



Log # 2024-7025

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On September 7, 2024, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received an initiation report complaint from Lt. Marco Tirado reporting alleged misconduct by members of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). Lt. Tirado alleged that on September 3, 2024, Officer Daniel Urbanski Jr searched an apartment without justification.² Lt. Tirado also alleged that Officer David Arauz searched an apartment without justification. However, COPA found no evidence that Officer Arauz searched an apartment without justification in its review of the evidence. Upon review of the evidence, COPA served additional allegations that Officer Pedro Venegas, Officer Juan Pintor Jr., Officer Sergio Martinez, and Officer Jose Lopez searched an apartment without justification. Additionally, COPA served allegations against Officer Urbanski Jr, Officer Venegas, Officer Pintor Jr., Officer Martinez, and Officer Lopez for failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report documenting the search of [REDACTED] apartment. Following its investigation, COPA reached **Sustained** findings for searching an apartment without justification for all involved officers.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE³

On September 3, 2024, at approximately 6:40 pm, Officer Daniel Urbanski Jr. and Officer David Arauz were patrolling the 7th district.⁴ In his statement, Officer Urbanski said that they were in the area because it was a hotspot for gang loitering, narcotics loitering, and shootings.⁵ The officers saw an individual, now known as [REDACTED] standing next to a parked vehicle in a vacant lot behind [REDACTED].⁶ According to Officer Urbanski Jr., they attempted to stop [REDACTED] on the street when they saw him clutch his waistband, revealing an L-shaped metal bulge.⁷ [REDACTED] fled and the officers followed on foot.⁸ While in pursuit, officers observed [REDACTED] pull a black handgun with an extended magazine from his waistband while he was running.⁹ The officers then

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 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, police reports, and officer interviews.

⁴ Att. 1, [REDACTED] Arrest Report and Att. 14 Officer Urbanski Jr. foot pursuit report

⁵ Att. 55, Urbanski Jr. statement transcript. Pg. 8, Lns. 9 to 11

⁶ Att. 1 and Att. 14

⁷ Att. 55, Pg. 7, Lns. 7 to 8; and Att. 1

⁸ Att. 1, Att.4 Officer Urbanski Jr. BWC footage at 1:55 to 2:10; Att. 5 Officer Arauz BWC footage, at 2:00 to 2:15

⁹ Att. 1

saw █████ enter the rear of an apartment at █████, on the second floor.¹⁰ Officers climbed the stairs to the second floor deck where Officer Urbanski Jr. tried unsuccessfully to kick open the locked door.¹¹ Officer Venegas eventually kicked open the door, and he, Officers Urbanski Jr., Arauz, and Juan Pintor Jr., entered the apartment.¹² Officers Jose Lopez and Sergio Martinez entered the apartment later.¹³ Officers Urbanski Jr., Venegas, Pintor Jr., Lopez and Martinez searched the apartment for █████ and his gun.¹⁴ During the search of the apartment, at approximately 6:43 pm, Officer Michael McCloud and Officer Adam Rios arrived on scene, where they encountered and arrested █████ in front of the building.¹⁵

From 6:43:04 pm to 6:45:30 pm, Officers Urbanski Jr., Venegas, Lopez, Martinez, and Pintor Jr., searched around the apartment.¹⁶ In his statement, Officer Urbanski Jr. said he was looking for █████ firearm during his search.¹⁷ And at approximately 6:43:19, Officer Urbanski Jr. found a firearm magazine.¹⁸ About two minutes later, Officer Urbanski Jr. found ammunition on a black table in the tv room.¹⁹ In his statement, Officer Venegas said he and the other officers secured the apartment to make sure nobody was hiding and to look for discarded weapons.²⁰ Officer Lopez told COPA that he searched the apartment for any individual hiding and for possible weapons.²¹ He said that he found nothing during this search.²² Officer Martinez said that he was searching for █████ and █████ firearm in the apartment.²³ Officer Pintor Jr. also said that he searched for a person and any guns/contraband.²⁴ He noted that he was unable to find a person or a weapon in his search.²⁵

During the search of the apartment, and individual now known as, █████ and an unknown black male stood outside the apartment's front door and argued with officers because they wanted to get inside their apartment.²⁶ The unknown male said words to the effect of "Y'all can search us and everything" to officers in the apartment.²⁷ However, the individual's verbal

¹⁰ Att. 1

¹¹ Att. 4, at 2:04 to 2:10; and Att. 4 at 2:10 to 2:15

¹² Att. 24, Officer Venegas BWC footage at 2:25 to 2:40

¹³ Att. 23, Officer Lopez BWC footage at 2:48 to 2:50; Att. 25 Officer Martinez BWC footage at 3:10 to 3:15

¹⁴ Att. 4, at 2:45 to 5:00; Att. 24 at 2:40 to 6:15; Att. 26 at 2:35 to 6:55; Att. 23 at 2:50 to 10:00; Att. 25 at 3:15 to 8:25

¹⁵ Att. 19, Officer Michael McCloud BWC footage at 2:17 to 2:40

¹⁶ Att. 4, at 4:03 to 6:30; Att. 24 at 3:46 to 6:13; Att. 23 Officer Lopez BWC at 3:39 to 6:05; Att. 25 Officer Martinez BWC footage at 4:02 to 6:29; and Att. 23 Officer Lopez BWC footage at 3:45 to 6:11

¹⁷ Att. 55, Pg. 7, Lns. 20 to 21

¹⁸ Att. 4, at 4:15 to 4:20

¹⁹ Att. 4, at 5:59 to 6:05

²⁰ Att. 53, Officer Venegas statement transcript, Pg. 10, Lns. 6 to 12

²¹ Att. 51, Officer Lopez statement transcript, Pg. 10, Lns. 1 to 6

²² Att. 51, Pg. 10, Lns. 15 to 17

²³ Att. 52, Officer Martinez statement transcript, Pg. 11, Lns. 20 to 22 and Pg. 12, Lns. 4 to 6

²⁴ Att. 54, Officer Pintor Jr. statement transcript, Pg. 7, Lns. 11 to 22

²⁵ Att. 35, Pg. 7, Lns. 23 to 24

²⁶ Att. 5, at 4:55 to 5:30

²⁷ Att. 5, at 6:28 to 6:32

consent to search was given at 6:45:30 pm, more than two minutes after officers started searching.²⁸

Following the conclusion of the incident, Officers Urbanski Jr., Venegas, Pintor Jr., Martinez, and Lopez did not complete an Investigatory Stop Report for the search of the apartment.²⁹ [REDACTED] was charged with a Class 3 felony of U UW (unlawful use of a weapon).³⁰ He was found not guilty on all counts.³¹

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer Daniel Urbanski Jr.

1. Searching an apartment without justification
 - Sustained, Violations of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10
2. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report documenting the search of [REDACTED] apartment
 - Not Sustained

Officer Pedro Venegas:

1. Searching an apartment without justification
 - Sustained, Violations of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10
2. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report documenting the search of [REDACTED] apartment
 - Not Sustained

Officer Juan Pintor Jr:

1. Searching an apartment without justification
 - Sustained, Violations of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10
2. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report documenting the search of [REDACTED] apartment
 - Not Sustained

Officer Sergio Martinez:

1. Searching an apartment without justification
 - Sustained, Violations of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10

²⁸ Att. 5, at 6:28 to 6:32

²⁹ Att. 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35: These PDFs show no ISRs were done in connection with the apartment search in connection with these five officers.

³⁰ Att. 1.

³¹ CO-1407405 The Cook County Clerk of Court database shows that [REDACTED] was found not guilty on all counts.; and Att. 26, Court records showing that [REDACTED] was found not guilty.

2. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report documenting the search of [REDACTED] apartment
 - Not Sustained

Officer Jose Lopez:

1. Searching an apartment without justification
 - Sustained, Violations of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10
2. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report documenting the search of [REDACTED] apartment
 - 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.

Officers Urbanski Jr., Venegas, Pintor Jr., Lopez and Martinez were all forthcoming in their responses to COPA. They all appeared to be overall credible as their statements reflected what happened in their BWC footage. COPA was unable to interview [REDACTED]³²

V. ANALYSIS³³

a. Searching an apartment without justification

COPA finds the allegations that Officers Urbanski Jr., Venegas, Pintor Jr., Martinez, and Lopez searched an apartment without justification is **Sustained**. "It is a basic principle of Fourth Amendment law that searches and seizures inside a home without a warrant are presumptively unreasonable."³⁴ This limitation, however, is subject to exceptions such as consent or exigent circumstances.³⁵ There is an extensive list of factors of exigent circumstances that are considered "to justify a nonconsensual entry into a home to arrest a suspect," including (1) "the gravity or violent nature" of the alleged offense; (2) "whether the suspect is 'reasonably believed to be armed'"; (3) the clarity of the probable cause that the crime was committed by the suspect; (4) the strength of belief that the suspect is present at the premises in question; (5) the likelihood of the

³² CO-1424020

³³ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, see Appendix B.

³⁴ *Payton v. New York*, 445 U.S. 573, 574 (1980).

³⁵ *Donovan v. Dewey*, 452 U.S. 594, 598 n. 6 (1981): Absent consent or exigent circumstances, a private home may not be entered to conduct a search or effect an arrest without a warrant.

suspect's escape; (6) the peaceful circumstances of the entry; (7) the need for promptness by officers after reaching the probable cause standard; (8) the presence or lack of delay by police "during which time a warrant could have been obtained;" and (9) "the reasonable belief that the suspect may be armed and violent."³⁶ It is further noted that "[a]ll such factors need not be established but only satisfied on balance."³⁷

It is well settled "that pursuit of a fleeing felon is itself an exigent circumstance justifying warrantless entry into a home."³⁸ However, the Supreme Court recognizes some ambiguity as to "warrantless entry in hot pursuit of a fleeing misdemeanor."³⁹ The Court set forth a test as follows: "When the totality of circumstances shows an emergency—such as imminent harm to others, a threat to the officer himself, destruction of evidence, or escape from the home—the police may act without waiting."⁴⁰

The Supreme Court further set the bounds of searches incident to arrest in *Chimel v. California*, a case in which officers searched the arrestee's entire three-bedroom house.⁴¹ *Chimel* set forth the general rule that arresting officers, in order to prevent the arrestee from obtaining a weapon or destroying evidence, could search both "the person arrested" and "the area within his immediate control."⁴² The Supreme Court case *Maryland v. Buie* set forth the "protective sweep" rule that a quick and limited search of premises may be conducted to protect the safety of police officers or others.⁴³ A protective sweep must be narrowly confined to a cursory inspection of those places in which a person might be hiding.⁴⁴ In *United States v. Robinson*, the Supreme Court held that the mere fact of a lawful arrest justifies a search of the arrestee and the area within his immediate control; probable cause that weapons or evidence will be found is not required.⁴⁵

In this case, the officers' actions may have started off as the hot pursuit of a person with a gun fleeing into an apartment. However, once ██████ was arrested outside of the apartment by Officer McCloud and Rios at 6:43 pm, that hot pursuit exemption was likely extinguished. As a result, Officers Urbanski, Venegas, Pintor, Martinez, and Lopez should have immediately left. While case law permits search incident arrest as another exemption, it also limits such a search to both "the person arrested" and "the area within his immediate control."⁴⁶ Here, officers continued to search the apartment for another two minutes before the received what may borderline qualify

³⁶ *People v. Stamps*, 108 Ill. App. 3d 280, 287 (1st Dist. 1982), *citing *People v. Sakalas*, 85 Ill. App. 3d 59, 65 (1st Dist. 1980) and *People v. Abney*, 81 Ill. 2d 159 (1980)).

³⁷ *People v. Stamps*, 108 Ill. App. 3d at 288.

³⁸ *Lange v. California*, 141 S. Ct. 2011, 2025 (2021). This quotation is taken from Justice Kavanagh, writing in concurrence with the decision and characterizing the "long-settled rule" established in *United States v. Santana*, 427 U.S. 38, 42-43 (1976).

³⁹ *Lange v. California*, 594 U.S. 295, 296 (2021) (quoting *Stanton v. Sims*, 571 U.S. 3, 10 (2013)).

⁴⁰ *Lange v. California*, 594 U.S. 295, 308 (2021)

⁴¹ *Chimel v. California*, 395 U.S. 752, 754 (1969).

⁴² *Chimel v. California*, 395 U.S. 752, 763 (1969).

⁴³ *Maryland v. Buie*, 494 U.S. 325, 327 (1990).

⁴⁴ *Maryland v. Buie*, 494 U.S. 325, 327 (1990).

⁴⁵ *United States v. Robinson*, 414 U.S. 218, 235 (1973).

⁴⁶ *Chimel v. California*, 395 U.S. 752, 763 (1969).

as “consent.” And that “consent” was given by an unknown male who may or may not be legally capable of providing consent to search that apartment.

Therefore, COPA finds Allegation 1 for all the officers, is **Sustained**.

b. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report documenting the search of [REDACTED] apartment

COPA finds the allegations that Officers Urbanski Jr., Venegas, Pintor Jr., Martinez, and Lopez failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report documenting the search of [REDACTED] apartment is **Not Sustained**. Officers must submit an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) following an investigatory stop, probable cause stop, and protective pat down “or other search in a public place”.⁴⁷ Officers must document “[a]ll the factors” supporting reasonable articulable suspicion “to temporarily detain an individual for investigation”, and “if applicable . . . to perform a Protective Pat Down” in the narrative portion of the ISR.⁴⁸

Here, all the officers told COPA in their statements that an ISR was completed for [REDACTED] as the arrestee, but no ISR was completed for anyone else as nobody else was detained.⁴⁹ However, officers did interact with [REDACTED] and another unknown male, who allegedly lived in the apartment they searched. While it is not entirely clear they were detained, they were not searched, nor patted down during their interaction with the officers. Indeed, [REDACTED] and the unknown male were not formally detained, but COPA cannot meet the evidentiary burden of clear and convincing to say they were free to leave or enter their apartment. Therefore, COPA finds Allegation 2 for all the officers is **Not Sustained**.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION⁵⁰

a. Officer Daniel Urbanski Jr.

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History

Officer Daniel Urbanski Jr. has 115 total awards, including 99 honorable mentions, five Department commendations, and two life saving awards. Officer Urbanski has no record of sustained complaints within the last five years. However, he has received four SPARs, all resulting in a reprimand. Urbanski received three SPARs for separate preventable accidents, two incidents in 2024 and one in 2025. His fourth SPAR is for a court appearance violation in July 2025.

ii. Recommended Discipline

⁴⁷ Att. 40 S04-13-09 (VIII)(A)(1).

⁴⁸ Att. 40 S04-13-09 (VIII)(A)(1).

⁴⁹ Att. 55, Pg. 29, Lns. 21 to 24, Pge. 30, Ln. 1; Att. 53 Pg. 16, Lns. 3 to 5; Att.54, Pg. 22, Ln. 6; Att. 52 Pg. 21, Lns. 4 to 7; and Att. 51, at Pg. 18, Lns. 4 to 14

⁵⁰ Att. 56, Combined POs Complimentary and Disciplinary Histories

COPA has found that Officer Urbanski violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10 when he searched an apartment without justification. In mitigation, COPA has considered Officer Urbanski's numerous awards and honors. However, this violation of privacy and the protections provided by the US and Illinois Constitutions, while slight, are very clear. While officers initially may have been justified in their entry and search of the apartment, that justification was extinguished once [REDACTED] was arrested. And yet, the officers continued to search for another two minutes. COPA acknowledges the duration of this violation was limited and took that into consideration in its recommendation. Therefore, COPA recommends Officer Urbanski receive a **Reprimand** and **Retraining** on the Department's search and seizure policy.

b. Officer Pedro Venegas

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History

Officer Pedro Venegas has 147 total awards, including 137 honorable mentions, two Department commendations, and two joint operations awards. Officer Venegas has no record of sustained complaints within the last five years. However, he has received two SPARs, both resulting in a reprimand. Venegas received one reprimand for a uniform violation in 2025. He received another reprimand for a preventable accident in 2025.

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officer Venegas violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10 when he searched an apartment without justification. In mitigation, COPA has considered Officer Venegas's numerous awards and honors. However, this violation of privacy and the protections provided by the US and Illinois Constitutions, while slight, are very clear. While officers initially may have been justified in their entry and search of the apartment, that justification was extinguished once [REDACTED] was arrested. And yet, the officers continued to search for another two minutes. COPA acknowledges the duration of this violation was limited and took that into consideration in its recommendation. Therefore, COPA recommends Officer Venegas receive a **Reprimand** and **Retraining** on the Department's search and seizure policy.

c. Officer Juan Pintor Jr.

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History

Officer Juan Pintor Jr. has 167 total awards, including 152 honorable mentions, four Department commendations, and two joint operations awards. Officer Pintor has had two sustained complaints against him in the last five years. Officer Pintor received a 1-day suspension for a sustained finding for neglect of duty in 2021. Officer Pintor also received a 5-day suspension for a sustained finding for an improper vehicle search with excessive damage in 2023. Officer Pintor has also received three SPARs, two resulting in a reprimand, one in no disciplinary action. Pintor received one reprimand for a uniform violation, a reprimand for a court appearance violation, and

a no disciplinary action taken for an inventory procedure violation. All SPARs were received in 2025 for incidents that occurred in 2025.

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officer Pintor violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10 when he searched an apartment without justification. In mitigation, COPA has considered Officer Pintor's numerous awards and honors. However, this violation of privacy and the protections provided by the US and Illinois Constitutions, while slight, are very clear. While officers initially may have been justified in their entry and search of the apartment, that justification was extinguished once [REDACTED] was arrested. And yet, the officers continued to search for another two minutes. COPA acknowledges the duration of this violation was limited and took that into consideration in its recommendation. Therefore, COPA recommends Officer Pintor receive a **Reprimand** and **Retraining** on the Department's search and seizure policy.

d. Officer Sergio Martinez

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History

Officer Sergio Martinez has 338 total awards, including 299 honorable mentions, 10 Department commendations, and three complimentary letters. Officer Martinez has had three sustained complaints against him in the last five years. Officer Martinez received a 3-day suspension for a sustained finding for improper reports in 2021. Officer Martinez received a reprimand for a sustained finding for misuse of Department equipment and/or supplies in 2022. Finally, Officer Martinez received a 5-day suspension for a sustained finding for verbal abuse (profanity) in 2023. Officer Martinez has no record of any SPARs received.

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officer Martinez violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10 when he searched an apartment without justification. In mitigation, COPA has considered Officer Martinez's numerous awards and honors. However, this violation of privacy and the protections provided by the US and Illinois Constitutions, while slight, are very clear. While officers initially may have been justified in their entry and search of the apartment, that justification was extinguished once [REDACTED] was arrested. And yet, the officers continued to search for another two minutes. COPA acknowledges the duration of this violation was limited and took that into consideration in its recommendation. Therefore, COPA recommends Officer Martinez receive a **Reprimand** and **Retraining** on the Department's search and seizure policy.

e. Officer Jose Lopez

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History

Officer Jose Lopez has 358 total awards, including 303 honorable mentions, 15 Department commendations, and six complimentary letters. Officer Lopez has had two sustained complaints against him in the last five years. Officer Lopez received a reprimand for a sustained finding for neglect of duty in 2023. Officer Lopez also received a 10-day suspension for a sustained finding for a traffic pursuit resulting in serious bodily injury in 2021. Officer Lopez has no record of any SPARs received.

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officer Lopez violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10 when he searched an apartment without justification. In mitigation, COPA has considered Officer Lopez’s numerous awards and honors. However, this violation of privacy and the protections provided by the US and Illinois Constitutions, while slight, are very clear. While officers initially may have been justified in their entry and search of the apartment, that justification was extinguished once [REDACTED] was arrested. And yet, the officers continued to search for another two minutes. COPA acknowledges the duration of this violation was limited and took that into consideration in its recommendation. Therefore, COPA recommends Officer Lopez receive a **Reprimand** and **Retraining** on the Department’s search and seizure policy.

Approved:



2-17-2026

Angela Hearts-Glass
Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator

Date

Appendix A

Case Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	09/03/2024 / 6:40 pm / ██████████, Chicago, IL ██████████
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	09/07/2024 / 8:55 am
Involved Member #1:	Daniel Urbanski Jr., #19189 / Employee# ██████████ / Date of Appointment: 11/27/2018 / Male / Unknown Race
Involved Member #2:	Pedro Venegas, #9624 / Employee# ██████████ / Date of Appointment: 11/16/2017 / Male / White Hispanic
Involved Member #3	Juan Pintor Jr., #6255 / Employee# ██████████ / Date of Appointment: October 16, 2017 / Male / White Hispanic
Involved Member #4	Sergio Martinez, #19512 / Employee# ██████████ / Date of Appointment: December 2, 2002 / Male / Hispanic
Involved Member #5	Jose Lopez, #11943 / Employee# ██████████ / Date of Appointment: 05/01/2006 / Male / Hispanic
Involved Individual #1:	██████████ Male, Black
Involved Individual #2:	██████████ Male, Black
Involved Individual #3	Unknown identity

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

- US Const. amend IV
- Ill. Const. Art. I, Section 6
- Special Order 04-13-09 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.⁵¹ 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.”⁵²

⁵¹ 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).

⁵² *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