



Log # 2022-0755

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On March 3, 2022, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received an initiation report from the 012th District reporting alleged misconduct by a member of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). Sgt. Kenneth Mok (Sgt. Mok) reported that on March 3, 2022, ██████ alleged that Officer Christine Taylor had verbally and physically abused ██████. ² Upon review of the evidence, COPA served allegations that Officer Christine Taylor struck ██████ in the face and in the eye and instructed her to lie to a school administrator. Following its investigation, COPA reached sustained findings regarding the allegations of verbally abusing ██████ by calling her a bitch and a hoe and by engaging in name-calling and condescension, degradation, and/or offensive and profane language.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE³

On March 3, 2022, ██████ requested a Police Officer to ██████ Elementary School to report an ongoing incident of child abuse by Officer Christine Taylor toward ██████ who is a minor child whom ██████ and Taylor ██████. During the incident, ██████ was in the custody of Officer Taylor. Officer Brendan Carney, who responded to the incident, spoke with school officials⁴ and ██████ who reported that on March 2, 2022, Officer Taylor slapped ██████ causing her to fall to the floor. Officer Carney notified his supervisor, Sgt. Mok, who later submitted an initiation report regarding the incident.

It was further alleged that on at least three separate dates between 2020 and 2021, Officer Taylor physically abused ██████ by striking her and/or pulling her hair. Officer Taylor stated that the allegations were not true and that the most physical contact between her and ██████ was hitting one another's hands when she would try to take her phone from her.⁵ It was further alleged that Officer Taylor instructed ██████ to lie to school officials regarding how she got

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 police reports, civilian interviews, and officer interviews.

⁴ ██████ contacted the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) who also responded to the school. Following its investigation, DCFS unfounded the abuse allegations.

⁵ Att.40 PO Taylor Statement 11Jan24, 53:30

a black eye,⁶ which Officer Taylor also denied in her statement.⁷ According to Officer Taylor, [REDACTED] obtained the black eye⁸ while playing with her brother⁹ and hit her face on a bedpost.¹⁰

During the audio interview with [REDACTED] she alleged that on March 2, 2022, Officer Taylor was angry because she did not assist her with the groceries and dishes. Officer Taylor instructed her to take off her glasses,¹¹ and she struck [REDACTED] on the back. When [REDACTED] fell to the floor, Officer Taylor kicked her on the back.¹² [REDACTED] also described an incident where she was seated in the backseat of the car and Officer Taylor became angry when she was using her cell phone while Officer Taylor was driving. She stated that Officer Taylor turned around and began pulling her hair and striking her on the face¹³ until [REDACTED] kicked her on the face.¹⁴

COPA obtained multiple phone recordings of Officer Taylor cursing and using degrading language toward [REDACTED]. In these recordings, Officer Taylor can be heard calling [REDACTED] a bitch multiple times.¹⁵ Officer Taylor admits to cursing at [REDACTED] but denies any abuse or throwing deodorant at [REDACTED].¹⁶

III. ALLEGATIONS

PO Christine Taylor:

1. It is alleged that on or about March 2, 2022, at or near [REDACTED] the accused, Officer Christine Taylor, struck [REDACTED] on the head and/or kicked her about the back.
 - Not Sustained.
2. It is alleged that in December 2021, the accused, Officer Christine Taylor, struck [REDACTED] about the face and/or pulled her by the hair.
 - Not Sustained.
3. It is alleged that on an unknown date and time in 2020, the accused, Officer Christine Taylor, threw deodorant in [REDACTED] direction, striking her on the eye.
 - Not Sustained.
4. It is alleged that on an unknown date and time in 2020, the accused, Officer Christine Taylor, instructed [REDACTED] to lie to the school administration regarding her injury.

⁶ Att.40 PO Taylor Statement 11Jan24, 27:35

⁷ Att.40 Officer Taylor Statement 11Jan24,39:09

⁸ Att. 5, pg. 40, lns. 20 to 22 - According to [REDACTED] when she was in 5th grade, her mother became angry at her because she did not fold the laundry. She then asked [REDACTED] why she did not wear deodorant and threw the deodorant at [REDACTED] Tyler, striking her about the left eye. [REDACTED] sustained a black eye, a bruise and swelling under her eye. [REDACTED] stated that her mother told her to tell school personnel that she struck her face on the bed frame playing with her brother.

⁹ Josiah Taylor corroborated Officer Taylor's account. He related that he and [REDACTED] were horseplaying on the bed and she struck her face. He was not interviewed by DCFS.

¹⁰ Att.40 Officer Taylor Statement 11Jan24, 35:30

¹¹ Att. 5 pg. 35, lns. 1 to 2

¹² Att. 5 Pg 40, lns. 2 to 24

¹³ Att. 5 pg. 40, lns. 20 to 22

¹⁴ Att. 5, pg. 41, lns. 3 to 4

¹⁵ Att.20 Recording 1, 0:08

¹⁶ Att.40 Officer Taylor Statement 11Jan24,1:10:15

- Not Sustained.
- 5. It is alleged that on several unspecified dates and times, the accused, Officer Christine Taylor, verbally abused [REDACTED] in that she called her a bitch and/or a hoe.
 - **Sustained. Violation of Rules 2 and 8.**
- 6. It is alleged that on unknown dates and times, the accused, Officer Christine Taylor, verbally abused [REDACTED] in that she engaged in name-calling, and/or condescension, and/or degradation, and/or offensive and profane language.
 - **Sustained. Violation of Rules 2 and 8.**

IV. CREDIBILITY ASSESSMENT

This investigation did not reveal any evidence that caused COPA to question the credibility of any witnesses.

V. ANALYSIS¹⁷

a. Officer Taylor physically abused [REDACTED]

COPA recommends a finding of Not Sustained for allegations # 1-4, that Officer Taylor physically abused [REDACTED] on various dates and times. After a review of the available evidence, COPA could not find sufficient evidence to support the allegations and claims of the complainant. COPA spoke with school officials and obtained DCFS records but was unable to find evidence that would support any of the allegations of physical abuse. [REDACTED] never received any medical treatment or had pictures taken of her injuries. Officer Taylor stated in an audio-recorded statement that [REDACTED] obtained the black eye while playing with her brother and hit her face on a bedpost.¹⁸ For these reasons, COPA recommends a finding of Not Sustained.

b. Officer Taylor verbally abused [REDACTED]

COPA recommends a finding of Sustained for allegations #5-6, that Officer Taylor verbally abused [REDACTED]. COPA obtained multiple recordings of verbal altercations between Officer Christine Taylor and [REDACTED]. On the recordings, Officer Taylor can be heard using degrading and profane language toward [REDACTED]. Officer Taylor can be heard saying, “Okay, bitch. Did I ever train you, bitch to walk around with your mother fucking phone in your hand and push a shopping cart? Can you do both, bitch?” while talking to [REDACTED].¹⁹ During an audio-recorded statement, Officer Taylor admitted to cursing at [REDACTED] relating to the recorded voice messages.²⁰

COPA has determined that the actions of Officer Taylor are in violation of Rule 2: Any action or conduct which impedes the Department’s efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings

¹⁷ For a definition of COPA’s findings and standards of proof, *see* Appendix B.

¹⁸ Att. 40 PO Taylor Statement January 11, 2024, 35:30

¹⁹ Att. 20 Recording 1, 0:12; Att. 21

²⁰ Att. 40 PO Taylor Statement January 11, 2024, 1:10:15

discredit upon the Department and Rule 8: Disrespect to or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty. For these reasons, COPA recommends findings of **Sustained**.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Officer Christine Taylor

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History²¹

Officer Taylor has received 41 awards including 16 honorable mentions and 1 meritorious award and one reprimand in 2023 for inattention to duty (SPAR).

ii. Recommended Discipline

Here, COPA has found that Officer Taylor violated Rules 8 and 9 by using derogatory and degrading language towards [REDACTED] Officer Taylor's behavior does not align with CPD's Rules and Regulations. Based on this information, combined with Officer Taylor's history, COPA recommends a suspension of up to 30 days and Parenting Classes.

Approved:

[REDACTED]

March 15, 2024

Shannon Hayes
Director of Investigations – Chief Investigator

Date

²¹ Att. 42.

Appendix A**Case Details**

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	March 2, 2022/18:00H/[REDACTED] St., Chicago, IL 60612
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	March 3, 2022/14:41H
Involved Officer #1:	Christine Taylor, Star #: 13699, Employee ID#: [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: 25 AUG 2003, Unit of Assignment: 020/193, Female, Black
Involved Officer #2:	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Involved Officer #3:	Kenneth Mok, Star #: 1990, Employee ID#: [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: 16 DEC 1991, Unit of Assignment: 012, Male, Asian Pacific Islander
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] Female, 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 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

- 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 8: Disrespect to or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty.

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.²² For example, if the evidence gathered in an investigation establishes that it is more likely that the conduct complied with Department 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.”²³

²² 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).

²³ *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