



Log # 2024-0002859

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On March 11, 2024, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received a complaint from Ms. [REDACTED] reporting alleged misconduct by members of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). Ms. [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) provided a telephone interview on April 8, 2024,² in her complaint, she alleged that on March 11, 2024, Officers Antonio Whitfield #19651 and Dexter Calhoun #17364 stopped, detained, and handcuffed her son [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) without justification. She also alleged that Officer Whitfield injured her son's finger while handcuffing him, failed to provide medical aid, and conducted a search on her son and her vehicle without justification.³ Upon reviewing the evidence, COPA served additional allegations that Officer Whitfield failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR), failed to provide [REDACTED] an Investigatory Stop Receipt, and failed to activate his Body-Worn Camera (BWC). Following its investigation, COPA reached sustained findings regarding the allegations of failing to complete an ISR, providing an ISR receipt, and failing to activate BWC.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE⁴

On March 11, 2024, Officers Whitfield and Calhoun were assigned to the 011th District Tactical Team on routine patrol in their unmarked vehicle near Iowa and St. Louis.⁵ During their patrol, the officers observed [REDACTED] disregarding a stop sign. Officers activated their emergency lights to stop the vehicle.⁶ [REDACTED] pulled to the left side of the street, abruptly exited the vehicle, and locked the doors with an unknown passenger inside. Before exiting the squad car, Officer Whitfield observed [REDACTED] bending down, exiting the vehicle, and locking the doors.⁷ The officers exited their squad car and conducted an Investigatory Stop,⁸ during which time Officer Calhoun activated his body-worn camera.⁹

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. 4.

³ 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.

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, Initiation Report, Arrest Report, Tactical Response Report (TRR), Case Reports, Event Query, Officer Interviews, etc.

⁵ Att. 31, at 5:10 to 5:18.

⁶ Att. 1, at 1:06.

⁷ Att.31,

at 5:26 to 5:35.

⁸ Att.1, at 1:57.

⁹ Att. 1, at 1:59. COPA must note that Officer Antonio Whitfield never activated his Body-Worn Camera during this incident.

As Officer Whitfield approached [REDACTED] he ([REDACTED] became irate, combative, and resistant towards his verbal commands and detainment.¹⁰ Officer Whitfield then tried to inform [REDACTED] of the reasons for the traffic stop, but he was not receptive. As [REDACTED] resisted, Officer Whitfield placed handcuffs on him and guided him to the rear of the vehicle.¹¹ [REDACTED] continued to argue with Officer Whitfield. Officer Whitfield requested [REDACTED] driver's license, and [REDACTED] said it was in his back pocket. [REDACTED] approached the officers, interfered with their traffic stop, and asked for her car keys.¹² Officer Calhoun intervened, informed her that they were conducting a traffic stop, and requested that she back away from [REDACTED] and Officer Whitfield.¹³ [REDACTED] said she was trying to get the keys to her vehicle.¹⁴ Officer Whitfield performed a protective pat-down on [REDACTED] and retrieved his driver's license. Officer Calhoun knocked on the passenger window and requested that the unknown passenger exit the vehicle. Officer Calhoun performed a protective pat-down on him and guided him to the rear of the vehicle.¹⁵

Officer Whitfield then conducted a name check of [REDACTED] and the vehicle license plate via his radio, which came back clear.¹⁶ Once the name and plate were cleared, Officer Whitfield searched the driver's immediate area of the vehicle.¹⁷ No weapons or contraband were found. Officer Whitfield removed the handcuffs, released [REDACTED] and gave him a verbal warning. No citations were issued. Officer Whitfield never activated his body-worn camera.

Officer Whitfield provided a statement to COPA,¹⁸ his statement was similar to the events recorded on Officer Calhoun's body-worn camera. Officer Whitfield denied having any knowledge of [REDACTED] finger injury, he stated that he was unaware of any type of injury.¹⁹ COPA provided photos of [REDACTED] injured finger during the statement,²⁰ Officer Whitfield confirmed the injuries via the photos but was unaware of the injury at the time of the traffic stop.²¹

Officer Calhoun provided a statement to COPA,²² his explanation was similar to the event that took place. Officer Calhoun denied knowing of [REDACTED] finger injury and was unaware he was injured.²³ Before the statement, COPA provided Officer Calhoun with photos of [REDACTED] injured finger.²⁴

Neither officer completed an Investigatory Stop Report for the traffic stop, the officers admitted in their statements that there was some confusion about the designee to complete the report.²⁵

¹⁰ Att.31, at 5:40 to 5:50. Att. 1, at 2:04 to 2:50.

¹¹ Att. 1, at 2:23. Att. 1, at 2:04 to 2:50.

¹² Att. 1, at 2:38 to 2:55.

¹³ Att. 1, at 2:43 to 2:50.

¹⁴ Att. 1, at 2:44.

¹⁵ Att. 1, at 3:11 to 3:55.

¹⁶ Att. 1, at 4:13.

¹⁷ Att.1, at 4:58. Att. 31, at 6:45.

¹⁸ Att. 31.

¹⁹ Att. 31. Att.36, pg. 13, Ins. 15 to 19.

²⁰ Att.5.

²¹ Att.31, at 11:22 to 11:46.

²² Att. 34.

²³ Att.34, at 7:49 to 7:57. Att. 36, pg.9, Ins. 17 to 21.

²⁴ Att.5.

²⁵ Att. 34, at 8:00 to 8:25. Att. 31, at 14:34 to 15:35.

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer Antonio Whitfield

1. Stopping, Detaining, and Handcuffing [REDACTED] without justification.
-Exonerated
2. Searching [REDACTED] vehicle without justification.
-Exonerated
3. Searching [REDACTED] without justification.
-Exonerated
4. Failing to provide medical aid to [REDACTED] finger.
-Not Sustained
5. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report.
-Sustained.
6. Failing to provide an Investigatory Stop Receipt.
-Sustained.
7. Failing to activate Body-Worn Camera.
-Sustained.

Officer Dexter Calhoun

1. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR).
-Sustained.
2. Failing to provide an Investigatory Stop Receipt.
-Sustained.

IV. CREDIBILITY ASSESSMENT

This investigation did not reveal any evidence that caused COPA to doubt the credibility of any of the individuals who provided statements.

V. ANALYSIS²⁶

a. The Detention of [REDACTED]

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Whitfield stopped, detained, and handcuffed [REDACTED] without justification, is **Exonerated**. CPD members are permitted to detain a person when there is Reasonable Articulate Suspicion (RAS) that a person is about to commit, is committing, or has committed a criminal offense.²⁷ This detention was an investigative stop. Reasonable articulable suspicion is defined as “an objective legal standard that is less than probable cause but more than hunch or general suspicion.”²⁸

Here, Officers Whitfield and Calhoun observed [REDACTED] disregarding a stop sign at Iowa and St. Louis, which was justification to stop the vehicle. Before exiting their squad car to conduct the traffic stop, Officer Whitfield observed [REDACTED] making furtive movements towards the floorboard of the vehicle, abruptly exiting the vehicle afterward, and locking the doors with an unknown passenger inside of the vehicle, which gave him reasonable articulable suspicion that [REDACTED] could be concealing a weapon or contraband inside of the vehicle, based on his behavior. Officer Whitfield approached [REDACTED] and tried to inform him of the reasons for the traffic stop; he was not receptive; instead, he became irate, combative, and resistant to verbal commands and detainment. Officer Whitfield placed [REDACTED] in handcuffs as a precautionary measure for officer safety and based on his irate behavior. He performed a protective pat-down, retrieved his driver’s license, and conducted a name and license plate check on the vehicle. Once the name and license plate check were cleared, Officer Whitfield removed the handcuffs, released him, and gave a verbal warning. No citations were issued. No weapon or contraband was found. COPA finds that Officer Whitfield acted within CPD policy, therefore, this allegation is **Exonerated**.

b. Failed to provide medical treatment

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Whitfield failed to provide medical aid to [REDACTED] finger is **Not Sustained**. [REDACTED] provided a statement to COPA,²⁹ in her statement, she alleged that Officer Whitfield injured her son’s finger during handcuffing and failed to provide medical aid to his finger. Officer Whitfield provided a statement to COPA,³⁰ and was shown photos of the injury to [REDACTED] finger.³¹ Officer Whitfield denied having any knowledge of the injury during the traffic stop but acknowledged the injury after photos were shown during his statement. Officer Whitfield never activated his body-worn camera and could not recall whether or not [REDACTED] complained of an injury during the traffic stop. Therefore, COPA finds insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegations by a preponderance of the evidence.

²⁶ For a definition of COPA’s findings and standards of proof, see Appendix B.

²⁷ Att. 32, S 04-13-09, Investigatory Stop System (effective July 10, 2017, to Present).

²⁸ Att. 32, S 04-13-09 II (C).

²⁹ Att.4.

³⁰ Att.31.

³¹ Att. 31. Att.5.

c. Investigatory Stop Report and Receipt

COPA finds the allegations that Officers Whitfield and Calhoun failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) is **Sustained**. Chicago Police Department members are required to complete an Investigatory Stop Report and provide the subject with an ISR receipt detailing the reasons for the stop.³² CPD members are required to complete an ISR for any stop that involves a Protective Pat Down or any other search. Furthermore, sworn members are required to provide the subject of the stop with the completed Investigatory Stop Receipt, which should include the event number, the reason for the stop, and the sworn member's name and star number, and failure to do so would be a violation of Rules 2,3,5,6, and 10.

In this case, Officers Whitfield and Calhoun conducted a traffic stop on [REDACTED] vehicle because they had disregarded the stop sign. Officers Whitfield and Officer Calhoun stopped, detained, placed handcuffs on [REDACTED] performed protective pat downs, searched the driver's immediate area, and requested his passenger out of the vehicle. Therefore, the officers were required to complete an ISR Report. Neither of the officers completed an ISR report. Both officers admitted in their statements that they failed to complete an ISR report.

COPA finds allegations that Officers Whitfield and Calhoun failed to provide [REDACTED] with ISR receipt is Sustained. Officer Whitfield never activated his body-worn camera, therefore there is no video evidence to verify whether or not they provided [REDACTED] with a receipt. In Officer Whitfield's statement to COPA,³³ he admitted that he had not completed an ISR report.³⁴ There was some confusion between the partners regarding who was the designee to complete the ISR report, neither of the officers completed the report. Officers Whitfield and Calhoun are responsible for ensuring that an ISR was completed and that an ISR receipt was provided to [REDACTED] because they were all involved in the traffic stop. Therefore, this allegation is **Sustained**.

d. Body-Worn Camera

COPA finds that the allegation that Officer Whitfield failed to activate his body-worn camera is **Sustained**. All Chicago Police Department members equipped with BWCs must "activate the system to event mode at the beginning of an incident and will record the entire incident for all law-enforcement related activities."³⁵ Officer Whitfield initially believed that activated his BWC but later admitted to not activating his body-worn camera.³⁶ Therefore, this allegation is **Sustained**.

³² Att. 32, S 04-13-09 (VIII) (A), Investigatory Stop System

³³ Att.31.

³⁴ Att. 31, at 14:34 to 15:35.

³⁵ Att. 33, S 03-14 V(A), Body Worn Cameras (effective December 29, 2023, to Present).

³⁶ Att. 31, at 13:45 to 14:31.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Officer Antonio Whitfield

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History³⁷

Officer Whitfield has a total of 83 awards, including one (1) 2019 Crime Reduction Award, two (2) Department Commendations, 76 Honorable Mentions, and one (1) Unit Meritorious Performance Award. Officer Whitfield had no complaint registered numbers with sustained findings in the last five (5) years. Officer Whitfield has received five (5) SPARS.

ii. Recommended Discipline

Here, COPA found that Officer Whitfield violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10 by failing to complete an investigatory stop report, not providing [REDACTED] with an ISR receipt, and failing to activate his BWC. Officer Whitfield admitted that he never completed the ISR and could not have provided [REDACTED] with a receipt. Officer Whitfield violated CPD policy by not activating his BWC. COPA recommends a suspension of up to 30 days.

b. Officer Dexter Calhoun

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History³⁸

Officer Calhoun has a total of 143 awards, including one (1) 2019 Crime Reduction Award, six (6) Department Commendations, 127 Honorable Mentions, and one (1) Superintendent's Award of Merit. Officer Calhoun had no complaint registered numbers with sustained findings in the last five (5) years. Officer Calhoun has received two (2) SPARS.

ii. Recommended Discipline

Here, COPA found that Officer Calhoun violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10 by failing to complete an investigatory stop report, and not providing [REDACTED] with an ISR receipt. Officer Calhoun admitted that he never completed the ISR and could not have provided [REDACTED] with a receipt. COPA recommends a suspension of up to 30 days.

Approved:

[REDACTED]

Sharday Jackson
Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator

October 30, 2024

Date

³⁷ Attachment 37.

³⁸ Attachment 37.

Appendix A**Case Details**

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	March 11, 2024 / 5:40 p.m. / 904 North St. Louis / Chicago, Illinois
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	March 11, 2024 / 6:17 p.m. /
Involved Officer #1:	Officer Antonio Whitfield / Star # [REDACTED] Employee # 127430/ Date of Appointment: December 19, 2019 / Unit of Assignment: 011 /Gender: Male / Race: Black
Involved Officer #2:	Officer Dexter Calhoun / Star # [REDACTED] Employee # 119280 / Date of Appointment: October 31, 2016 / Unit of Assignment: 011 /Gender: Male /Race: Black
Involved Individual #1:	Ms. [REDACTED] Female /White Hispanic
Involved Individual #2:	[REDACTED] / Male /

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

- S 04-13- 09, Investigatory Stop System (effective July 10, 2017, to Present)
- G 03-02-02, Body Worn Cameras (effective June 28, 2023, 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.³⁹ 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.”⁴⁰

³⁹ 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).

⁴⁰ *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