pointed a Firearm at ██████ without justification.
-Not Sustained.

2. Initiating and/ or continuing a foot pursuit in Violation of General Order G03-07.V.A.
-Exonerated.

⁴¹ NCIC, the National Crime Information Center, is a law enforcement database that is maintained by the Federal Bureau of Investigations and provides law enforcement agencies with information on documented criminal matters, such as active warrants, fugitive alerts, missing persons, stolen vehicles, and other relevant criminal information. LEADS, the Law Enforcement Agencies Data Systems, is a statewide database operated by the Illinois State Police, which connects police departments and various state agencies in Illinois, and provides access to criminal history information, fugitive alerts, and other vital information.

⁴² Att. 41, pg. 35, lns. 1 – 3. According to PPO Waggle, the officers believed they were authorized to initiate a foot pursuit because ██████ committed a Class A misdemeanor, namely obstruction of identification.

⁴³ Att. 41, pg. 35, lns. 6 - 22

⁴⁴ Att. 41, pgs. 27 – 35.

3. Failing to consider a reasonable alternative to a foot pursuit in Violation of General Order G03-07.IV.
-Exonerated.

Probationary Police Officer Tyler Waggle

1. Failed to notify OEMC of Taser Deployment in a timely manner.
-Not Sustained.
2. Discharging your Taser probes at or in the direction of [REDACTED] while fleeing without justification.
-Sustained, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, and 8.
3. Initiating and/ or continuing a foot pursuit in Violation of General G03-07.V.A.
-Exonerated.
4. Failing to consider a reasonable alternative to a foot pursuit in Violation of G03-07.IV.
-Exonerated.

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 the ability to recall the incident from memory.

Except as discussed herein, this investigation did not reveal any evidence that caused COPA to doubt the credibility of FTO Piell's and Officer Waggle's statements. [REDACTED] account of the incident was mostly accurate, but he gave the officers a false name during the encounter, and he did not mention the deception in his interview. This reduced the credibility of [REDACTED] account.

V. ANALYSIS⁴⁵

a. Foot Pursuit

COPA finds the allegation that Officers Piell and Waggle initiated and/or continued a foot pursuit in violation of CPD policy is **exonerated**. CPD policy states that its members may only engage in a foot pursuit when there is a valid law enforcement need to detain the person that the CPD members reasonably believe outweighs the threat to safety posed by the pursuit.⁴⁶ A valid law enforcement need to detain a person exists when the CPD members establish reasonable articulable suspicion or probable cause to believe that (1) the person being pursued has committed, is committing, or is about to commit a felony, a Class A misdemeanor, or a traffic offense that

⁴⁵ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, see Appendix B.

⁴⁶ Att. 45, G03-07(I)(A), Foot Pursuits (effective August 29, 2022 to present).

endangers the physical safety of others, or (2) the person being pursued is committing or is about to commit an arrestable offense that poses an obvious physical threat to any person.⁴⁷ The act of fleeing from the police alone cannot be a justification for engaging in a foot pursuit.⁴⁸ Additionally, the policy prohibits CPD members from initiating or continuing a foot pursuit if the members reasonably believe the risk to CPD members, members of the public, or the person being pursued outweighs the objective of immediate apprehension.⁴⁹

In this case, Officers Piell and Waggle observed ██████ trespassing, loitering, and possibly attempting to burglarize an abandoned building, prompting them to conduct an investigatory stop. During the stop, ██████ repeatedly provided false and misleading information about his identity in an effort to obstruct the officers. Once FTO Piell discovered that ██████ had given a fictitious name, ██████ fled on foot, leading to a foot pursuit that was initiated by FTO Piell and followed by PPO Waggle. The officers had both reasonable articulable suspicion and probable cause to pursue ██████ as he had provided false information regarding his identity⁵⁰ and was observed engaging in suspicious activity at an abandoned property. Therefore, COPA finds the officers' decision to initiate and continue the foot pursuit of ██████ was justified.

COPA finds the allegation that Officers Piell and Waggle failed to consider a reasonable alternative to a foot pursuit in violation of CPD policy is **exonerated**. CPD policy states that a decision to initiate or continue a foot pursuit “must be continuously re-evaluated in light of the circumstances presented at the time.”⁵¹ Specifically, the policy indicates that members should consider alternatives to engaging in or continuing a foot pursuit in certain situations that pose a “particularly high risk” to CPD members and the public.⁵² Reasonable alternatives may include containment of the area, saturation of the area with other law enforcement personnel, video monitoring and apprehension technology, helicopter unit support, and apprehension at a later time when the identity of the person being pursued is known.⁵³

In this case, the pursuit occurred in an environment that appeared to present only ordinary risks to both ██████ and the public. Both officers activated their BWCs at the start of the incident and maintained visual contact with each other as they pursued ██████. The officers provided radio notifications regarding the path of ██████ flight for any other police personnel in the area. They also used de-escalation techniques in an effort to persuade ██████ to stop. Additionally, COPA notes that ██████ had provided false and misleading information to obstruct his identity, and he admitted to prior arrests for violent crimes. This left the officers with few alternatives to a foot pursuit. As PPO Waggle pointed out, “At the time the subject started running from us... we don't know his identity, so it's not like we can just get him at a later time. We don't know if he has a warrant or is wanted for other reasons. He's already exhibited that he has been arrested for violent

⁴⁷ Att. 45, G03-07(IV)(B)(1).

⁴⁸ Att. 45, G03-07(II)(C).

⁴⁹ Att. 45, G03-07(V)(A).

⁵⁰ This crime, which was captured on BWC footage, is a Class A misdemeanor. See 720 ILCS 5.0/31-1.5-A.

⁵¹ Att. 45, G03-07(IV)(B)(2).

⁵² Att. 45, G03-07(VI).

⁵³ Att. 45, G03-07(IV)(G).

crimes. So as far as the balancing test goes, it seemed imperative that we detain this person...”⁵⁴ Accordingly, COPA finds this allegation is exonerated.

b. Firearm Pointing

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Piell pointed a firearm at or in the direction of ██████ without justification is **not sustained**. CPD members may only point a firearm at a person when it is objectively reasonable to do so under the totality of the circumstances faced by the member on the scene.⁵⁵ While reasonableness is not capable of precise definition, CPD members may consider factors that include, but are not limited to, the nature of the incident, the risk of harm to the member or others, and the level of threat or resistance presented or maintained by the person, such as possession or access to weapons.⁵⁶

In this case, BWC footage confirmed that Officer Piell pointed his firearm at ██████ during the foot pursuit of ██████.⁵⁷ The footage also depicted the officers losing sight of ██████ as he ran behind USPS trucks. Officer Piell unholstered his weapon and ordered ██████ to stop and get on the ground. Officer Piell admitted to COPA that he pointed his firearm at ██████ because it was a high-risk stop, and he believed that ██████ was potentially armed and/or violent. Although CPD policy generally prohibits the use of deadly force against a fleeing subject, Officer Piell cited safety concerns, including ██████ violent background, his level of resistance, his brief disappearance from view, and the possibility that he had picked up a weapon off the ground and armed himself. As ██████ slowed from exhaustion, Officer Piell kept his distance, issued verbal commands, and pointed his firearm, considering those actions safer than engaging ██████ directly. Officer Piell reported his firearm pointing to OEMC and acknowledged his familiarity with CPD policy, which permits firearm pointing when it is objectively reasonable under the totality of the circumstances. Based on the available evidence, COPA recommends a finding of not sustained.

c. Taser Discharge

COPA finds the allegation that PPO Waggle discharged his Taser probes at or in the direction of ██████ as he was fleeing without justification, is **sustained**. A CPD member’s use of a Taser must be objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional under the totality of the circumstances, including using the minimum amount of force needed under the circumstances.⁵⁸ Additionally, CPD members must continually assess the necessity of the use of a Taser and whether alternatives may be employed, including the use of de-escalation techniques, other response options, and other resources.⁵⁹

Tasers may only be used in response to an active resister when there is a reasonable belief that the person is armed, presents a risk of serious injury to others, and no other reasonable force options are available or would be effective under the circumstances. A Taser may also be employed

⁵⁴ Att. 43, pg. 17, lns. 11 to 22; see Att. 39, pg. 15, lns. 7 to 15.

⁵⁵ Att. 47, D19-01 (II)(E), Firearm Pointing Incidents (effective November 1, 2019 to April 15, 2025).

⁵⁶ Att. 47, D19-01 (II)(E),

⁵⁷ Att. 4, at 21:34.

⁵⁸ Att. 46, G03-02-04 (II)(C)(1), Taser Use Incidents (effective June 28, 2023, to present).

⁵⁹ Att. 46, G03-02-04 (II)(C)(2).

against an active resister if the person is exhibiting violent or aggressive behavior and there is a reasonable belief that the person has committed a felony offense, or any offense that endangers a person.⁶⁰ CPD policy prohibits the use of Tasers against a fleeing person whose only action is flight alone.⁶¹ CPD members are trained to avoid the use of Tasers under circumstances where they may increase the risk of serious injury or death, unless other force options are not readily available or would otherwise be ineffective.⁶²

Here, FTO Piell initiated a foot pursuit of ██████ with PPO Waggle following as ██████ fled across 63rd Street toward the USPS staging area. As the officers chased ██████ around the lot, PPO Waggle unholstered his Taser, announced “Taser, Taser,” and deployed the Taser in ██████ direction. The Taser was ineffective, as it attached only to ██████ winter coat. Ultimately, PPO Waggle caught up to ██████ and used a takedown to place him into custody.

COPA finds that PPO Waggle’s Taser deployment violated CPD policy for several reasons. First, the evidence shows that ██████ was an active resister as he fled from the officers. However, the officers did not have an objectively reasonable belief that ██████ was armed or presented a risk of serious injury, as FTO Piell had already conducted a protective pat-down of ██████ and determined he was only in possession of tools. Additionally, while ██████ was argumentative during the stop, he was not exhibiting violent or aggressive behavior. This is corroborated by the officers’ decision not to place him in handcuffs. Therefore, ██████ did not meet the requirements of an active resister against whom the use of a Taser was authorized. This is consistent with the conclusions of Lt. Keith Rigan, who reviewed PPO Waggle’s TRR and found that his use of force was not in compliance with CPD policy. As Lt. Rigan noted, “The subject was an active resister however that in and of itself does not authorize the use of the Taser.”⁶³

Second, at the time of PPO Waggle’s Taser discharge, ██████ was running on concrete through the USPS staging area. Under these circumstances, the Taser deployment posed a risk of serious injury to ██████ as he was in motion and could have fallen and suffered an impact injury to the head or other area.⁶⁴ Additionally, other force options were readily available to PPO Waggle, as demonstrated by the fact that he successfully placed ██████ into custody by using an emergency takedown.

COPA, therefore, finds that PPO Waggle’s Taser deployment violated CPD’s Taser Use Incidents policy, and this allegation is sustained by a preponderance of the evidence.

d. Failure to Notify

COPA finds the allegation that PPO Waggle failed to notify the Office of Emergency Management and Communication (OEMC) of his Taser discharge in a timely manner is **not sustained**. CPD policy states that, immediately upon gaining control and restraining the person, a CPD member who has discharged their Taser will notify OEMC.⁶⁵

⁶⁰ Att. 46, G03-02-04 (II)(D).

⁶¹ Att. 46, G03-02-04 (II)(F)(8).

⁶² Att. 46, G03-02-04 (II)(G).

⁶³ Att. 12, pg. 7.

⁶⁴ Att. 46, G03-02-04 (II)(G)(2) and (6).

⁶⁵ Att. 46, G03-02-04(IV)(A)(5).

Here, it is undisputed that PPO Waggle did not personally notify OEMC about his Taser deployment; instead, FTO Piell made the radio notification.⁶⁶ In his statement to COPA, PPO Waggle explained that it was his first week on patrol after the training academy, and he acknowledged that his partner had notified OEMC of the Taser deployment.⁶⁷ However, the BWC footage shows that the notification was not delayed or untimely, as FTO Piell reported his partner’s Taser discharge less than 15 seconds after it occurred.⁶⁸ Accordingly, COPA lacks sufficient evidence that PPO Waggle committed misconduct by failing to personally notify OEMC. Therefore, COPA recommends a finding of not sustained.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Officer Tyler Waggle

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History⁶⁹

Officer Waggle has been employed by CPD since April 16, 2024. He has received five awards, including one Democratic Convention Service Award and four Honorable Mention Certificates. He has no prior sustained complaints or SPARs.

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that PPO Waggle violated Rules 2, 3, 6, and 8 when he deployed his Taser at [REDACTED] without justification. In recommending discipline, COPA notes the presence of numerous mitigating factors. At the time of this incident, PPO Waggle had been a CPD member for just eight months, and it was his first week on patrol after the training academy. He was inexperienced as a police officer and admitted as much during his COPA interview. Additionally, PPO Waggle’s Taser use did not cause any significant impact or injury to [REDACTED]. Further, PPO Waggle was not disrespectful or unprofessional during his encounter with [REDACTED]. It is for these reasons, combined with PPO Waggle’s complimentary history and lack of disciplinary history, that COPA recommends he receive a **Reprimand** and **retraining** on CPD’s Taser policy.

Approved:

[REDACTED]

1/30/2026

Steffany Hreno
Acting Deputy Chief Administrator

Date

⁶⁶ Att. 28, OEMC Event Query (Event #2435402839) pg. 1.
⁶⁷ Att. 43, pg. 20, ln. 24 to pg. 21, ln. 12.
⁶⁸ Att. 4, at 21:45 to 22:00.
⁶⁹ Att. 49.

Appendix ACase Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	December 19, 2024 / 7:47 a.m. / 6320 South Lowe AVE, Chicago, Illinois 60621
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	December 19, 2024 / 11:16 a.m.
Involved Officer #1:	Field Training Officer Daniel Piell /Star # 19595/ Employee # [REDACTED] /Date of Appointment: February 18, 2014/ Unit of Assignment:007 / Gender: Male / Race: Caucasian
Involved Officer #2:	Probationary Police Officer Tyler Waggle/ Star # 6369/ Employee # [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: April 16, 2024/ Unit of Assignment: 007/ Gender: Male/ Race: Asian Pacific Islander
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] / Date of Birth: [REDACTED], 1977/ Gender: Male / Race: 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

- G03-02, De-Escalation, Response to Resistance, and Use of Force (effective June 28, 2023, to Present).
- G03-02-04, Taser Use Incidents (effective June 28, 2023, to Present).
- G03-07, Foot Pursuits (effective August 29, 2022, to Present).
- D19-01, Firearm Pointing Incidents (effective November 01, 2019, to April 15, 2025).

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.⁷⁰ For example, if the evidence gathered in an investigation establishes that it is more likely that the conduct complied with Department 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.”⁷¹

⁷⁰ 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).

⁷¹ *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