



Log # 2024-0006776

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On August 22, 2024, at 7:02 p.m., Complainant ██████████ telephoned COPA and subsequently filed a complaint via COPA’s website, stating that she, her husband, her neighbors, and her cousins were sitting on the porch when officers approached and said they were responding to a domestic incident. ██████████ responded that there was no domestic incident, and she had her husband’s grandmother, who owns the property, tell the officers the same. ██████████ stated that the officers asked what was in their cups, grabbed her neighbor, ██████████ by the arm, and told him to stand up. ██████████ asked the officers to stop because no one had done anything wrong, and at that time, assist units arrived on the scene. ██████████ related that she “slid down”² and shielded her neighbor, screaming at the officers to please get off her property. She alleged that the officers used excessive force against her, her family, and the neighbor.

Upon review of the evidence, COPA served allegations against Officers DJ Pacheco, Jonathan Mondragon, and Carlos Manarpaac-Alvarez. COPA found that Officer Pacheco committed misconduct when he pointed his weapon at ██████████ without justification, failed to make a weapons pointing notification to OEMC, failed to activate his body-worn camera (BWC) in a timely manner, and engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with ██████████. Additionally, COPA found that Officers Mondragon and Manarpaac-Alvarez failed to activate their BWCs in a timely manner.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE⁴

On August 22, 2024, Officers Pacheco, Mondragon, and Manarpaac-Alvarez were in the 003rd District when Sergeant Bruno, who was working in the SDSC⁵ room, told them to investigate an individual sitting on a porch. The officers relocated to ██████████. Upon arrival, Officers Pacheco, Mondragon, and Manarpaac-Alvarez exited their vehicle and approached said location. Officer Mondragon was the driver, Officer Pacheco was the front seat passenger, and Officer Manarpaac-Alvarez was in the back seat. Officer Pacheco stated that he observed a male,

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. 16.

³ ██████████ was one of the individuals gathered on the family’s property at the time the officers arrived at the location.

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 POD footage, BWC footage, CPD reports, and officer statements.

⁵ SDSC – Strategic Decision Support Center.

now known as ██████████ who matched the description provided by Sergeant Bruno, and was sitting on the porch. There were numerous individuals gathered near the porch area, and the officers were taken aback by the number of people present. Once the officers approached the porch, ██████████ gave multiple cues that he might be armed, so the officers attempted to detain him.⁶

Simultaneously, ██████████ stood behind the officers, in a bladed stance, and he was the only person not saying anything. Officer Pacheco told COPA that ██████████ turned his body away from the officers and pushed his body up against a fence, as if he was trying to conceal something like a firearm or contraband.⁷ Officer Pacheco asked ██████████ what was going on, but ██████████ did not respond.⁸ Officer Pacheco told his partner to keep an eye on ██████████ because he believed ██████████ could possibly be armed. Officers Mondragon and Pacheco spoke to ██████████ while Officer Manarpaac-Alvarez stood behind them.

The officers attempted to detain ██████████ but he immediately fled on foot. Officer Manarpaac-Alvarez ran after ██████████ and Officer Pacheco followed.⁹ ██████████ tripped, and Officer Manarpaac-Alvarez attempted to detain him when a tussle ensued.¹⁰ Officer Pacheco acknowledged that he used profanity due to the high-stress situation, but he stated it was not intentional.¹¹ While the officers struggled with ██████████ a female approached and Officer Pacheco observed her reach for her waistband. Officer Pacheco unholstered his weapon, but he held it at the low ready position upon observing that the female was only holding a cell phone.¹² Officer Manarpaac-Alvarez continued yelling at ██████████ to stop reaching, and he had his taser out.¹³ Officer Pacheco stated that ██████████ had a big bulge and appeared to have an L-shaped object in his right pocket, which he believed was consistent with a firearm.¹⁴

Officer Pacheco said that he held his firearm in a low ready position, towards ██████████ because he thought ██████████ was reaching for his firearm.¹⁵ Officer Pacheco characterized ██████████ as an assailant and conducted a knee strike and an emergency takedown, at which point the officers placed ██████████ into custody.¹⁶ The officers then retrieved a firearm from ██████████. Officer Pacheco said he had no idea where Officers Orsi, Leoni, and Farano were during this incident, nor did he know what happened with Officer Mondragon and the people on the porch.¹⁷

⁶ Att. 38, Pages 9-11.

⁷ Att. 38, Page 11, Lines 10-23.

⁸ Att. 38, Page 13, Lines 11-17.

⁹ Att. 38, Page 14, Lines 1-17.

¹⁰ Att. 6 at 2:43; Att. 38, Page 14, Lines 20-24.

¹¹ Att. 38, Page 15, Lines 8-16.

¹² Att. 7 at 3:06; Att. 38, Page 16, Lines 3 to Page 17, Line 6.

¹³ Att. 38, Page 17, Lines 10-14.

¹⁴ Att. 38, Page 20, Lines 1-9.

¹⁵ Att. 38, Page 17, Lines 1-9.

¹⁶ Att. 38, Page 21, Lines 13-21.

¹⁷ Att. 38, Page 22, Lines 7-23.

Officer Manarpaac-Alvarez provided a similar account of the incident to COPA. He denied the allegation that he failed to activate his BWC in a timely manner but acknowledged that he activated it three to four minutes after arriving at the scene.¹⁸

Officer Mondragon essentially stated the same as Officers Pacheco and Manarpaac-Alvarez, but added that Sergeant Bruno had observed ██████ on POD video repeatedly manipulating a heavy-weighted object along his waistband.¹⁹ Based on Sergeant Bruno's observations, Officer Mondragon and his partners relocated to 71st and Rhodes Ave to conduct an investigatory stop.²⁰ Upon arrival, Officer Mondragon was thrown off by the number of people at the scene, as he had expected only two people.²¹ Officer Mondragon engaged the people on the porch to assess the situation, knowing that ██████ might have a firearm. Officer Mondragon asked ██████ if he had a firearm and to step off the porch, while simultaneously, Officers Pacheco and Manarpaac-Alvarez took off running after ██████.²² Officer Mondragon recalled that a female and other individuals tried to take his focus off ██████ but Officer Mondragon and other assist officers placed ██████ into custody and retrieved a firearm.²³ Officer Mondragon did not see the interaction between ██████ and Officers Pacheco and Manarpaac-Alvarez because he was dealing with ██████ who was still on the porch.²⁴ Officer Mondragon denied the allegation that he failed to activate his BWC in a timely manner.²⁵

Officers Gina Orsi, Michael Leoni, and Robert Farano each provided accounts of the incident similar to that of Officer Mondragon. Officer Orsi added that, upon arrival at the scene, she observed multiple people engaged with the police.²⁶ Officer Orsi described seeing a black female, now known as ██████ stand up and physically block the officers who were attempting to place handcuffs on ██████. Officer Orsi also heard Officer Farano say that ██████ hit him. Officer Orsi tried to remove ██████ from the porch area so she could be placed in custody for battering a police officer. Another individual, identified as ██████ grabbed Officer Orsi's arm and tried to impede the arrest.²⁷

Officer Farano told COPA that, upon his arrival at the scene, he walked up the porch stairs to make his presence known and attempted to assist in detaining ██████. At that point, ██████ became upset, started causing a disturbance, and struck him in the face.²⁸ Officer Farano placed ██████ in custody and assisted in placing ██████ in custody.²⁹ Officer Farano did not recall

¹⁸ Att. 43, Pages 16-17, Lines 20-24, 1-4.

¹⁹ Att. 39, Pages 5-6, Lines 19-24, 1-12.

²⁰ Att. 39, Page 6, Lines 11-23.

²¹ Att. 39, Page 6, Lines 17-23.

²² Att. 39, Page 7, Lines 13-24.

²³ Att. 39, Page 8, Lines 10-20.

²⁴ Att. 39, Page 9, Lines 1-9.

²⁵ Att. 39, Page 13, Lines 12-24, Page 16, Lines 5-24.

²⁶ Att. 42, Page 6, Lines 17-24.

²⁷ Att. 42, Page 10, Lines 8-18.

²⁸ Att. 40, Page 6, Lines 9-15.

²⁹ Att. 40, Page 6, Lines 16-23.

seeing Officers Leoni, Pacheco, or Manarpaac-Alvarez on the scene, as he believed Officers Pacheco and Manarpaac-Alvarez were in a foot chase with ██████████³⁰

Officer Leoni was the transport officer and, upon arrival at the scene, observed ██████████ on the ground. Officer Leoni was able to grab ██████████ arm while the officers searched him. After ██████████ was searched, the officers lifted him off the ground and tried to take him to the transport vehicle, but ██████████ pulled away. The officers conducted an emergency takedown, and once they got ██████████ back up, they brought him to the transport vehicle and transported him to the 003rd District Station.³¹

Sergeant Brackin told COPA that he was monitoring the radio when he heard Beat 302S request assist units at 71st and Rhodes Ave. for a man with a gun.³² Upon arriving on the scene, Sergeant Brackin observed a group of people on the front porch of a house, and he saw officers remove someone from the front porch and conduct a takedown. Sergeant Brackin moved the person aside to de-escalate the situation, assess the situation, and gather as much information as he could.³³

Sergeant Brackin's BWC shows him arriving at the scene, a crowd yelling, and officers and individuals on the porch tussling, pulling, and pushing one another.³⁴ At that point, Sergeant Brackin tried to gain control of the scene while the officers were attempting an arrest.³⁵ Sergeant Brackin told COPA that he tried to move people back, de-escalate the situation, and protect the officers who were trying to effect the arrest.³⁶ Sergeant Brackin observed an officer retrieving a firearm from an individual on the ground, and he heard officers giving the individual commands to stop resisting.³⁷ Sergeant Brackin then learned that someone had fled on foot, so he went to the other location where Officers Pacheco and Manarpaac-Alvarez were located. He was told a firearm was recovered, and ██████████ was in custody. Due to the volatility of the scene, Sergeant Brackin instructed the officers to leave the area, but he ensured they ensured they completed TRRs.³⁸ Sergeant Brackin also completed a TRR for pushing a person back.

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer DJ Pacheco

1. Committed misconduct when he pointed his weapon at ██████████ without justification.

-- **Sustained** as a violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 10, 11 and D19-01.

³⁰ Att. 4.

³¹ Att. 41, Pages 6-8.

³² Att. 44, Pages 5-6.

³³ Att. 44.

³⁴ Att. 9 at 3:36.

³⁵ Att. 44, Page 6, Lines 1-24.

³⁶ Att. 44, Page 7, Lines 1-8.

³⁷ Att. 44, Page 8, Lines 4-13.

³⁸ Tactical Response Reports, Att. 45, 46, 47, 48, 52, and 53.

2. Failed to make a weapons pointing notification to OEMC.
 - **Sustained** as a violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10.
3. Committed misconduct when he failed to activate his body-worn camera in a timely manner in violation of Special Order S03-14.
 - **Sustained** as a violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10.
4. Engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with [REDACTED]
 - **Sustained** as a violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.

Officer Jonathan Mondragon

1. Committed misconduct when he failed to activate his body-worn camera in a timely manner in violation of Special Order S03-14.
 - **Sustained** as a violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10.

Officer Manarpaac-Alvarez

1. Committed misconduct when he failed to activate his body-worn camera in a timely manner in violation of Special Order S03-14.
 - **Sustained** as a violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10.

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 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.

COPA's investigation included the interviews of seven CPD members, four of whom were witness officers.³⁹ COPA found their statements were consistent with each other as well as with the video footage and written reports. COPA's investigation did not reveal any evidence that called into question the credibility of any of the involved parties who provided statements.

V. ANALYSIS⁴⁰

a. Officer DJ Pacheco

COPA finds Allegation 1 against Officer Pacheco, that he pointed his weapon at [REDACTED] without justification, is **Sustained**. Officer Pacheco denied the allegation and asserted that due to the totality of circumstances, his actions were justified.⁴¹

³⁹ COPA was unable to obtain formal interviews with any of the civilians involved in this incident. See CMS Notes.

⁴⁰ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, see Appendix B.

⁴¹ Att. 38, Page 26, Lines 16-18.

CPD directives provide that an officer 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 officer on the scene. 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 (e.g., possession or access to weapons).⁴²

In this case, BWC footage captured Officer Pacheco pointing his firearm directly at ██████ head.⁴³ (See Figure 1.) At the time, ██████ was lying on his back on the sidewalk. His right hand was holding onto the fence, and the officers appeared to be holding his left hand.⁴⁴ COPA recognizes that ██████ was armed, and a firearm was later recovered from his waistband. However, at the time of the firearm pointing, ██████ did not present a level of resistance or threat sufficient to justify Officer Pacheco's action. Officer Pacheco pointed and held his firearm just inches from ██████ head, creating an unnecessary safety risk for ██████ both officers, and the female bystander. Therefore, by a preponderance of the evidence, COPA finds this allegation is **Sustained** as a violation of D19-01 and Rules 2, 3, 6, 10, and 11.



Figure 1: Officer Pacheco's BWC shows him pointing his weapon at or near ██████ head.

COPA finds Allegation 2 against Officer Pacheco, that he failed to make a weapons-pointing notification to OEMC, is **Sustained**. Department Notice D19-01 requires all CPD

⁴² Att. 49, D19-01 (II)(E), Firearm Pointing Incidents (effective November 1, 2019 – April 14, 2025).

⁴³ Att. 7, at 3:09.

⁴⁴ Att. 7 at 2:55-3:12; Att. 6 at 2:50-3:10.

members who point a firearm at a person while in the performance of their duties to notify OEMC promptly after the incident.⁴⁵ Officer Pacheco acknowledged that he did not make the notification, but stated that it was an unintentional oversight due to the high-stress situation and the totality of the circumstances.⁴⁶ Therefore, this allegation is **Sustained** in violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10.

COPA finds Allegation 3 against Officer Pacheco, that he failed to activate his BWC in a timely manner, is **Sustained**. CPD policy requires members to record all law-enforcement-related encounters, including investigatory stops, arrests, foot and vehicle pursuits, and use-of-force incidents. CPD members must activate their BWC at the beginning of an incident and record the entire incident for all law-enforcement-related activities.⁴⁷ If exigent circumstances prevent the activation of a BWC at the beginning of an incident (e.g., the incident scene creates a situation where the initial activation of the BWC is unsafe, impractical, or impossible), the member will activate their BWC “as soon as practicable.”⁴⁸

Here, the BWC footage shows the officers arrived at the scene at approximately 4:45:20pm.⁴⁹ Officer Pacheco, however, did not activate his BWC until 4:47:32 pm,⁵⁰ more than two minutes after he began conducting the investigatory stop. Officer Pacheco said he failed to activate his BWC because he was scanning the area, it was a high-stress situation, and the number of individuals took him by surprise. He stated that once he realized they were going to go hands-on with the individuals, he immediately activated his BWC.⁵¹ Still, the evidence shows that Officer Pacheco had ample opportunity to activate his BWC before engaging with the individuals on the porch. For these reasons, COPA finds that Officer Pacheco failed to activate his BWC in a timely manner. Therefore, this allegation is **Sustained** as a violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10.

COPA finds Allegation 4 against Officer Pacheco, that he engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with ██████████ is **Sustained**. Officer Pacheco did not deny the allegation but stated that his use of profane language was not intentional, due to the high-stress situation and the totality of the circumstances.⁵² CPD’s Rules of Conduct list acts expressly prohibited for all members, including Rule 8, which states that officers may not engage in any behavior that would result in disrespect toward or maltreatment of any person.⁵³ Additionally, Rule 9 states that members are not permitted to engage in any unjustified verbal or physical altercation with any person.⁵⁴ Further, CPD policy requires officers to interact with all members of the public in an unbiased, fair, and respectful manner. CPD members must “treat all persons with the courtesy and dignity which is

⁴⁵ Att. 49, D19-01 (III)(A).

⁴⁶ Att. 38, Pages 26-27, Lines 22-24 and Lines 1-2.

⁴⁷ Att. 50, S03-14 (V)(A)(2), Body Worn Cameras (effective August 8, 2024 to present).

⁴⁸ Att. 50, S03-14 (V)(A)(3).

⁴⁹ Att. 6 at 00:10.

⁵⁰ Att. 7 at 02:00.

⁵¹ Att. 38, Page 27, Lines 8-12.

⁵² Att. 38, Page 27, Lines 15-17.

⁵³ Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department, (V) Rules of Conduct, Rule 8, pg. 7 (effective April 16, 2015 to present).

⁵⁴ Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department, (V) Rules of Conduct, Rule 9, pg. 7 (effective April 16, 2015 to present).

inherently due every person as a human being; [and] act, speak, and conduct themselves in a courteous, respectful, and professional manner.”⁵⁵ The BWC footage⁵⁶ and other evidence shows that Officer Pacheco failed to meet this standard of professionalism during this incident. Therefore, this allegation is **Sustained** as a violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.

b. Officer Jonathan Mondragon

COPA finds Allegation 1 against Officer Mondragon, that he failed to activate his BWC in a timely manner, is **Sustained**. CPD policy requires its members to record all law-enforcement-related encounters, including investigatory stops, arrests, foot and vehicle pursuits, and use-of-force incidents. CPD members must activate their BWC at the beginning of an incident and record the entire incident for all law-enforcement-related activities.⁵⁷ If exigent circumstances prevent the activation of a BWC at the beginning of an incident (e.g., the incident scene creates a situation where the initial activation of the BWC is unsafe, impractical, or impossible), the member will activate their BWC “as soon as practicable.”⁵⁸

Here, the BWC footage shows the officers arrived at the scene at approximately 4:45:20pm.⁵⁹ Officer Mondragon, however, did not activate his BWC until 4:47:11pm,⁶⁰ nearly two minutes after he began conducting the investigatory stop. Officer Mondragon explained that he was distracted and thrown off by the number of people he encountered on the porch. He initially thought there would be approximately two people, but when he arrived at the scene, there were about six or seven.⁶¹ Still, the evidence shows that Officer Mondragon had ample opportunity to activate his BWC before engaging with █████ and the others on the porch. For these reasons, COPA finds that Officer Mondragon failed to activate his BWC in a timely manner. Therefore, this allegation is **Sustained** as a violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10.

c. Officer Manarpaac-Alvarez

COPA finds Allegation 1 against Officer Manarpaac-Alvarez, that he failed to activate his BWC in a timely manner, is **Sustained**. As discussed above, CPD policy requires its members to activate their BWCs at the beginning of an incident and record the entire incident for all law-enforcement-related activities.⁶² The BWC footage shows the officers arrived at the scene at approximately 4:45:20pm,⁶³ but Officer Manarpaac-Alvarez did not activate his BWC until

⁵⁵ Att. 57, G02-01(III)(B)(1)-(3), Protection of Human Rights (effective June 30, 2022, to present)

⁵⁶ See generally, Att. 7 at 2:35 to 6:15.

⁵⁷ Att. 50, S03-14 (V)(A)(2).

⁵⁸ Att. 50, S03-14 (V)(A)(3).

⁵⁹ Att. 6 at 00:10.

⁶⁰ Att. 5 at 02:00.

⁶¹ Att. 39, Page 16, Lines 1-24.

⁶² Att. 50, S03-14 (V)(A)(2).

⁶³ Att. 6 at 00:10.

4:47:34pm.⁶⁴ Officer Manarpaac-Alvarez denied the allegation and added no further explanation.⁶⁵ Still, the evidence shows that Officer Manarpaac-Alvarez had ample opportunity to activate his BWC before engaging with the individuals on the porch. For these reasons, COPA finds that Officer Manarpaac-Alvarez failed to activate his BWC in a timely manner. Therefore, this allegation is **Sustained** as a violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Officer DJ Pacheco⁶⁶

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History

Officer Pacheco has been employed by CPD since March 16, 2020. He has received 29 awards, including two Department Commendations. He has not received any sustained complaints in the last five years.

Officer Pacheco has received four recent SPARs: one failure to timely activate BWC (1 Day off), one preventable accident (reprimand), one failure to perform assigned tasks (reprimand), and one court appearance violation (no disciplinary action). However, all of these SPARs were issued for misconduct that occurred after this incident.

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officer Pacheco violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, when he pointed his weapon at ██████████ without justification, failed to make a weapons pointing notification to OEMC, failed to timely activate his BWC, and engaged in an unjustified verbal altercation with ██████████. In recommending discipline, COPA acknowledges that ██████████ was in possession of a firearm, resisted being detained, and attempted to take possession of Officer Mondragon's Taser, creating a highly volatile and unsafe situation for all parties involved. In mitigation, Officer Pacheco accepted responsibility for his use of profanities and unprofessional language, failing to notify OEMC of the pointing incident, and failing to timely activate his BWC. He noted that his misconduct was unintentional in nature, and was due to the high stress of the incident and the numerous civilians on scene. Officer Pacheco denied the allegation of pointing his weapon at ██████████ and related that his actions were justified. In aggravation, however, Officer Pacheco's actions escalated an already tense situation with ██████████ created an unnecessary safety risk, and could have led to a potentially deadly outcome. His misconduct brought discredit to CPD and damaged the trust between CPD and members of the public.

For these reasons, COPA recommends that Officer Pacheco receive a **1 to 10 day suspension** and **retraining** on firearm pointing incidents (D19-01 (now S03-22)), BWC activation

⁶⁴ Att. 6 at 02:00.

⁶⁵ Att. 43, Page 15, Line 16.

⁶⁶ Att. 55

(S03-14), and the protection of human rights when interacting with members of the public (G02-01).

b. Officer Jonathan Mondragon⁶⁷

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History

Officer Mondragon has been with CPD since July 27, 2018. In that time, he has received 50 various awards, including five Department Commendation Awards. He has not received any sustained complaints in the last five years, or any recent SPARs.

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officer Mondragon violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10, when he failed to activate his BWC in a timely manner. In mitigation, COPA recognizes Officer Mondragon's lack of any disciplinary history. Additionally, Officer Mondragon credibly explained that the delay in his BWC activation was a result of encountering numerous civilians at the scene, instead of the one that he had anticipated. In aggravation, however, COPA notes that Officer Mondragon's delayed BWC activation hindered this investigation, as his BWC failed to record audio from the first two minutes of the incident, when Officer Mondragon encountered the large numbers of civilians.

Therefore, COPA recommends that Officer Mondragon receive a **reprimand** and **retraining** on BWC activation (S03-14).

c. Officer Carlos Manarpaac-Alvarez⁶⁸

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History

Officer Manarpaac-Alvarez has been with CPD since April 25, 2022. In that time, he has received 32 various awards, including two Department Commendations awards and One Life Saving Award. He has not received any sustained complaints in the last five years.

Officer Manarpaac-Alvarez has received two recent SPARs: one failure to perform assigned tasks (no disciplinary action), and one BWC violation (reprimand). However, both SPARs were issued for misconduct that occurred after this incident.

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA found that Officer Manarpaac-Alvarez violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10, when he failed to activate his BWC in a timely manner. In mitigation, COPA recognizes that Officer

⁶⁷ Att. 56

⁶⁸ Att. 54

Manarpaac-Alvarez had only been a police officer for two years at the time of the incident, and his misconduct may be attributed to inexperience and/or inadequate training. In aggravation, COPA notes that Officer Manarpaac-Alvarez's delayed BWC activation hindered this investigation, as his BWC failed to record audio from the first two minutes of the incident, when he encountered large numbers of civilians on scene.

For these reasons, COPA recommends that Officer Manarpaac-Alvarez receive a **reprimand** and **retraining** on BWC activation (S03-14).

Approved:



Steffany Hreno
Acting Deputy Chief Administrator

2/21/2026

Date

Appendix A

Case Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	August 22, 2024 / 4:50 pm / [REDACTED]
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	August 22, 2024 / 7:02 pm
Involved Member #1:	Officer DJ Pacheco, Star# 18162, Employee ID # [REDACTED] DOA: March 16, 2020, Unit of Assignment: 003, Male, White Hispanic
Involved Member #2:	Officer Jonathan Mondragon, Star#13036, Employee ID # [REDACTED] DOA: July 27, 2018, Unit of Assignment: 003/544, Male, White
Involved Member #3:	Officer Carlos Manarpaac-Alvarez, Star# 17832, Employee ID # [REDACTED] DOA: April 25, 2022, Unit of Assignment: 003, Male, White Hispanic
Involved Member #4:	Officer Michael Leoni, Star# 19543, Employee ID # [REDACTED] DOA: June 1, 2022, Unit of Assignment: 003, Male, White
Involved Member #5:	Officer Robert Farano, Star# 122763, Employee ID # [REDACTED] DOA: March 16, 2018, Unit of Assignment: 003/606, Male, White
Involved Member #6:	Officer Gina Orsi, Star# 16968, Employee ID # [REDACTED] DOA: December 12, 2016, Unit of Assignment: 003/142, Female, White
Involved Member #7:	Sergeant Connor Brackin, Star# 1898, Employee ID # [REDACTED] DOA: September 29, 2014, Unit of Assignment: 004, Male, White Hispanic
Involved Individual #1	[REDACTED], Male Black
Involved Individual #2	[REDACTED] Female, Black
Involved Individual #3	[REDACTED] Male, Black
Involved Individual #4	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]t, Male, 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 11:** Incompetency or inefficiency in the performance of duty.

Applicable Policies and Laws

- D19-01: Firearm Pointing Incidents (effective November 1, 2019 to April 14, 2025)
- S03-14: Body Worn Cameras (effective August 8, 2024 to present)
- G02-01: Protection of Human Rights (effective June 30, 2022, 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.⁶⁹ 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.”⁷⁰

⁶⁹ 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).

⁷⁰ *People v. Coan*, 2016 IL App (2d) 151036, ¶ 28 (quoting Illinois Pattern Jury Instructions, Criminal, No. 4.19 (4th ed. 2000)).

Appendix C

- 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