



April 3, 2026

Mr. Max A. Caproni

Executive Director, Chicago Police Board
30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 1220
Chicago, Illinois 60602

Via Email

RE: Request for Review, Log #2022-0004696

Dear Mr. Caproni,

Pursuant to the Municipal Code of Chicago Section 2-78-130 and Police Board Rules of Procedure Section VI, please consider this letter a Request for Review of a non-concurrence between the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) and the Superintendent of the Chicago Police Department (CPD) in Log #2022-0004696.¹

As set forth in detail in COPA's Final Summary Report (FSR) dated July 7, 2025,² there is a compelling legal and evidentiary basis to support COPA's disciplinary recommendations regarding Police Officers Lauren Holt and Ariel Williams. COPA recommended Officer Holt receive a 1-to-29-day suspension, based on findings that she (1) detained Julias [REDACTED] without justification, (2) searched Julias [REDACTED] vehicle without justification, (3) detained [REDACTED] without justification, and (4) failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) to document the detention of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] without justification. COPA Recommended Officer Williams receive a 1-to-29-day suspension, based on findings that she (1) detained Julias [REDACTED] without justification, (2) searched Julias [REDACTED] vehicle without justification, (3) detained [REDACTED] without justification, (4) failed to complete an ISR to document the

¹ As required by the Police Board Rules of Procedure, enclosed are copies of COPA's final summary report, the Department's non-concurrence letter, and the certificate of meeting.

² COPA initially closed this case on May 1, 2024. On December 20, 2024, COPA agreed to re-open the case for additional investigation, which resulted in the serving of one additional allegation. COPA's July 7, 2025, FSR covers the entire investigation.

detention of ██████ and ██████ without justification, and (5) failed to timely activate her body-worn camera (BWC).

I. BACKGROUND

A. Relevant Factual Background³

On November 1, 2022, Officers Holt and Williams were working as part of a tactical team along with Officers Demetrius Prothro, Carl Smith, and Criag Adams III.⁴ The five officers operated two separate patrol cars: the other officers traveled in one patrol car while Officers Holt and Williams traveled closely behind in a second patrol car. The officers conducted an investigatory stop of ██████ and ██████ as ██████ and ██████ were exiting their car and ██████ was carrying a baby carrier containing their infant child.⁵ Other officers handcuffed and began questioning ██████ by the front of his car.⁶

Officer Holt appeared to speak with ██████⁷ then assisted another officer conduct a search of ██████ car.⁸ Officer Holt searched the passenger compartment near the front-passenger seat,⁹ a purse,¹⁰ and the passenger compartment near the rear passenger-side seat.¹¹ Officer Williams stood by the front of ██████ car with ██████ and the baby carrier carrying her infant child placed on the hood.¹² During this time, Officer Williams appeared to ask ██████ for identification, as ██████ presented an identification card.¹³

The officers eventually released ██████ and ██████ without providing any documentation of the stop, including an ISR, investigatory stop receipt, Traffic Stop Statistical Survey, or arrest report.¹⁴

B. Disputed Findings and Recommendations

The Superintendent disputes sustained Allegations #1-4 against both Officers Holt and Williams, recommending an alternative finding of Not Sustained for each of these allegations.¹⁵ The

³ A more detailed factual summary is found in the FSR.

⁴ Note: The Superintendent concurs with COPA's factual findings and disciplinary recommendations regarding accused Officers Smith, Prothro, and Adams. The Superintendent also concurs with COPA's recommended sustained finding for Allegation #5 against Officer Williams, that she failed to timely activate her BWC.

⁵ Att. 7, 1:00 to 1:05. Att. 4, 1:20 to 1:26.

⁶ Officers Smith and Prothro handcuffed and questioned ██████ Att. 6, at 01:17; Att. 7, at 01:28

⁷ Att. 4, at 1:25 to 1:48.

⁸ Att. 4, at 1:49 to 3:55.

⁹ Att. 4, at 1:49 to 2:40.

¹⁰ Att. 4, at 2:40 to 2:56.

¹¹ Att. 4, at 3:02 to 3:52.

¹² Att. 8, 0:01 to 4:43. Note, Officer Williams did not activate her BWC until the 1:59 timestamp.

¹³ Att. 8, at 0:41 to 0:46.

¹⁴ Att. 34, pg. 60, lns. 6 to 12; pg. 61, lns. 17 to 19.

¹⁵ Superintendent's letter, pg. 2. Allegations #1-4 for both officers are as follows: that they (1) detained Julias ██████ without justification, (2) searched Julias ██████ vehicle without justification, (3) detained ██████ without justification, and (4) failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) to document the detention of ██████ and ██████ without justification.

Superintendent concurs with COPA's sustained finding regarding Allegation #5 against Officer Williams, that she failed to timely activate her BWC.¹⁶ The Superintendent disputes COPA's penalty recommendation for both officers, recommending an alternative penalty of a reprimand for Officer Williams, and no penalty for Officer Holt.¹⁷

C. Applicable Department Policy

CPD Rule 2 prohibits any action or conduct which impedes CPD's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings credit upon CPD. CPD Rule 3 prohibits any omission or failure to act to promote CPD's efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals. CPD Rule 5 prohibits failure to perform any duty. CPD Rule 6 prohibits disobedience of any order or directive, whether written or oral.

The then-applicable CPD Special Order S04-13-09,¹⁸ titled "Investigatory Stop System", required "[s]worn members who conduct an Investigatory stop" to "complete an Investigatory Stop Report."¹⁹ The policy clarified: "Sworn members who conduct an Investigatory Stop, Probable Cause stop when no other document captures the reason for the detention, and, if applicable, a Protective Pat Down or other search in a public place, are required to submit an Investigatory Stop Report into the Investigatory Stop Database."²⁰

II. ARGUMENT

A. COPA proved that Officers Holt and Williams detained ██████████ and ██████████ searched ██████████ vehicle, and failed to issue an ISR without justification.

The Superintendent concurs with COPA's findings that the detention of ██████████ and ██████████ and search of ██████████ vehicle was improper.²¹ The Superintendent further agrees with COPA's finding that the failure to issue an ISR violated CPD policy.²² However, the Superintendent disputes whether it was "safe or appropriate" for Officers Holt and Williams "to question the . . . legitimacy of the traffic stop."²³ The Superintendent argues Officers Holt and Williams were the "assist unit", and that the other officers were the "primary unit".²⁴

Regardless of the designation of "primary" or "assist" units, both officers actively participated in the traffic stop, including the detention of ██████████ and search of ██████████ car. The Superintendent's argument implies (1) Officers Holt and Williams did not know the reason for the traffic stop, (2) Officer Holt did not know why she was searching ██████████ car, or (3) what the object of this search was. Additionally, the Superintendent's designation of officers as an assist

¹⁶ Superintendent's letter, pg. 2.

¹⁷ Superintendent's letter, pg. 2.

¹⁸ Note: S04-13-09 was rescinded on February 3, 2026, and replaced with a new series of General Orders. However, S04-13-09 remained in effect at the time of the incident.

¹⁹ Investigatory Stop System, S04-13-09 (III)(C) (effective July 10, 2017, to February 3, 2026).

²⁰ S04-13-09 (VIII)(A)(1) (emphasis omitted).

²¹ Superintendent's letter, pg. 1 to 2

²² Superintendent's letter, pg. 1 to 2.

²³ Superintendent's letter, pg. 2.

²⁴ Superintendent's letter, pg. 2

unit does not relieve them of their duty to intervene when they observe improper conduct. The 7th Circuit has long held that officers have a duty to intervene when they observe improper conduct.²⁵ Officers who fail to intervene when they can prevent another officer from infringing on a person's constitutional rights face liability for their failure.²⁶ COPA properly sustained Allegations #1-3 against Officers Holt and Williams.

The Superintendent further argues Officers Holt and Williams should not have had to complete an ISR because "it was reasonable for the assist unit to believe the primary unit would complete any necessary paperwork related to the traffic stop."²⁷ As previously addressed, Officers Holt and Williams actively participated in the traffic stop. This argument also conflicts with CPD policy referenced above, which does not distinguish between primary or assisting officers. Officers Holt and Williams conducted an investigatory stop and a vehicle search; as such, S04-13-09 required them to complete an ISR.²⁸ None of the officers involved in the stop and search, including Officers Holt or Williams, did so, in clear violation of CPD policy. COPA properly sustained Allegation #4 against Officers Holt and Williams.

As COPA established in the FSR, Officers Holt and Williams improperly detained [REDACTED] and searched his vehicle, improperly detained [REDACTED] and failed to complete the required ISR. The Superintendent has failed to show that Officers Holt and Williams did not participate in the alleged misconduct and that they did not fail to submit an ISR. COPA's sustained findings for each sustained allegation against Officers Holt and Williams were reasonable.

III. CONCLUSION

For these reasons, COPA maintains that the Superintendent has failed to meet his affirmative burden of showing COPA's recommendations in this case are unreasonable. Accordingly, COPA respectfully requests that the Chicago Police Board reject the Superintendent's non-concurrence in this matter and accept COPA's findings and recommendations.

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]

LaKenya White
Chief Administrator
Civilian Office of Police Accountability

²⁵ *Yang v. Hardin*, 37 F.3d 282, 285 (7th Cir. 1994) (stating police officer may be held liable for failure to intervene in constitutional violation); *Lanigan v. Village of E. Hazel Crest*, 110 F.3d 467, 476 (7th Cir. 1997); *Byrd v. Brishke*, 466 F.2d 6, 11 (7th Cir. 1972)

²⁶ *Yang v. Hardin*, 37 F.3d 282, 285 (7th Cir. 1994) (citing *Byrd v. Brishke*, 466 F.2d 6 (7th Cir. 1972)).

²⁷ Superintendent's letter, pg. 2

²⁸ S04-13-09 (III)(C); (VIII)(A)(1).