



Log # 2025-0156

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On January 9, 2025, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received an Initiation Report from Sgt. Shalaine Enahora documenting [REDACTED] allegations of misconduct against members of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). [REDACTED] alleged that on January 9, 2025, Officers Fernando Ontanon and Mark Hanna stopped her without justification.² Upon review of the evidence, COPA served additional allegations that Officers Ontanon and Hanna failed to complete an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) documenting their interaction with [REDACTED] and that they were disrespectful to [REDACTED]. Following its investigation, COPA reached sustained findings regarding the allegations that the officers improperly detained [REDACTED] and treated her disrespectfully.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE³

On January 8, 2025, at approximately 9:15 pm, Officers Ontanon and Hanna were on directed patrol near 6800 S Jeffery Blvd. The officers observed an individual, later identified as [REDACTED] walking at a quick pace and blading her body as the officers drove past her.⁴ Officer Hanna conducted a U-turn and pulled alongside [REDACTED] reportedly noticing that she had a “weighted object in the front jacket pocket.”⁵ The officers then stopped [REDACTED] by using their vehicle as a barrier to block her path.⁶ According to [REDACTED] the officers did not say anything to her before pulling onto the sidewalk.⁷ According to the officers, they asked [REDACTED] if she had a gun, and she responded, “Yeah I got it, I got this dick.”⁸

Officer Ontanon exited the passenger seat of the CPD vehicle and approached [REDACTED] who had turned to walk around the rear of the vehicle. Officer Ontanon asked, “you got something on

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 BWC footage, third-party video, police reports, civilian interviews, officer interviews.

⁴ Att. 11, ISR.

⁵ Att. 11; Att. 18, COPA Statement Officer Hanna, at Pg.11, Lns. 1 to 6.

⁶ Att. 4, Officer Ontanon BWC, at 1:55 to 2:02; Att. 7, [REDACTED] Statement, at 8:24; Att. 18, at Pg.13, Lns. 2 to 10.

⁷ Att 7, at 8:20.

⁸ Att. 11; Att. 16, COPA Statement Officer Ontanon, at Pg.11, Lns. 3 to 10; Att. 19, at Pg. 12, Lns. 1 to 11 and Pg. 15, Lns. 18 to 24.

you?,” and ██████ responded, “I ain’t got shit. I’m walking to--.”⁹ As ██████ was speaking, Officer Hanna approached her from behind and patted down her front jacket pockets.¹⁰ ██████ recalled being lifted off the ground as Officer Hanna placed her in a bear hug from behind, like he was doing “the Heimlich.”¹¹ No firearms or weapons were found on ██████.¹² Both officers immediately returned to their vehicle, and Officer Hanna used his hands to form the shape of a heart, which he directed at ██████.¹³ As Officer Hanna began to maneuver the CPD vehicle back onto the street, he repeatedly told ██████ “I love you,” and called out to her, “Are you a girl?”¹⁴ Officer Ontanon also referred to ██████ as a “trick” and a “snitch,” more than once.¹⁵

During his COPA statement, Officer Hanna explained that he said, “I love you” to ██████ as a way of “being the bigger person instead of responding with profanity or disrespect.”¹⁶ He said he asked ██████ if she was a girl because he was under the belief that ██████ was a man, due to the “I got this dick” comment and the face covering she wore.¹⁷ For his part, Officer Ontanon told COPA that he called ██████ a “trick” and a “snitch” because she was recording the incident on her cell phone, and he was suggesting that she was a “tattletale.”¹⁸

The officers later completed an ISR documenting the detention and pat down of J. Doe, later identified as ██████. The ISR alleges that ██████ refused to cooperate with verbal commands, began spitting in their direction, and attempted to strike their vehicle with a closed fist.¹⁹ As a result, the officers chose not to obtain ██████ identification, and they left the scene without conducting a name check in LEADs or issuing ██████ an ISR receipt.²⁰

At approximately 10:02 pm Sgt. Shalaine Enahora responded to 7020 S Jeffery Blvd, where she registered a complaint from ██████.²¹

III. ALLEGATIONS

Police Officer Fernando Ontanon:

1. Stopping ██████ without justification.
 - **Sustained**, in Violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, and 10.

⁹ Att. 4, at 2:00 to 2:06; Att. 7, at 11:05 to 11:36.

¹⁰ Att. 18, at Pg. 13, Ln. 17 to Pg. 14, Ln. 2.

¹¹ Att. 7, at 8:30 to 9:00.

¹² Att. 18, at Pg.15, Lns. 6 to 9.

¹³ Att. 6, Cell phone video, at 00:21.

¹⁴ Att. 3, at 2:16 to 2:26.

¹⁵ Att. 3, at 2:26 to 2:34.

¹⁶ Att. 18, at Pg. 24 Lns. 15 to 17.

¹⁷ Att. 18, at Pg. 25 Lns. 1 to 14.

¹⁸ Att. 16, at Pgs. 19 to 20.

¹⁹ Att. 11.

²⁰ Att. 11.

²¹ Att. 5, Sgt. Enahora’s BWC at 9:35 to 15:03.

2. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report documenting their interaction with [REDACTED]
 - **Unfounded.**
3. Disrespect to or maltreatment of [REDACTED] without justification in violation of Rule 8.
 - **Sustained**, in Violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.

Police Officer Mark Hanna:

1. Stopping [REDACTED] without justification.
 - **Sustained**, in Violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, and 10.
2. Failing to complete an Investigatory Stop Report documenting their interaction with [REDACTED]
 - **Unfounded.**
3. Disrespect to or maltreatment of [REDACTED] without justification in violation of Rule 8.
 - **Sustained**, in Violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9.

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 accurately recall the event from memory.

During their COPA statements, Officers Hanna and Ontanon provided accounts that were generally consistent with each other and with the available BWC video. For example, both officers recalled [REDACTED] saying, "I got this dick," even though it occurred prior to the officers activating their BWCs. The officers also explained their confusion regarding the incident, which they recalled as involving the stop of a male citizen. This accounts for the ISR's inaccurate description of [REDACTED] as a male John Doe.

With respect to [REDACTED] COPA notes that she provided consistent accounts of the incident during her COPA statement and in her complaint to Sgt. Enahora, which was captured on BWC video. Although some of the details of [REDACTED] account deviate from the officers' recollection (e.g., whether the officers said anything prior to stopping their vehicle), other aspects of her account are highly credible. For example, COPA credits [REDACTED] detailed description of Officer Hanna placing her in a bear hug from behind, like he was doing "the Heimlich" maneuver.

At the conclusion of the investigation, COPA did not find any material discrepancies that caused it to question the credibility of any of the parties.

V. ANALYSIS²²

a. Stopped [REDACTED] without justification

COPA finds the allegation that Officers Hanna and Ontanon stopped [REDACTED] without justification, is **Sustained**. A police officer may temporarily detain an individual for an investigatory stop when “the officer’s decision is based on specific, articulable facts which warrant the investigative stop intrusion.”²³ Officers must possess specific and articulable facts which, combined with rational inferences from those facts, reasonably warrant a belief that an individual is committing, is about to commit, or has committed a criminal offense.²⁴ Reasonable suspicion is an objective legal standard that is less than probable cause, but more than a hunch or general suspicion.²⁵

The Illinois Supreme Court has further explained the level of suspicion needed to justify a stop:

Viewed as a whole, the situation confronting the police officer must be so far from the ordinary that any competent officer would be expected to act quickly. The facts supporting the officer’s suspicions need not meet probable cause requirements, but they must justify more than a mere hunch. The facts should not be viewed with analytical hindsight, but instead should be considered from the perspective of a reasonable officer at the time that the situation confronted him or her.²⁶

Officers who perform investigatory stops must be able to explain their reasonable articulable suspicion and justify why they believed a person was committing criminal activity. The purpose of an investigatory stop is for officers to confirm or dispel their reasonable articulable suspicion that a person is engaged in criminal activity.²⁷ If officers do not develop probable cause to support an arrest, they must release the person.

Furthermore, Illinois law permits a person with a license to carry a firearm in public.²⁸ The firearm may be fully or partially concealed. Courts have ruled that mere possession of a firearm does not provide reasonable articulable suspicion to detain a person or probable cause to arrest a

²² For a definition of COPA’s findings and standards of proof, see Appendix B.

²³ *People v. Moore*, 286 Ill. App. 3d 649, 653 (3d Dist. 1997) (citing *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1, 21, (1968)); *People v. Stewart*, 242 Ill. App. 3d 599, 605 (1993)).

²⁴ Att. 20, S04-13-09 (II)(C)(1), Investigatory Stop System (effective July 10, 2017 to February 2, 2026); see also *People v. Hackett*, 2012 IL 111781, ¶ 20 (citing *People v. Close*, 238 Ill. 2d 497, 505 (2010)).

²⁵ Att. 20, S04-13-09 (II)(C); see also *United States v. Jones*, No. 22-3218, 2023 U.S. App. LEXIS 27841, at *3 (7th Cir. Oct. 19, 2023) (citing *United States v. Richmond*, 924 F.3d 404, 411 (7th Cir. 2019)).

²⁶ *People v. Thomas*, 198 Ill. 2d 103, 110 (2001).

²⁷ *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1, 28 (1968); see also *People v. Cummings*, 2016 IL 115769, ¶ 18; Att. 20, S04-13-09 (II)(A).

²⁸ 430 ILCS 66/10(c).

person.²⁹ Rather, officers seeking to detain a person for illegal possession of a firearm must have specific and articulable reasons to believe the person does not have a license to carry the firearm and is otherwise engaged in criminal activity.

Additionally, courts have repeatedly ruled that furtive movements alone are not sufficient to constitute reasonable articulable suspicion.³⁰ There must be additional indica of criminal behavior such as open contraband, suspicious objects in plain view, or prior information.³¹

In this case, the officers' articulated suspicion hinged on [REDACTED] walking at a quick pace and blading her stance.³² They also added that [REDACTED] appeared to have a bulge in her front jacket pocket,³³ and that she made a flippant comment when they pulled alongside her and asked if she had a gun. However, none of these factors, even considered together, constitute reasonable articulable suspicion that [REDACTED] had committed or was about to commit a crime. Furthermore, the officers claimed they decided to conduct a stop of [REDACTED] only after they asked if she had a gun and she responded, "yeah I do, I got this dick."³⁴ But even if [REDACTED] was concealing a firearm in her jacket pocket, which she was not, that alone would not provide reasonable articulable suspicion to detain [REDACTED] was in violation of no law by walking swiftly, having a bulge or "weighted object" in her jacket, or giving a sharp retort to the officers' question. The evidence shows that the officers stopped [REDACTED] based on a "mere hunch,"³⁵ not specific and articulable facts that would reasonably warrant a belief that [REDACTED] was engaged in criminal activity. Therefore, COPA finds the allegation for Officers Hanna and Ontanon is **Sustained** by a preponderance of the evidence.

b. Failed to complete an ISR

COPA finds the allegation that Officers Hanna and Ontanon failed to complete an ISR is **Unfounded**. COPA initially served this allegation after searching the ISR database and failing to locate an ISR matching the details of this incident. However, during Officer Ontanon's statement

²⁹ *United States v. Watson*, 900 F.3d 892, 896 (7th Cir. 2018) (analyzing 4th Amendment to Indiana law, which allows firearms in public with a license and stating that "a mere possibility of unlawful use" of a gun is not sufficient to establish reasonable suspicion.") (citing *United States v. Paniagua-Garcia*, 813 F.3d 1013, 1014-15 (7th Cir. 2016); *People v. Horton*, 2019 IL App (1st) 142019-B, ¶ 57-59 (noting that "a belief that a defendant 'may or may not' possess a weapon is simply a hunch and does not reach the threshold of probable cause."); *People v. Dorsey*, 2025 IL App (1st) 240933, ¶19; *People v. Bloxton*, IL App (1st) 181213, ¶34.

³⁰ *In re Jarrell C.*, 2017 IL App (1st) 170932, ¶ 22 (holding a person holding their hands towards their crotch and grabbing waistband in high crime area alone was insufficient to justify reasonable suspicion let alone probable cause); *People v. Slaymaker*, 2015 IL App (2d) 130528, ¶ 19 (holding person putting hands in their pocket did not rise to level of reasonable suspicion or presence of a weapon); *In re Rafeal E.*, 2014 IL App (1st) (holding officers lacked reasonable suspicion for a stop when person was in a high crime area and placed hands near their crotch or pockets).

³¹ *People v. Trisby*, 2013 IL App (1st) 112552, ¶ 15.

³² Att. 16, at Pg. 10, Lns. 17 to 22; Att. 18, Pgs. 11 to 13.

³³ Att. 18, at Pg. 14; and Att. 11, ISR.

³⁴ Att. 16, at Pg. 11 Lns. 3 to 10. COPA notes that, had [REDACTED] been carrying a firearm unlawfully, it is unlikely she would have taunted the officers in this manner.

³⁵ See *People v. Thomas*, 198 Ill. 2d 103, 110 (2001).

to COPA, he produced a copy of the ISR that was generated under the name “J. Doe,” because the officers never obtained ██████ ID.³⁶ COPA then independently verified that ISR by searching the database using the details provided. As a result, COPA finds this allegation is **Unfounded** by clear and convincing evidence.

c. Disrespect to and/or Maltreatment of ██████

COPA finds the allegation that Officers Hanna and Ontanon disrespected and/or maltreated ██████ is **Sustained**. CPD policy requires its members to “interact with all members of the public in an unbiased, fair, and respectful manner,”³⁷ “treat all persons with the courtesy and dignity which is inherently due to every person as a human being,”³⁸ and “act, speak, and conduct themselves in a courteous, respectful, and professional manner.”³⁹ The policy also states that officers will “not exhibit a condescending attitude or direct any derogatory terms towards any person in any manner and will not use language or take action intended to taunt or denigrate an individual, including racist or derogatory language.”⁴⁰

The CPD Rules of Conduct further stress the requirement that CPD members treat all individuals in a respectful manner. CPD Rule 2 prohibits any action or conduct which impedes CPD’s policy and goals or brings discredit upon CPD, and it expressly applies to both the professional and private conduct of all CPD members.⁴¹ Rule 3 prohibits actions that fail to promote CPD’s efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals.⁴² Rule 8 prohibits any disrespect or maltreatment of any person, while on or off duty.⁴³ Finally, Rule 9 prohibits CPD members from engaging in any unjustified verbal or physical altercation with any person, while on or off duty.⁴⁴

In this case, Officer Ontanon told COPA that he and his partner attempted to deescalate the situation by driving away as ██████ became irate.⁴⁵ However, before departing, both officers made comments in ██████ direction in a mocking tone. Officer Ontanon directed words to the effect of “trick” and “snitch” at ██████ more than once.⁴⁶ When asked what those words meant, Officer Ontanon told COPA, “a tattletale.”⁴⁷ Meanwhile, Officer Hanna made a heart sign with his hands and repeatedly told ██████ words to the effect of, “I love you.” He later stated this was his way of

³⁶ Att. 11, ISR narrative.

³⁷ Att. 23, G02-01(III)(B)(1), Protection of Human Rights (effective June 30, 2022, to April 29, 2026).

³⁸ Att. 23, G02-01(III)(B)(2).

³⁹ Att. 23, G02-01(III)(B)(3).

⁴⁰ Att. 23, G02-01(III)(B)(4); see also Att. 25, G02-04 (II)(B)(2), Prohibitions Regarding Racial Profiling and other Bias-Based Policing (eff. February 1, 2023 to April 30, 2026).

⁴¹ Att. 26, Rule 2, Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department (effective April 16, 2015, to present).

⁴² Att. 26, Rule 3.

⁴³ Att. 26, Rule 8.

⁴⁴ Att. 26, Rule 9.

⁴⁵ Att. 16, at Pg. 11, Lns. 23 to 24.

⁴⁶ Att. 3, 2:27 to 2:34.

⁴⁷ Att. 16, at Pg. 19, Lns. 5 to 7.

“being the bigger person, instead of responding with profanity or disrespect to somebody.”⁴⁸ Officer Hanna also called out of his vehicle window to ██████ asking her, “Are you a girl?”⁴⁹ He told COPA he had been under the impression that ██████ was a man, due to the “I got this dick,” comment.⁵⁰

Despite the officers’ explanations, it is clear from the overall context of the incident that they made these comments to taunt or mock ██████. If the officers wanted to deescalate the situation, they could have simply driven off without saying anything to ██████. Instead, they made disparaging remarks at ██████ out of their vehicle windows as they left the scene. These remarks were disrespectful, unprofessional, and served no law enforcement purpose. For these reasons, COPA finds the allegation for Officers Hanna and Ontanon is **Sustained** by a preponderance of the evidence.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Complimentary and Disciplinary Histories

i. Officer Mark Hanna⁵¹

Officer Hanna has been employed by CPD since December 12, 2016. In that time, he has received 226 total awards, including one Superintendent’s award of valor, one life saving award, one police officer of the month award, one top gun arrest award, six Department commendations, one special commendation, and 200 honorable mentions. Officer Hanna has one prior sustained complaint in the last five years and two recent SPARs, which are detailed below:

- A violation noted for failing to timely activate his BWC (Log 2023-0002381);
- A reprimand for a 2026 court appearance violation; and
- A reprimand for a 2025 preventable accident.

ii. Officer Fernando Ontanon⁵²

Officer Ontanon has been employed by CPD since January 17, 2017. In that time, he has received 174 total awards, including six Department commendations, one special commendation, one police officer of the month award, one top gun arrest award, and 155 honorable mentions. Officer Ontanon does not have any prior sustained complaints in the last five years, but he has received two recent SPARS, both for court appearance violations where no disciplinary action was taken.

⁴⁸ Att. 18, at Pg. 24, Lns. 15 to 17.

⁴⁹ Att. 3, at 2:16 to 2:26.

⁵⁰ Att. 18, at Pg. 25, Lns. 1 to 14.

⁵¹ Att. 22

⁵² Att. 21.

b. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officers Hanna and Ontanon violated Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, and 10 when they stopped [REDACTED] with justification and disrespected and/or maltreated [REDACTED]. In mitigation, COPA has considered the officers’ impressive complimentary histories and lack of relevant disciplinary histories. However, the applicable CPD policies are very clear, and the officers both violated [REDACTED] constitutional rights and failed to treat her in a respectful and professional manner. Therefore, COPA recommends that Officer Hanna and Officer Ontanon each receive a **Reprimand** and **Retraining** on investigatory stops and professionalism.

Approved:

[REDACTED]

Steffany Hreno
Deputy Chief Administrator

7/6/2026

Date

Appendix A**Case Details**

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	January 9, 2025- 9:17 pm- 6800 S Jeffrey Blvd Chicago, IL 60649.
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	January 9, 2025- 10:41 pm.
Involved Member #1:	Officer Fernando Ontanon, Star #13705, Employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: 1/17/2017, Unit: 009, Male, White Hispanic.
Involved Member #2:	Officer Mark Hanna, Star #13731, Employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: 12/12/2016, Unit: 009, 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

- G02-01, Protection of Human Rights (effective June 30, 2022 to April 30, 2026)
- G02-04, Prohibitions Regarding Racial Profiling and other Bias-Based Policing (effective February 1, 2023 to April 30, 2026)
- S04-13-09 Investigatory Stop System (effective July 10, 2017 to February 2, 2026)
- Rules and Regulations of the Chicago Police Department (effective April 16, 2015, 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.⁵³ 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.”⁵⁴

⁵³ 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).

⁵⁴ *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