



Log # 2025-0004092

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On August 13, 2025, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received an initiation report from Sergeant (Sgt.) Anthony Onesto documenting alleged misconduct by a member of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). Sgt. Onesto alleged that on August 13, 2025, Sgt. Denna Wilson² struck ██████████ in the face.³ Upon review of the evidence, COPA served additional allegations that Sgt. Wilson failed to de-escalate the encounter with ██████████ and that Sgt. Wilson and Officer Alex Poskin failed to complete a Crisis Intervention Training (CIT) report for ██████████. Following its investigation, COPA reached sustained findings regarding the allegations of failing to complete a CIT report.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE⁴

On August 13, 2025, at approximately 1:56 pm, at or near 6201 S. Emerald Drive, Sgt. Wilson and Officer Poskin (collectively, “the officers”) responded to a 911 call reporting a disturbance inside of a Department of Child and Family Services (DCFS) Office.⁵ Upon arrival, Sgt. Wilson and Officer Poskin spoke with ██████████ who was one of ██████████ social workers. ██████████ related that ██████████ a minor in the care of DCFS, had left her placement, was upset with ██████████ and had thrown liquid on her. ██████████ requested that ██████████ be transported to a hospital for a mental health evaluation.⁶ Shortly afterwards, ██████████ walked into the lobby where Sgt. Wilson and Officer Poskin were speaking with ██████████. The officers attempted to speak with ██████████ however ██████████ appeared focused on ██████████. ██████████ asked ██████████ if she wanted to take another shower, suggesting that she was going to throw some other liquid on her.⁷ The officers observed that ██████████ had a bottle of lotion under her arm and attempted to remove it from her. ██████████ pulled away from the officers and pushed them. The

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 At the time of the incident, Sgt. Wilson was an officer. Due to Sgt. Wilson’s promotion, COPA obtained an affidavit override to address additional allegations that were not identified by Sgt. Onesto. Att. 20.

³ Att. 1. 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 BWC footage, police reports, civilian interviews, officer interview.

⁵ Atts. 13, 14, 16.

⁶ Att. 10 at 2:38-3:30

⁷ Att. 10 at 4:33-4:42.

officers attempted to gain control of [REDACTED] and handcuff her, at which point Officer Poskin used a leg sweep to conduct an emergency takedown of [REDACTED]⁸

This was followed by a struggle on the ground, during which Sgt. Wilson briefly placed her hand on [REDACTED] upper chest/neck area as a control technique.⁹ Officer Poskin and Sgt. Wilson were eventually able to handcuff [REDACTED] and bring her to a standing position. While Officer Poskin stood with [REDACTED] near the exit, [REDACTED] attempted to pull away from him, and then she spit on the floor. Sgt. Wilson, who was initially not near the exit, moved closer to her partner and [REDACTED] then spit a second time, this time directly at Sgt. Wilson's face. Sgt. Wilson responded by striking [REDACTED] in the face.¹⁰ In her Tactical Response Report (TRR), Sgt. Wilson explained that after [REDACTED] spit on her chin, it appeared that [REDACTED] was attempting to spit again. Sgt. Wilson "then attempted to redirect the subject's head/face area by using a focused pressure strike about the face area."¹¹

After striking [REDACTED] the officers walked her to the squad car. [REDACTED] was uncooperative and refused to sit upright in the rear of the squad car and demanded that she be released. [REDACTED] laid in the back of the squad car until supervisors and an ambulance arrived. Officers were instructed by sergeants who arrived on scene to transport [REDACTED] to St. Bernard Hospital for a mental health evaluation.

After the incident, Sgt. Wilson and Officer Poskin both completed TRRs to document their use of force; however, COPA was unable to locate any Crisis Intervention Training (CIT) reports related to this incident.

III. ALLEGATIONS

Sgt. Denna Wilson:

1. Failing to de-escalate the encounter with [REDACTED]
 - Exonerated
2. Using excessive force when striking [REDACTED] in the face
 - Exonerated
3. Failing to complete a Crisis Intervention Training (CIT) report for [REDACTED]
 - **Sustained, Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10**

Officer Alex Poskin:

1. Failing to complete a Crisis Intervention Training (CIT) report for [REDACTED]
 - **Sustained, Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10**

⁸ Att. 7; Att. 10 at 7:20.

⁹ Att. 10 at 7:39. COPA evaluated Sgt. Wilson's hand placement but determined that it did not warrant an excessive force allegation.

¹⁰ Att. 9 at 3:29-3:37

¹¹ Att. 6, pg. 5

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 to accurately recall the event from memory.

In his statement with COPA, Officer Poskin seemed to have genuinely forgotten to complete a CIT report for this incident. He explained that he is CIT certified and understood he needed to complete the report. Officer Poskin completed other documentation for this incident such as a TRR. In her statement to COPA, Sgt. Wilson, who was recently promoted to a sergeant in November 2025, explained that she was instructed to complete a TRR and other forms, which she did. Sgt. Wilson was able to provide a detailed account of the encounter with ██████ which was corroborated by both officers' BWC footage. An interview of ██████ further confirmed the initial call for assistance with ██████ also explained that she was battered by ██████ that ██████ did not comply with the officers' commands, and that ██████ was combative with the officers. Additionally, ██████ confirmed that she requested that ██████ be transported to the hospital for a mental health evaluation, and that she requested the involuntarily hospitalization as ██████ guardian.

Overall, COPA found the statements of the parties involved credible.

V. ANALYSIS¹²

a. Failing to de-escalate the encounter with ██████

COPA finds that Allegation #1 against Sgt. Wilson is **Exonerated**. CPD members are required to use de-escalation techniques to prevent or reduce the need force, unless doing so would place a person or a Department member at the immediate risk of harm, or de-escalation techniques would be clearly ineffective under the circumstances at the time.¹³ The policy also states that CPD members will provide a warning and exercise persuasion prior to the use of force.¹⁴

In her statement to COPA, Sgt. Wilson explained that she used de-escalation techniques by talking to ██████ for several minutes, attempting to gain ██████ compliance. Sgt. Wilson stated that she also used time as a tactic and tactical positioning.¹⁵ The BWC video corroborates Sgt. Wilson's account, showing that she repeatedly told ██████ to "hold on," "relax," and "chill," and that she asked ██████ to tell her what was going on.¹⁶ Additionally, in his statement to COPA,

¹² For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, see Appendix B.

¹³ Att. 27, G03-02 (II)(D) De-escalation, Response to Resistance, and Use of Force Options (effective June 28, 2023, to present).

¹⁴ Att. 27, G03-02 (II)(D)(2)(a).

¹⁵ Att. 26, pg. 9, Ins. 13-24 & pg. 10, Ins. 1-3.

¹⁶ Att. 10 at 4:53-5:41

Officer Poskin confirmed that both he and Sgt. Wilson used several de-escalation techniques, but they were unable to gain ██████ compliance.¹⁷ The evidence shows that Sgt. Wilson attempted to use various forms of de-escalation without compliance from ██████ who was dealing with a mental health crisis.

For these reasons, COPA finds there is clear and convincing evidence that Sgt. Wilson used de-escalation techniques in accordance with CPD policy. Therefore, the allegation is exonerated.

b. Using excessive force when striking ██████ in the face

COPA finds Allegation #2 against Sgt. Wilson, that she used excessive force when striking ██████ in the face, is **Exonerated**. CPD policy provides that, “Department members’ use of force must be objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional under the totality of the circumstance, including using the minimum amount of force needed under the circumstances.”¹⁸

In her statement to COPA, Sgt. Wilson stated that while waiting for the ambulance, ██████ became hostile and spit in her direction.¹⁹ Sgt. Wilson approached ██████ who then spit directly on Sgt. Wilson’s face. Sgt. Wilson stated that she redirected ██████ with a strike, and after the strike, ██████ complied.²⁰ Sgt. Wilson explained that being spit on posed a risk of a communicable disease, and that she needed to gain control so that ██████ would not spit again.²¹ Sgt. Wilson’s explanation is consistent with the other available evidence, including the BWC footage, Sgt. Wilson’s TRR, and the exposure report she completed after the incident.²² Additionally, ██████ told COPA that she observed ██████ being aggressive towards the officers, and that she observed ██████ spit at the officers.²³ Given the risk of exposure to bodily fluids, Sgt. Wilson acted quickly and effectively to prevent another battery. COPA further notes that CPD policy authorizes the use of direct mechanical strikes against assailants, and ██████ became an assailant when she spit on Sgt. Wilson.²⁴

For these reasons, COPA finds there is clear and convincing evidence that Sgt. Wilson’s use of force against ██████ was objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional under the totality of the circumstances. Therefore, the allegation is exonerated.

c. Failing to complete a Crisis Intervention Training (CIT) report for ██████

COPA finds the allegation against Sgt. Wilson and Officer Poskin, that they failed to complete a Crisis Intervention Training (CIT) report, is **Sustained**. CPD policy states that the CIT

¹⁷ Att. 32, pg. 11, lns. 1-23.

¹⁸ Att. 38, G03-02-01(II)(C)(1), Response to Resistance and Force Options (effective June 28, 2023, to present).

¹⁹ Att. 26, pg. 8, lns. 3-11.

²⁰ Att. 26, pg. 8, lns. 10-11.

²¹ Att. 9 at 3:32-3:34

²² Atts. 6, 10, and 12.

²³ Att. 40, pg. 4, ln. 22 to pg. 5, ln. 6.

²⁴ See Att. 38, G03-02-01 (IV)(C)(1)(a)(1).

program facilitates and acts in coordination with partnerships between law enforcement and designated mental health facilities to reinforce safe and dignified treatment for people experiencing a mental health crisis.²⁵ CPD members are required to complete a Crisis CIT Report on CLEARNET when they respond to a call for service that has a mental health component.²⁶

In this case, the officers were dispatched to a disturbance in which a DCFS client was in crisis and needed transport to a hospital.²⁷ Both Sgt. Wilson and Officer Poskin agreed that they did not complete a CIT form for ██████████. In his statement to COPA, Officer Poskin stated that he understood it was his responsibility to complete a CIT report.²⁸ Officer Poskin explained that he did not complete the report because the encounter with ██████████ was a high stress situation that lasted a long time, and he forgot to complete it, but that he has completed CIT reports in the past.²⁹ Officer Poskin also confirmed that he has been CIT-certified since 2016.³⁰ In her statement to COPA, Sgt. Wilson stated that she did not complete a CIT report because she was instructed to complete other paperwork, and she believed the officers who transported ██████████ to the hospital should have completed the forms.³¹ However, CPD policy clearly states that at the conclusion of an incident with a mental health component, the CPD member(s) assigned to investigate the incident will complete a CIT report.³² Both Sgt. Wilson and Officer Poskin had a responsibility to complete a CIT report for ██████████ but did not; therefore, the allegation is sustained as a violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Sgt. Denna Wilson

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History³³

Sgt. Wilson has been employed by CPD since April 17, 2017. She has received 35 awards, including two Department Commendation Awards and one Unit Meritorious Performance Award. In the past five years, Sgt. Wilson has not received any sustained complaints or SPARs.

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Sgt. Wilson violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10 when she failed to complete a Crisis Intervention Training (CIT) report for ██████████. In recommending

²⁵ Att. 22, S05-14(II)(III)(A)(1) Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) Program (July 28, 2025, to present).

²⁶ Att. 27, S04-20 (VI)(H)(3), Recognizing and Responding to Individuals in Crisis (August 18, 2023-present).

²⁷ Att. 13 & 14

²⁸ Att. 32, pg. 10, lns. 18-20.

²⁹ Att. 32, pg. 10, lns. 1-9.

³⁰ Att. 32, pg. 8, lns. 9-20. Sgt. Wilson was not CIT-certified at the time of the incident, although she is now currently certified after becoming a sergeant. Att. 26, pg. 12, lns. 8-12.

³¹ Att. 26, pg. 12, lns. 13-20.

³² Att. 27, S04-20 (VII)(J)(3).

³³ Att. 34

discipline, COPA notes that Sgt. Wilson’s failure to complete a CIT report appears to have resulted from a misunderstanding of CPD policy. Sgt. Wilson believed the transport officers were supposed to complete the CIT report; however, CPD policy states that officers who respond to a call for service with a mental health component are required to complete a CIT report. Also in mitigation, COPA notes Sgt. Wilson’s impressive complimentary history and lack of disciplinary history.

Considering these factors, COPA recommends that Sgt. Wilson receive a **reprimand** and **retraining** on S04-20, Recognizing and Responding to Individuals in Crisis.

b. Officer Alex Poskin

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History³⁴

Officer Poskin has been employed by CPD since September 29, 2014. He has received 27 various awards including: two Department Commendation Awards, one Field Training Service Award, one Life Saving Award and one Unit Meritorious Performance Award. Officer Poskin has not received any sustained complaints in the last five years. However, he has received two recent SPARs: one for preventable accident (reprimand), and one court appearance violation (1 day off).

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officer Poskin violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10 when he failed to complete a Crisis Intervention Training (CIT) report for [REDACTED]. In recommending discipline, COPA notes that Officer Poskin accepted responsibility for forgetting to complete the report. He noted that his misconduct was unintentional in nature, and was a misstep due to the stressful event.

Considering these factors, COPA recommends that Officer Poskin receive a **reprimand** and **retraining** on S04-20, Recognizing and Responding to Individuals in Crisis.

Approved:

[REDACTED]

Steffany Hreno
Acting Deputy Chief Administrator

4/23/2026

Date

³⁴ Att. 33

Appendix ACase Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	August 13, 2025/1:56pm/6201 S. Emerald Drive, Chicago, IL 60621
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	August 13, 2025/4:41pm
Involved Member #1:	Denna Wilson, Star #1822 (#12191), employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: April 17, 2017, Unit of Assignment: 003, gender: Female, Black
Involved Member #2:	Alex Poskin, Star #6170, employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: September 29, 2014, Unit of Assignment: 007, gender: Male, White
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.

Applicable Policies and Laws

- G03-02: De-escalation Response to Resistance and Use of Force (June 28, 2023, to present).
- G03-02-01: Response to Resistance and Force options (effective June 28, 2023, to present)
- S05-14: Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) Program (July 28, 2025, to present).
- S04-20: Recognizing and Responding to Individuals in Crisis (August 18, 2023-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.³⁵ 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.”³⁶

³⁵ 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).

³⁶ *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