



Log # 2023-0002433

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On June 6, 2023, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received a notification from the Chicago Police Department (CPD) regarding a taser deployment with hits.² Upon review of the evidence, COPA served allegations that Officer Jamaul Jenkins used force on ██████████ and ██████████ and used profanities towards ██████████ and ██████████. COPA also served an allegation that Officer Lakeidra C. Bolin displayed her firearm in the direction of ██████████ and two other individuals without justification. Additionally, with the approval of CPD's Bureau of Internal Affairs (BIA),³ COPA served allegations that Sergeant (Sgt.) Anthony Ceja failed to follow procedural protocols, used profane language towards ██████████ and ██████████ and displayed his firearm at ██████████ and two other individuals without justification.

Following its investigation, COPA reached **Sustained** findings regarding the use of force against ██████████ verbal language towards ██████████ and ██████████ failing to use de-escalation techniques, and failing to give verbal warning's prior to the discharge of a taser.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE⁴

On June 6, 2023, at approximately 7:44 am, at or near 4178 S. Drexel Blvd., Chicago, IL, Sgt. Ceja, Officer Anthony Gillum, and Officer Jenkins responded to an attempted suicide call reported by ██████████ mother, ██████████⁶ Sgt. Ceja was the first to approach the resident's front door along with Officer Gillum. The front door was initially opened by ██████████ and then closed but not shut completely.⁷ Sgt. Ceja proceeded to slightly push the door and used his flashlight to look inside the residence. While waiting outside, an unknown male approached Sgt. Ceja and indicated with his hands that he had a hearing disability. The male appeared confused about the situation and did not understand what was happening at the time.⁸ An American Sign

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 COPA did not serve allegations regarding the taser use due to it being in compliance under CPD policy.

³ Att. 48, Affidavit Override for Sgt. Ceja.

⁴ The following is a summary of what COPA finds most likely occurred during this incident. This summary utilized information from several different sources, including body worn camera (BWC) footage, police reports, officer interviews, event queries, and Evidence Technician (ET) Photos.

⁶ Att. 26, BWC of Sgt. Ceja, at 3:30 to 4:35; Att. 30, BWC of Officer Jenkins, at 3:40 to 5:37; Att. 33, Crisis Intervention Report.

⁷ Att. 26, at 7:05 to 7:45; Att. 27, BWC Officer Gillum, at 6:40 to 7:03.

⁸ Att. 26, at 8:05 to 8:45; Att. 27, at 7:31 to 8:03.

Language (ASL) interpreter was requested. The male then appeared to understand that officers were in the residency for ██████████

Sgt. Ceja then approached the room, to which the male pointed and was able to identify ██████████⁹ When Sgt. Ceja ordered ██████████ and ██████████ to leave the room, ██████████ responded by yelling at the Officers and making violent threats.¹⁰ ██████████ also started shouting at Sgt. Ceja. Subsequently, ██████████ was escorted out of the room by Officer Jenkins. ██████████ then positioned himself in a bladed stance and grabbed Officer Jenkins's vest, which led to a physical altercation.¹¹ As Officer Jenkins and ██████████ were on the couch, Sgt. Ceja came out of the room and deployed his taser in the direction of ██████████ back.¹² Sgt. Ceja's taser malfunctioned and fired all prongs simultaneously.¹³ ██████████ appeared to have relocated from the living room area to the rear of the residence. ██████████ is then seen approaching officers in a fast-paced motion. Sgt. Ceja unholstered his firearm and ordered ██████████ to show his hands.¹⁴

██████████ was then handcuffed by Officer Gillum, and eventually, ██████████ was handcuffed by Officer Jenkins. Officer Jenkins then appeared to push ██████████ towards a wall to lead her towards the exit and appeared to have called her words to the effect of a "hoe" in the process.¹⁵ Officer Jenkins returned to what appeared to be a frustrated ██████████ then told officers, "Let me go, I'm beat your fucking ass." While Officer Jenkins was walking away from ██████████ a loud noise was heard in the background, as if someone banged on the metal door. Officer Jenkins then told ██████████ words to the effect of, "Yeah, that's all you can hit bitch ... bitch ass nigga."¹⁷ Ultimately, ██████████ and ██████████ were taken to the hospital, and ██████████ was taken to a mental health facility.

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer Jamaul Jenkins:

1. Striking ██████████ without justification.
 - Exonerated
2. Forcefully directing a handcuffed ██████████ into a wall without justification.
 - Sustained, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10.
3. Referring to ██████████ as a "hoe" or words of similar effect
 - Sustained, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10.

⁹ Att. 26, at 8:45 to 9:36; Att. 27, at 8:20 to 9:09.

¹⁰ Att. 26, at 9:45 to 11:00; Att. 27, at 9:15 to 10:25.

¹¹ Att. 30, at 10:34 to 10:51; Att. 27, at 10:39 to 10:54.

¹² Att. 26, at 11:24 to 11:33.

¹³ Att. 16, Taser download for X30006FDV.

¹⁴ Att. 25, BWC of Officer Abigail Aleman, at 2:35 to 2:48

¹⁵ Att. 30, at 12:20 to 12:28; Att. 25, BWC of Officer Abigail Aleman, at 3:13 to 3:22.

¹⁷ Att. 30, at 12:44 to 13:02; and at 13:02 to 13:08.

4. Referring to [REDACTED] as a “bitch” or other words of similar effect.
 - Sustained, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10.
5. Stating “bitch ass nigga” or other words of similar effect.
 - Sustained, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10.

Officer Lakeidra Bolin:

1. Displaying your firearm at or in the direction of [REDACTED] and/or two other individuals, without justification.
 - Not Sustained

Sergeant Anthony Ceja:

1. Failing to comply with S04-20 by not using de-escalation techniques such as time as a tactic, containment, or calm and controlled communication when responding to an individual in crisis.
 - Sustained, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10
2. Using profane language in the direction of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]
 - Sustained, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, and 10
3. Displaying your firearm at or in the direction of [REDACTED] and/or two other individuals, without justification
 - Not Sustained
4. Failing to comply with G03-02-04 by failing to give verbal commands and warnings prior to, during, and after the discharge of the taser.
 - Sustained, in violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10

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. The statement provided by every party who was interviewed was consistent with the evidence COPA collected. Therefore, COPA did not find any basis to question the credibility of the statement provided to COPA.

V. ANALYSIS¹⁸

A. Officer Jamaul Jenkins

i. Use of force on ██████████

COPA finds Allegation 1 that Officer Jenkins used force against ██████████ is **Exonerated**. CPD members are permitted to use force when it is “objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional to the threat, actions, and level of resistance offered by a person, under the totality of the circumstances.”¹⁹ Furthermore, when a member encounters a citizen who is using or threatening the use of force against another person or themselves which is likely to cause injury, that citizen is considered an assailant under the Department’s use of force model.²⁰ If that citizen’s actions are aggressively offensive with or without weapons, members are permitted to respond with presence; verbal directions; holding and compliance techniques; control instruments; deployment of oleoresin capsicum; stunning; takedowns; canine use; taser deployment; direct mechanical strikes; and impact weapons and munitions.²¹ However, the force they use must be objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional in order to ensure the safety of a member or third person, stop an attack, make an arrest, control subject, or prevent escape.²² Further, CPD members will continually assess the necessity of the use of force and whether alternatives may be employed, including the use of de-escalation techniques, other response options, and the availability of other resources.²³

In this case, ██████████ used threatening language towards Sgt. Ceja before he was escorted out of the room by Officer Jenkins.²⁴ Once in the living room, ██████████ positioned himself aggressively and grabbed Officer Jenkins by the vest. In Officer Jenkins's statement, he explained that he was grabbed and shaken violently, which put him in fear of receiving a battery.²⁵ Officer Jenkins claimed that in order to protect himself, he used mechanical strikes on ██████████ to help control the situation.²⁶ Following a review of all the available evidence, COPA finds that ██████████ actions classified him as an assailant when he grabbed Officer Jenkins. As a result, Officer Jenkins acted within policy when he performed focused pressure strikes on ██████████²⁷ Therefore, COPA finds Allegation 1, is **Exonerated**.

¹⁸ For a definition of COPA’s findings and standards of proof, *see* Appendix B.

¹⁹ Att. 40, G03-02-01: Response to Resistance and Force Options (effective April 15, 2021, to June 28, 2023).

²⁰ Att. 40, G03-02-01 IV(C).

²¹ Att. 40, G03-02-01 IV(C)(1).

²² Att. 39, G03-02, De-Escalation, Response to resistance, and Use of Force (III)(B) (effective April 15, 2021, to June 28, 2023).

²³ Att. 39, G03-02 (III)(B)(1-3).

²⁴ Att. 30, at 10:30.

²⁵ Att. 37, Officer Jenkins Statement, Pg.9, Ln. 3 to Pg. 10, Ln. 5.

²⁶ Att. 37, Pg. 9, Ln. 24 to Pg.11, Ln. 15.

²⁷ See G03-02-01 (IV)(C)(a)(1), in part: Department members are permitted to use direct mechanical techniques, including forceful, concentrated striking movements such as punching, kicking, or focused pressure strikes and pressures.

ii. Use of force on ██████████

COPA finds Allegation 2 that Officer Jenkins directed ██████████ into a wall without justification, is **Sustained**. Department policy requires all uses of force must be objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional, and Department members will refrain from using force against a person who is secured and restrained with handcuffs or other restraining device.²⁸ The Department provides for limited exceptions to this rule save for incidents where a member: (1) must act to prevent injury to the department member, the restrained person, or another person; (2) must act to prevent escape; or (3) is compelled by other law enforcement objectives.²⁹

In this case, Officer Jenkins told COPA that he never pushed ██████████ but rather used direct extensions of his arms toward ██████████ to get her to her mother and off the scene.³⁰ When asked how much force was applied when using his direct extensions, Officer Jenkins explained that a small percentage of force was used because she resisted and pulled away.³¹ However, this is directly contradicted by the evidence.³² Furthermore, ██████████ did not show signs consistent with the excepts to the Department prohibition on using force against a person restrained with handcuffs. In sum, ██████████ was handcuffed, under control, and not attempting to escalate the situation at the time Officer Jenkins used force against her, in direct violation of G03-02-01.³³ Therefore, COPA finds Allegation 2, is **Sustained**.

iii. Verbal Abuse

COPA finds Allegations 3, 4, and 5 that Officer Jenkins used profane language in the direction of or reference to civilians, are **Sustained**. CPD Rules and Regulations 8 and 9 prohibit members from engaging in unjustified verbal altercations and/or maltreating or disrespecting any person.³⁴ Additionally, CPD policy mandates that all “members treat all persons with courtesy and dignity which is inherently due every person as a human being.”³⁵ And that Department members will “act, speak, and conduct themselves in a professional manner ... and maintain a courteous attitude in all contacts with the public.”³⁶ Furthermore, members “will not exhibit a condescending attitude or direct any derogatory terms toward any person in any manner.”³⁷

²⁸ Att. 40, G03-02-01 (II)(G).

²⁹ Att. 40, G03-02-01 (II)(G).

³⁰ Att. 37, Pg. 14, Ln. 17 to Pg. 16, Ln. 8.

³¹ Att. 37, Pg. 16, Lns. 10 to 24.

³² Att. 30, at 12:20 to 12:40.

³³ Att. 40, G03-2-01 (II) (G) .

³⁴ Att. 56, Section V., Rules 8 and 9 of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department.

³⁵ Att. 38, G02-01 III (B), Protection of Human Rights (effective October 5, 2022, to present); G02-04 II (C), Prohibition Regarding Racial Profiling and Other Bias Based Policing (effective February 01, 2023, to present).

³⁶ Att. 38, G02-01 III (B).

³⁷ Att. 38, G02-01 III(D).

Here, Officer Jenkins explained he never referred to ██████ as a “hoe” and actually referred to ██████ as a “ha” and claimed he stated, “Get ha out of here.”³⁸ COPA does not find Officer Jenkins’s explanation convincing in context nor substance. Rather, BWC evidence more likely than not captures Officer Jenkins saying words to the effect of, “Get her out of here, get yo hoe ass out.”³⁹ Contextually, Officer Jenkins’s explanation simply does not make sense – and is not supported by the evidence.

With regard to calling ██████ a “bitch,” Officer Jenkins admitted to saying that and said he did so because ██████ had thrown something at him.⁴⁰ Lastly, when Officer Jenkins was asked about stating words to the effect of “bitch ass nigga,” he explained that it was not directed at anyone, no other citizens were around, and he only said it out of duress to himself.⁴¹ While COPA understands that frustrating and stressful situations may give rise to the use of certain language, Officer Jenkins’s explanation is simply no excuse for using the type of words he did in that situation. Therefore, COPA finds that Allegations 3, 4, and 5, are **Sustained**.

B. Officer Lakeidra Bolin

i. Firearm Display

COPA finds Allegation 1 that Officer Bolin displayed a firearm, without justification, is **Not Sustained**. Under CPD Department Notice D19-01: Firearm Pointing Incidents, Department members are not required to make a notification for any unholstering or display of a firearm or having the firearm in a “ready” position (e.g., low ready, position “SUL”) or any other position during the course of an incident, unless the firearm is pointed at the person.⁴⁴ Additionally, Department Rules and Regulation prohibit officers from unlawful or unnecessary use or display of a weapon.⁴⁵

Here, Officer Bolin told COPA that she had unholstered her firearm and kept it at a low ready position.⁴⁶ However, Officer Bolin explained that she responded to a 10-1 situation and encountered a full house and a combative individual who looked like he was charging at them.⁴⁹ Officer Bolin told COPA she withdrew her weapon in part to protect herself from the combative individual who was shouting things such as “I’m going to kill you, I’m going to kick your ass, I’m going to do X, Y, and Z.”⁵¹ Officer Bolin could not recall if she made a pointing notification, but COPA obtained the OEMC records, which showed she did notify OEMC of the incident, despite

³⁸ Att. 37, Pg. 17, Lns. 1 to 10.

³⁹ Att. 30, at 12:27 to 12:32.

⁴⁰ Att. 37, Pg. 18, Lns. 2 to 20.

⁴¹ Att. 37, Pg. 17, Ln. 11 to Pg. 19, Ln. 10.

⁴⁴ Att. 53, D19-01: Firearm Pointing Incidents II (B).

⁴⁵ Att. 56, Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department, Rule 38.

⁴⁶ Att. 47, Officer Bolin’s COPA Statement, at Pg. 10, Lns. 7 to 12.

⁴⁹ Att. 47, at Pg. 9, Lns. 3 to 18.

⁵¹ Att. 47, at Pg. 14, Ln. 2 to Ln. 9.

not technically being required to by D19-01.⁵³ For these reasons, COPA finds Allegation 1, is **Not Sustained**.

C. Sergeant Anthony Ceja

i. Failure to De-Escalate

COPA finds Allegation 1 that Sgt. Ceja failed to comply with S04-20 by not using de-escalation techniques such as time as a tactic, containment, or calm and controlled communication when responding to an individual in crisis, is **Sustained**. Under CPD directive S04-20, Department members are committed to interact with individuals in crisis with dignity, respect and the foremost regard for the preservation of human life and the safety of all persons involved.⁵⁴ S04-20 further requires officers to use appropriate crisis intervention techniques and using time as a tactic when there is time to negotiate, de-escalate, and request additional resources to ensure the safety of all persons involved.⁵⁵

In this case, Sgt. Ceja failed to use de-escalation tactics when he encountered an individual, [REDACTED] whom he had prior knowledge was experiencing a mental health crisis. It is true, Sgt. Ceja encountered a stressful situation with multiple people in a room yelling at him and refusing to comply with verbal commands.⁵⁶ However, Sgt. Ceja refused to embrace the tactics of de-escalation, such as time and containment – especially considering the number of officers on the scene. Rather, Sgt. Ceja allowed the verbal antagonizing from the civilians to get to him, which led to a further escalation of the incident. While COPA understands that these experiences can be fraught with frustration for the officers – it is still their duty to de-escalate the situation whenever safety allows. For these reasons, COPA finds Allegation 1, is **Sustained**.

ii. Verbal Abuse

COPA finds Allegation 2 that Sgt. Ceja used profane language in the direction of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] **Sustained**. CPD Rules and Regulations 8 and 9 prohibit members from engaging in unjustified verbal altercations and/or maltreating or disrespecting any person.⁶⁴ Additionally, CPD policy mandates that all “members treat all persons with courtesy and dignity which is inherently due every person as a human being.”⁶⁵ And that Department members will “act, speak, and conduct themselves in a professional manner ... and maintain a courteous attitude in all contacts with the

⁵³ Att. 47, at Pg. 10, Ln.18 to Pg. 11, Ln. 3.

⁵⁴ Att. 55, S04-20: Recognizing and Responding to Individuals in Crisis II (A) (effective 03 April, 2023 to 18 August, 2023).

⁵⁵ Att. 55, S04-20: Recognizing and Responding to Individuals in Crisis II (A) (effective 03 April, 2023 to 18 August, 2023).

⁵⁶ Att. 26, Sgt. Ceja BWC at 8:40 to 11:00.

⁶⁴ Att. 56, Section V., Rules 8 and 9 of the Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department.

⁶⁵ Att. 38, G02-01 III (B), Protection of Human Rights (effective October 5, 2022, to present); G02-04 II (C), Prohibition Regarding Racial Profiling and Other Bias Based Policing (effective February 01, 2023, to present).

public.”⁶⁶ Furthermore, members will not exhibit a condescending attitude or direct any derogatory terms toward any person in any manner and will not use language or take action intended to taunt or denigrate an individual, including using racist or derogatory terms.⁶⁷

In this case, when asked about the language used during this event, Sgt. Ceja admitted to using derogatory terms, stating, “I did say derogatory terms.”⁶⁸ Sgt. Ceja said he “shouldn’t have said that” but blamed the “high-stress situation.”⁶⁹ While COPA understands that frustrating and stressful situations may give rise to the use of certain language, CPD directive requires members to operate at the highest level of professionalism and maintain respect. Therefore, COPA finds Allegation 2, is **Sustained**.

iii. Firearm Display

COPA finds Allegation 3 that Sgt. Ceja displayed his firearm, is **Not Sustained**. Under CPD Department Notice D19-01: Firearm Pointing Incidents, 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.⁷⁰ Additionally, whenever a department member points a firearm at a person while in the performance of his or her duties, the member will notify OEMC promptly after the incident has concluded.⁷¹

In this case, Sgt. Ceja explained that when ██████ ran to the back and then ran to the front towards them, Sgt. Ceja believed he was armed.⁷² Moreover, despite several verbal orders, ██████ would not show his hands until Sgt. Ceja pointed his firearm.⁷³ Even though ██████ was not armed, Sgt. Ceja explained that, based on his experience, ██████ was exhibiting behavior that showed ██████ might be armed.⁷⁴ While COPA finds Sgt. Ceja’s explanation is plausible, there is not enough evidence to support a clear and convincing exoneration of Sgt. Ceja’s weapon display. Therefore, COPA finds Allegation 3, is **Not Sustained**.

iv. Improper Use of a Taser

COPA finds Allegation 4, that Sgt. Ceja failed to comply with G03-02-4 by failing to give verbal commands and warnings prior to, during, and after the discharge of the taser, is **Sustained**. Under CPD directive G03-02-04: Taser Use Incidents, members who discharge a taser device will give verbal commands and warnings prior to, during, and after the discharge of the taser.⁷⁵

⁶⁶ Att. 38, G02-01 III (B).

⁶⁷ Att. 38, G02-01 III (B).

⁶⁸ Att. 52, Sgt. Ceja’s Transcribed statement, Pg. 18, Ln. 21 to Pg. 22, Ln. 4

⁶⁹ Att. 52, Pg. 18, Ln. 21 to Pg. 22, Ln. 4

⁷⁰ Att. 53, D19-01 II (E)

⁷¹ Att. 53, D19-01 III (A)

⁷² Att. 52, Pg. 21, Lns. 15 to 20

⁷³ Att. 52, Pg.22, Ln. 17 to Pg. 23, Ln. 8

⁷⁴ Att. 52, at Pg. 23, Lns. 19 to 21

⁷⁵ Att. 54, G03-02-04: Taser Use Incidents III (B) (effective 15 April 2021 to 28 June 2023)

In this case, Sgt. Ceja explained to COPA that he is familiar with CPD directive G03-02-4 and explained that he was allowed to use his taser on an assailant.⁷⁶ He also explained that members are supposed to announce it if it is safe and feasible, but he did not have time to do so. However, he announced it after the deployment of the taser.⁷⁷ When asked if there were any verbal commands prior to deploying the taser, Sgt. Ceja stated he could not issue any due to [REDACTED] fighting with officers, but he did yell out, “Tase him.”⁷⁸ COPA asked Sgt. Ceja if stating, “Fuck him, tase that mother fucker,” was a warning, to which Sgt. Ceja stated, “I, I yelled out taser, so yeah. I mean, I, I, I, would take it as a warning.”⁷⁹ COPA does not believe the Department would agree with Sgt. Ceja’s interpretation of G03-02-04. Rather, based on the provisions of G03-02-04, COPA finds that Sgt. Ceja did not give sufficient warning prior to deploying his taser. Therefore Sgt. Ceja was in violation of CPD directive G03-02-04 and finds Allegation 4, is **Sustained**.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Officer Jamaul Jenkins

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History⁸¹

Officer Jamaul Jenkins has received 18 total awards, including 15 honorable mentions, one life saving award, and one Department Commendation. Officer Jenkins has received three SPARs, one for being absent/leaving duty assignment, one for failure to have a current IL license plate and/or city vehicle sticker, and another for a preventable accident. Officer Jenkins received a reprimand for the license plate and/or city vehicle sticker violation. Officer Jenkins received no disciplinary action for the two other SPARs. Officer Jenkins received a 5-day suspension for a 2020 excessive force incident. Officer Jenkins also received a 1-day suspension for a neglect of duty incident in 2021.

ii. Recommended Discipline

Here, COPA has found that Officer Jenkins has violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10 by forcibly directing [REDACTED] into a wall and by using profane and/or abusive language in the direction of civilians, in violation of CPD policy. Officer Jenkins refused to take accountability for his language and even attempted to offer extraordinarily unlikely alternatives (including claiming to say “Ha” rather than “Hoe”).⁸² Considering these factors, along with Officer Jenkins’s history, COPA recommends a Violation Noted and sensitivity training.

⁷⁶ Att. 52, Pg. 24, Ln. 2 to Ln. 19

⁷⁷ Att. 52, Pg. 24, Ln. 2 to Ln. 19

⁷⁸ Att. 52, Pg. 24, Ln. 22 to Pg. 25, Ln. 1

⁷⁹ Att. 52, Pg. 25, Ln. 23 to Pg. 26, Ln. 22

⁸¹ Att. 44, Officer Jenkins Complimentary and Disciplinary History

⁸² Att. 37, Pg 17, Lns. 1 to 10.

b. Sgt. Anthony Ceja

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History⁸³

Sgt. Anthony Ceja has received 102 total awards, including 63 honorable mentions, seven Department commendations, and five complimentary letters. Sgt. Ceja does not have a record of sustained complaints nor SPARs on his record.

ii. Recommended Discipline

Here, COPA has found that Sgt. Ceja has violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10 by failing to de-escalate, using profane language, and failing to provide verbal commands and warnings prior to discharging his taser, in violation of CPD policy. Sgt. Ceja provided useful context to help understand the high-stress situation he was presented. However, he also knew [REDACTED] was experiencing a mental health crisis prior to arriving and failed to use the de-escalation tactics prescribed in S04-20.

Sgt. Ceja took accountability for his choice of words, admitting that it was a high-stress situation and that he should not have responded that way.⁸⁴ Considering these factors, along with Sgt. Ceja’s history, COPA recommends Violation Noted and sensitivity training.

Approved:

[REDACTED SIGNATURE]

4-24-2025

Angela Hearts-Glass
Deputy Chief Administrator-Chief Investigator

Date

⁸³ Att. 57, Sgt. Anthony Ceja Complimentary and Disciplinary History
⁸⁴ Att. 52, Pg. 18, Ln. 21 to Pg. 22, Ln. 4.

Appendix A

Case Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	June 6, 2023/ 07:44 am/ 4178 S. Drexel BLVD, Chicago, IL, 60653
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	June 6, 2023/ 12:47 pm
Involved Member #1:	Jamaul Jenkins, Star #8917, Employee ID # [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: June 16, 2017, Unit of Assignment: 002, Male, Black or African American
Involved Member #2	Lakeidra Bolin, Star #166694, Employee ID # [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: December 15, 2017, Unit of Assignment: 002, Female, Black or African American
Involved Member #3	Anthony Ceja, Star #1005, Employee ID # [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: October 29, 2007, Unit of Assignment: 002, Male,
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] Male, Black or African American
Involved Individual #2:	[REDACTED] Female, Black or African American
Involved Individual #3:	[REDACTED] Male, Black or African American

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.
- Rule __:** [Insert text of any additional rule(s) violated]

Applicable Policies and Laws

- G02-01: Protection of Human Rights (Effective June 30, 2022 to present)
- G03-02: De-Escalation, Response to Resistance, and Use of Force (Effective April 15, 2021, to June 28, 2023)
- G03-02-1: Response to Resistance and Force Options (Effective April 15, 2021 to June 28, 2023)
- S04-20: Recognizing and Responding to Individuals in Crisis (Effective April 23, 2023, to August 18, 2023)
- D19-01: Firearm Pointing Incidents (Effective November 1, 2019 to present)
- G03-02-04: Taser Use Incidents (Effective April 15, 2021 to June 28, 2023)

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.⁸⁵ 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.”⁸⁶

⁸⁵ 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).

⁸⁶ *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