



Log # 2024-7451

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On September 27, 2024, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received a telephone complaint from [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) reporting alleged misconduct by members of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). [REDACTED] alleged that on September 26, 2024, Officers Michael Ambrose, Pablo Cartagena, William Cygnar, and Jasmine Gonzalez stopped him and his wife without justification, searched their cigarette box without justification, and failed to provide their names and badge numbers upon request.² [REDACTED] also alleged that Officer Gonzalez was rude and unprofessional, stating words to the effect of, “You look like you shoot drugs.” Upon review of the evidence, COPA served additional allegations that the officers failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR), failed to issue an Investigatory Stop Receipt, and failed to activate their body-worn cameras (BWC). Following its investigation, COPA reached not sustained findings regarding all of the allegations.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE³

On September 26, 2024, Officers Ambrose, Cartagena, Cygnar, and Gonzalez were on routine patrol in one police vehicle. [REDACTED] told COPA that he and his wife, [REDACTED] were walking home from purchasing cigarettes when they observed the police vehicle near 810 S Francisco Avenue, adjacent to Manley Career Academy. While [REDACTED] and his wife continued walking, the officers drove up on the curb to stop them, without activating their lights or sirens.⁴

[REDACTED] stated that two of the four officers jumped out of the vehicle and began interrogating them, informing [REDACTED] and his wife that they were in a high narcotics area.⁵ [REDACTED] said that he and his wife both voluntarily opened their bags and belongings to prove to the officers they did not have any drugs on them.⁶ He recalled that the female officer, now

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, civilian interviews, and officer interviews.

⁴ Att. 8, audio recorded statement of Complainant, at 10:00.

⁵ Att. 8 at 5:50.

⁶ Att. 8 at 8:48 and 13:45.

identified as Officer Gonzalez, stated words to the effect of, “You look like you shoot drugs.”⁷ ██████ said that the officers did not conduct a pat down of him or his wife, nor did they ask for the couple’s identifications.⁸ He told COPA that he asked for the officers’ badge numbers, but none of them provided their information. Additionally, the officers did not issue an Investigative Stop Receipt.⁹ ██████ recalled that the stop lasted approximately ten minutes; however, the police vehicle’s GPS data showed the officers were in the area, at a complete stop, for approximately four minutes.¹⁰

The officers’ interaction with ██████ and his wife was caught on Officer Gonzalez’s and Officer Cygnar’s BWCs for fifteen seconds of the buffering period. Officers Ambrose and Cartagena remained in the police vehicle, and their BWCs did not capture audio or video of the interaction. COPA conducted interviews with all four of the CPD members involved. Officer Ambrose, the driver of the police vehicle, could not recall the encounter with ██████ and his wife.¹¹ Officer Ambrose further reported that he and his partners often conduct community outreach that does not warrant an ISR, because the encounters are consensual. Officer Ambrose stated that these encounters are merely conversations, and that the individuals are free to leave at any time.¹² Officer Ambrose denied the allegations made against him.¹³

Officer Cygnar told COPA that he had no direct recollection of the incident and was relying on the BWC he was shown.¹⁴ Officer Cygnar did not recall having a conversation with ██████ or his wife.¹⁵ He stated that the encounter was not documented because ██████ and his wife were not detained and were free to leave on their own will.¹⁶ Officer Cygnar said he did not activate his BWC because he did not categorize the encounter as “police activity.”¹⁷ Officer Cygnar denied the allegations made against him.¹⁸

Officer Cartagena, the front passenger of the police vehicle, also could not recall the encounter. However, after viewing his BWC, Officer Cartagena said it looked like he and Officer Ambrose were in the vehicle “chitchatting.”¹⁹ Additionally, Officer Cartagena explained that Officer Gonzalez likes to talk to people and do community engagement, because she came from CAPS. He posited that Officer Gonzalez was “probably just interacting” with them.²⁰ Officer

⁷ Att. 8 at 6:56.

⁸ Att. 8 at 13:38.

⁹ Att. 8 at 14:55.

¹⁰ Att. 5 and Att. 7, GPS coordinates of the vehicle driven by the officers at the time of incident.

¹¹ Att. 32 - Officer Michael Ambrose interview transcript.

¹² Att. 32, pg. 16, lns. 20 – 24.

¹³ Att. 32, pgs. 25 – 27.

¹⁴ Att. 30 – Officer Cygnar interview transcript, pg. 11, lns. 17 - 19

¹⁵ Att. 30, pg. 11, lns. 11 – 12.

¹⁶ Att. 30, pg. 19, lns. 10 – 11.

¹⁷ Att. 30, pg. 19, ln. 24 to pg. 20, lns. 1 – 2.

¹⁸ Att. 30, pgs. 22 – 23.

¹⁹ Att. 35 – statement transcript of Officer Pablo Cartagena, pg. 10, lns. 4 - 10

²⁰ Att. 35, pg. 10, lns. 13 – 24.

Cartagena said he did not recall the duration of the interaction, nor did he recall hearing or seeing anything pertaining to it.²¹

Finally, Officer Gonzalez was unable to recall the incident, even after reviewing her BWC footage. However, she noted that the video showed [REDACTED] wife was smiling, and it “seemed like a positive encounter.”²² Officer Gonzalez further explained that she frequently engages in consensual encounters with people, as she is “really friendly” and “talk[s] to everyone.”²³ She denied all of the allegations against her, and stated that she did not recall making the comment, “You look like you shoot drugs.”²⁴

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officers Michael Ambrose, Pablo Cartagena, William Cygnar, and Jasime Gonzalez:

1. Failing to provide name and badge number after being requested by [REDACTED]
 - Not Sustained
2. Stopping [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] without justification
 - Not Sustained
3. Searching cigarette box without justification
 - Not Sustained
4. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report
 - Not Sustained
5. Failing to issue an Investigatory Stop Receipt
 - Not Sustained
6. Failing to activate your BWC
 - Not Sustained

Officer Jasmine Gonzalez:

7. Rude and unprofessional, stating words to the effect of, “You look like you shoot drugs” to [REDACTED]
 - Not Sustained

IV. CREDIBILITY ASSESSMENT

An individual’s credibility 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

²¹ Att. 35, pgs. 11 – 12.

²² Att. 31– statement transcript of Officer Jasmine Gonzalez, pg. 17, lns. 2 – 3.

²³ Att. 31, pg. 11, lns. 18 – 23.

²⁴ Att. 31, pgs. 19, 22 – 23.

individual making the statement, while the second factor concerns the individual's ability to accurately perceive the event at the time of the incident and to recall it from memory.

During his COPA statement on October 22, 2024, ██████████ provided an account of the incident that was consistent with the available BWC evidence. Additionally, ██████████ was candid and forthcoming about the fact that he and his wife voluntarily opened their bags to show they did not possess drugs. He easily recalled the details of the incident, and COPA found him to be generally credible.

In contrast, none of the accused officers could recall the incident, even after they reviewed the available BWC footage. This is noteworthy given that three of the four officers were interviewed in January 2025, less than four months after the incident. The officers' inability to recall the events limited COPA's ability to fully assess their credibility. Additionally, it reduced the evidence available to COPA to confirm or refute ██████████ allegations, especially given the lack of BWC footage. However, there is no evidence that the officers' failure to recall the incident was deceptive or intentional.

V. ANALYSIS²⁵

a. Failure to Identify

COPA finds the allegation that Officers Ambrose, Cartagena, Cygnar, and Gonzalez failed to provide their name and badge numbers upon the request of ██████████ is **not sustained**. During their statements to COPA, the officers denied that they failed to provide their identifiers to the civilians during this incident. Officer Ambrose stated that he never got out of the police vehicle, Officer Cygnar was unable to recall having a conversation with ██████████ or his wife, and Officer Gonzalez stated she did not recall this stop at all. In contrast, ██████████ alleged that he requested the officers' information, but they did not provide it. There is no BWC footage to resolve this discrepancy, as the officers did not activate their cameras during the alleged stop. For these reasons, COPA finds there is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove this allegation by a preponderance of the evidence.

b. Stopping ██████████ and ██████████ without justification

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Ambrose, Cartagena, Cygnar, and Gonzalez stopped ██████████ and ██████████ without justification is **not sustained**. The central issue in evaluating this allegation is whether the officers' interaction with the ██████████ couple was an investigatory stop or a consensual encounter. CPD policy defines an investigatory stop as "[t]he temporary detention and questioning of a person in the vicinity where the person was stopped based on Reasonable Articulate Suspicion that the person is committing, is about to commit, or has committed a criminal offense."²⁶ In contrast, a voluntary contact is a consensual encounter

²⁵ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, see Appendix B.

²⁶ Att. 21, S04-13-09 (II)(A), Investigatory Stop System (effective July 10, 2017 to February 2, 2026).

between an officer and a person during which the person must feel free to leave the officer's presence. In evaluating whether a consensual encounter has elevated to an investigatory stop, courts consider factors including: the threatening presence of several officers; a display of a weapon by an officer; the use of language or tone of voice indicating that compliance with the officer's request might be compelled; whether an officer blocks a person's path; or whether the choice to end the encounter is not available to the person.²⁷

In this case, the officers did not have an independent recollection of their encounter with ██████████ and his wife. However, after reviewing the limited BWC footage that was available, the officers asserted that ██████████ and his wife were not detained and were free to leave. According to the officers, the encounter was part of community outreach in a high narcotics area. Officer Cartagena explained that Officer Gonzalez, who had experience working in CAPS, "likes to talk to people" and was "probably just interacting."²⁸ The BWC footage shows that only two of the officers were outside their police vehicle, neither officer was blocking the path of ██████████ or his wife, there was no weapons display, and both ██████████ and his wife appeared to be laughing and/or smiling. However, the footage only captured the last 15 seconds of the interaction, and it did not record any audio during that time. As a result, COPA lacks sufficient evidence to determine whether this was an investigatory stop or a consensual encounter. Therefore, this allegation is not sustained.

c. Search without justification

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Ambrose, Cartagena, Cygnar, and ██████████ searched a cigarette box without justification is **not sustained**. During his COPA interview, ██████████ alleged that the officers asked his wife for her pack of cigarettes. He stated that Officer Gonzalez then ripped apart the foil on the cigarette box before handing it back to his wife.²⁹ All of the officers, including Officer Gonzalez, either denied or did not recall searching the cigarette box. Additionally, while the BWC footage captured ██████████ holding the cigarette box in her hand, and then placing it back inside her bag, it did not show any of the officers taking possession of or searching the box. However, because the BWC footage only captured the last 15 seconds of the encounter, COPA cannot prove or disprove whether any of the officers searched the cigarette box. Therefore, this allegation is not sustained.

d. Failing to complete an ISR

COPA finds the allegation that Officers Ambrose, Cartagena, Cygnar, and Gonzalez failed to complete an ISR is **not sustained**. According to Special Order S04-13-09, officers who conduct an investigatory stop, probable cause stop when no other document captures the reason for the

²⁷ Att. 21, S04-13-09 (II)(A).

²⁸ Att. 35, pg. 10.

²⁹ Att. 8 at 13:45 to 14:20.

detention, or a protective pat down or other search in a public place, are required to submit an ISR.³⁰

Here, although limited, the BWC footage showed that Officer Gonzalez did have some type of interaction with [REDACTED] and his wife. The video further captured Officer Gonzalez shining her flashlight into [REDACTED] bag. The GPS report also indicates that the officers were at that specific location for at least four minutes. COPA attempted to locate a copy of an ISR for this incident, with negative results.³¹ The officers told COPA they did not recall the interaction but denied they were required to submit an ISR. Officer Ambrose stated that he was familiar with the ISR procedures and did not believe this incident rose to the level of an investigatory stop because, based on his review of Officer Gonzalez's BWC, it appeared to be a consensual encounter.³² Officer Cygnar also explained they were not conducting a police activity, and therefore, there was no reason to document the encounter.³³ Officers Gonzalez and Cartagena did not recall if they completed an ISR, but Officer Gonzalez noted that ISRs are not required for consensual encounters.³⁴

As discussed above, COPA was unable to determine whether this was an investigatory stop or a consensual encounter. Therefore, COPA lacks sufficient evidence to prove or disprove that an ISR was required, and this allegation is **not sustained**.

e. Failing to issue an Investigatory Stop Receipt

COPA finds the allegation that Officers Ambrose, Cartagena, Cygnar, and Gonzalez failed to issue an Investigatory Stop Receipt is **not sustained**. Special Order S04-13-09 requires officers to issue an Investigatory Stop Receipt to persons following "the completion of an Investigatory Stop that involves a Protective Pat Down or any other search."³⁵ Officer Ambrose denied the allegation because he "didn't think it was an investigatory stop, so there's no need to issue a receipt."³⁶ Officer Cygnar similarly denied the allegation.³⁷ Officers Gonzalez and Cartagena stated they did not recall whether they issued an Investigatory Stop Receipt.³⁸ As discussed above, COPA's ability to determine what happened was limited by the officers' inability to recall the incident, as well as their failure to activate their BWCs. COPA, therefore, lacks sufficient evidence to prove or disprove that the officers were required to issue an ISR receipt; accordingly, this allegation is not sustained.

³⁰ Att. 21, S04-13-09 (VIII)(A)(1). S04-13-09 (VIII)(A)(4) gives examples of when officers must issue ISRs and Investigatory Stop Receipts.

³¹ Att. 16 – ISR Search.

³² Att. 32, pgs. 26 to 27, lns. 20 to 24 and lns. 1 to 4.

³³ Att. 30, pg. 19, lns. 6 to 14.

³⁴ Att. 31, pg. 18, lns. 17 to 22, pg. 23, ln. 6; Att. 35, pg. 13, lns. 9 to 13.

³⁵ Att. 21, S04-13-09 (VIII)(A)(3).

³⁶ Att. 32, pg. 26, lns. 17 to 21.

³⁷ Att. 30, pg. 22, ln. 20.

³⁸ Att. 31, pg. 23, lns. 7 to 12; Att. 35, pg. 13, lns. 14 to 16.

f. Failing to activate BWC

COPA finds the allegation that Officers Ambrose, Cartagena, Cygnar, and Gonzalez failed to activate their BWCs, is **not sustained**. CPD policy states that members equipped with a BWC will electronically record all law-enforcement related activities. The use of BWCs to electronically record law-enforcement-related activities is mandatory and is not discretionary.³⁹ However, while the list of law-enforcement-related activities includes investigatory stops, interrogations, searches, and any encounter with the public that becomes adversarial after the initial contact, it does not include consensual encounters where a person is free to leave.⁴⁰

In the officer statements provided to COPA, Officer Ambrose stated that he did not get out of the police vehicle, and he could not recall the details of the alleged stop.⁴¹ Officer Cygnar stated that he did not conduct any police activity with [REDACTED] and his wife.⁴² Officer Gonzalez’s reason for not activating her BWC during this incident was that “it was a consensual conversation, the individuals were free to leave at any time.”⁴³ Officer Cartagena could not recall the incident, so he denied the allegation against him. As discussed above, COPA cannot determine if this incident involved an investigatory stop, which would have required the officers to activate their BWCs, or if it was a consensual encounter, where BWC activation might not have been required. Therefore, this allegation is not sustained.

g. Officer Jasmine Gonzalez was rude and unprofessional, stating words to the effect of, “You look like you shoot drugs”

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Gonzalez was rude and unprofessional, stating words to the effect of, “You look like you shoot drugs,” is **Not Sustained**. Although [REDACTED] alleged that Officer Gonzalez made this comment, Officer Gonzalez neither recalled the encounter or using this language.⁴⁴ Due to the conflicting testimonial evidence and lack of video footage, COPA lacks sufficient evidence to prove or disprove this allegation.

Approved:

[REDACTED]

3/10/2026

Steffany Hreno
Acting Deputy Chief Administrator

Date

³⁹ Att. 22, S03-14 (V)(A)(1) Body Worn Cameras (effective August 8, 2024, to February 27, 2026).

⁴⁰ See Att. 22, S03-14 (II)(I).

⁴¹ Att. 32.

⁴² Att. 30, pgs. 20 to 21, lns.24 and 1 to 2.

⁴³ Att. 31, pg. 20, lns. 12 to 13.

⁴⁴ Att. 31, pg. 19, lns. 11 to 19.

Appendix A

Case Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	September 26, 2024/ 10:05 pm/ 810 S Francisco Avenue Chicago, IL 60612
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	September 27, 2024/ 4:16 pm
Involved Member #1:	Michael Ambrose, Star #19607, employee ID# [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: November 18, 2019, Unit of Assignment: 011, Male, White
Involved Member #2:	Pablo Cartagena, Star #12513, employee ID# [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: October 16, 2019, Unit of Assignment: 011, Male, White Hispanic
Involved Member #3	William Cygnar, Star #3726, employee ID# [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: February 16, 2021, Unit of Assignment: 011, Male, White
Involved Member #4	Jasmine Gonzalez, Star #18276, employee ID# [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: February 16, 2021, Unit of Assignment: 011, Female, White Hispanic
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] Male, Hispanic
Involved Individual #2:	[REDACTED] Female, White

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

- Special Order S04-13-09: Investigatory Stop System: July 10, 2017 to February 2, 2026.
- Special Order S03-14: Body Worn Camera: August 8, 2024 to February 27, 2026.

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.⁴⁵ 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.”⁴⁶

⁴⁵ 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).

⁴⁶ *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