



Log # 2025-0005801

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On November 20, 2025, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received an initiation report accusing Officer² Ivan Pita of misconduct, namely that, on November 19, 2025, Officer Pita inappropriately discharged his firearm and failed to carry his firearm in an approved holster.³ Following its investigation, COPA sustained findings of misconduct.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE⁴

Officer Pita was assigned to a plain-clothes prostitution detail at the time of this incident.⁵ Officer Pita's approved, concealed carry holster had broken and he had left it at home when he went to the 6th District station to start his shift.⁶ His duty holster was located inside the station.⁷ Not knowing what else to do, and not wanting to seek supervisory guidance because he was embarrassed,⁸ Officer Pita placed his fully loaded pistol in the waistband of his trousers and walked towards the district.⁹ Officer Pita heard a "bang," checked himself and discovered a hole in his trousers.¹⁰ Officer Pita placed his weapon inside of his car trunk, checked himself thoroughly and discovered bleeding on or about his groin area.¹¹ Officer Pita approached another CPD member

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 Officer Pita was a probationary police officer at the time of this incident. He completed his probation in January 2026, less than two months after this incident. This report will refer to him by his current title.

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 CPD reports and the CPD member's statement. There were no available video or audio recordings which captured the event.

⁵ Att. 20, pg. 10, lns. 4 to 5.

⁶ Att. 20, pg. 14. Officer Pita had driven to the district from his house with the pistol on the passenger seat of his personal car. Att. 20, pg. 28, lns. 4 to 7.

⁷ Att. 20, pg. 7, lns. 4 to 9.

⁸ Att. 20, pg. 16, lns. 5 to 9.

⁹ Att. 20, pg. 7, lns. 13 to 14., Att. 23, U04-02(III)(A). CPD Officers are only authorized to carry their firearms in department-approved holsters. For exposed firearms, wear a department-approved holster attached only to the trouser or equipment belt.

¹⁰ Att. 20, pg. 8, lns. 2 to 11.

¹¹ Att. 20, pg. 8, lns. 14 to 21.

and asked her to call 911 and notify CPD.¹² Other CPD members assisted him until an ambulance arrived.¹³

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer Ivan Pita:

1. Inappropriately discharging your firearm.
 - Sustained, in violation of Rules 6, 10, 11, 12.
2. Failing to carry your firearm in an approved holster.
 - Sustained, in violation of Rules 6, 10, 11, 12.

IV. CREDIBILITY ASSESSMENT

Officer Pita was the only CPD member who was required to give a statement in this matter. The facts were not contested. The investigation did not reveal any evidence that would cause COPA to question his credibility.

V. ANALYSIS¹⁴

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Ivan Pita inappropriately discharged his firearm to be **sustained**. Officer Pita admitted he placed his fully loaded weapon inside the waistband of his trousers. The weapon unintentionally discharged as he attempted to walk into the district building. Officer Pita checked himself and identified a hole in his trousers and bleeding on or about his groin area. He then informed another officer he'd been shot and requested medical aid.

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Ivan Pita failed to carry his firearm in an approved holster to be **sustained**. Uniform and Property U06-01-23 states uniform sworn members will carry their firearms in a department approved holster. In this case, Officer Pita admitted that his department approved holster was broken, that he left it at home, and that he decided to place his loaded weapon inside of his waistband. There was no exigency which required him to proceed in this manner, and he declined to talk to a supervisor for advice because he was too embarrassed.

¹² Att. 20, pg. 9, lns. 1 to 3.

¹³ Att. 20, pg. 9, lns. 3 to 8.

¹⁴ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, *see* Appendix B.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Officer Pita

Aggravating factors that apply to the accused officer include his failure to accept responsibility for his misconduct¹⁵ as well as a failure to fully understand the importance of following CPD directives. There was some suggestion in the officer's statement that the officer's failure to properly secure the loaded weapon was due his approved holster being unserviceable for a non-trivial amount of time. The officer's unwillingness to either obtain a replacement approved holster appropriate to his duty assignment or to approach his chain of command regarding the issue suggests a lack of forthrightness and candor on his part. He could have simply unloaded the firearm, placed it in a bag, and walked inside to receive guidance from more experienced CPD members. The result of Officer Pita's poor judgment was an unintentional firearm discharge, causing injury to himself.

Although COPA notes Officer Pita's relatively limited years of experience and low rank at the time of the incident, the nature of the misconduct here is not such as to make these relevant mitigating factors. Safe handling of firearms is a matter in which new officers should be expected to be proficient due to their recent training. Failure to follow CPD directives can be a *more* serious matter for less experienced officers. Although the misconduct here was inadvertent, this does not operate as a mitigating factor but, rather, as further evidence of Officer Pita's negligence in mishandling his loaded firearm and unwillingness to follow the applicable rules.

Additionally, it is unclear exactly how Officer Pita planned to carry his pistol *after* he arrived at the district. His duty holster, which was inside the station, was not a replacement for the broken inside-the-waistband holster that would be required for concealed carry during this assignment. Given Officer Pita's own testimony regarding his reluctance to engage with supervisory personnel at 006 District,¹⁶ COPA is left with concerns regarding how long Officer Pita would have carried his weapon in an unsafe manner outside of an approved holster.

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History¹⁷

Officer Pita was appointed to CPD on July 16, 2024, and was a probationary officer at the time of the incident. In the intervening period, the officer received four awards, including three honorable mention certificates. According to the reports reviewed by COPA when considering disciplinary recommendations, in his short period of employment by CPD the officer has no instance(s) of sustained discipline, but he received one SPAR for a September 10, 2025,

¹⁵ Officer Pita said "the gun discharged by itself," but also said the weapon was subsequently inspected and was found to be in working order Att. 20, pg. 9, ln. 17, pg. 29, lns. 10 to 16.

¹⁶ Att. 20, pg. 15, ln. 23 to pg. 16, ln. 10.

¹⁷ Atts. 19, 21, and 22. The CPD member's attorney advised that Officer Pita was obliged to complete some additional training as a result of the incident that was subject to the investigation subject of this report, but to his knowledge has not already been subject to any discipline with respect to it (CMS Note CO-1484522; *see also* CMS Note CO-1484489).

weapons/ammunition violation. (SPAR 582562 – failure to perform the 2025 taser qualification within the required dates) which resulted in no discipline.

ii. Recommended Discipline

This incident resulted from Officer Pita's indiscipline and poor judgment. This is an exceptional case where progressive discipline would be counterproductive. The imposition of significant discipline at this juncture is required to remedy the situation. A failure to do so will potentially result in a more serious safety violation later in the officer's career. COPA recommends the officer **be suspended for a period of 11 to 29 days.**

Approved:



Shannon Hayes
Acting Deputy Chief – Chief Investigator

May 4, 2026

Date

Appendix A**Case Details**

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	November 19, 2025 / 10:05 pm / 7808 Halsted ST, Chicago, IL 60620.
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	November 20, 2025 / 8:11 am.
Involved Member #1:	Officer Ivan Pita, Star: 14419, Employee ID # [REDACTED] DOA: July 16, 2024, Unit: 004, Male, Hispanic.

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 11:** Incompetency or inefficiency in the performance of duty.
- ☒ **Rule 12:** Failure to wear the uniform as prescribed.

Applicable Policies and Laws

- U04-02, Department Approved Weapons and Ammunition, effective May 7, 2021
- U04-02-01, Department Approved Handguns and Ammunition, effective January 3, 2024
- U06-01-23, Holster-Firearm, effective May 7, 2021

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.¹⁸ 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.”¹⁹

¹⁸ 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).

¹⁹ *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