



Log # 2025-0003162

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On June 27, 2025, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received a copy of an Initiation Report submitted by Sergeant Deryk Thomas reporting alleged misconduct by a member of the Chicago Police Department (CPD).² Sergeant Thomas alleged that on June 27, 2025, Officer LaShawn Taylor stepped on the face of [REDACTED] a minor.³ Upon review of the evidence, COPA served an allegation that Officer Taylor stepped on [REDACTED] face, without justification. Following its investigation, COPA reached an **Exonerated** finding regarding the allegation against Officer Taylor.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE⁴

At approximately 1:37 pm, Officers Leslie Estrada and Taylor responded to a domestic disturbance call at [REDACTED]. Officers Estrada and Taylor previously responded to domestic calls at the address involving [REDACTED].⁵ The day of the incident, [REDACTED] and her brother had a physical altercation and [REDACTED] mother, [REDACTED] requested that [REDACTED] be removed from the home.⁶ [REDACTED] father, [REDACTED] was called and [REDACTED] parents determined that due to [REDACTED] mental health issues, [REDACTED] should be admitted to [REDACTED] Hospital.⁷ Her father requested that the officers transport [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] because she had jumped out of his car in the past.⁸ When [REDACTED] learned that she was to be transported to [REDACTED] she did not comply with her father's or officers' directions to put on her shoes and leave the premises. [REDACTED] stalled and attempted to

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. 1, Initiation Report.

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. COPA investigators contacted [REDACTED] parents multiple times to schedule a statement and was able to reach her father. During the phone call, [REDACTED] father told COPA investigators that from his perspective, the officers were calm and collected and that his daughter used stall tactics. He further stated that his daughter got aggressive once officers placed handcuffs on [REDACTED] and that she tried to bite an officer with dreadlocks. (CO-1448319). [REDACTED] and her father did not appear for the statement scheduled on July 11, 2025, and did not respond to follow-up phone calls. (CO-1448319, CO-1448713, CO-1449464 and CO-1457775).

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, and officer interviews.

⁵ Att. 20, Statement of Officer Leslie Estrada (transcript), pg. 11, lns. 8 to 15; Att. 24, Statement of Officer LaShawn Taylor (transcript), pg. 9, lns. 15 to 16.

⁶ Att. 3, BWC of Officer Leslie Estrada at 2:07 to 2:38.

⁷ Att. 3 at 44:44 to 44:51.

⁸ Att. 3 at 44:51 to 45:00.

negotiate with her father and the officers for several minutes.⁹ Officer Estrada told [REDACTED] that she did not want to handcuff her and directed [REDACTED] to put her shoes on.¹⁰

When [REDACTED] sat on the porch steps of the house to put on her shoes she became increasingly irate, at one point stating that she was going to smack Officer Taylor if Officer Taylor did not move away from her.¹¹ Officer Taylor borrowed Officer Estrada's handcuffs and when Officer Taylor approached [REDACTED] with the handcuffs [REDACTED] stated, "You not gone touch me."¹² Officer Estrada took her handcuffs back and attempted to handcuff [REDACTED] left wrist. [REDACTED] flailed her left arm and Officer Taylor assisted by grabbing it while Officer Estrada grabbed [REDACTED] right wrist.¹³ [REDACTED] grabbed the handcuffs from Officer Estrada. Officer Estrada gave [REDACTED] continued direction to stop and let the handcuffs go.¹⁴ Officer Taylor told [REDACTED] that she was about to make things worse.¹⁵ Officer Taylor placed her knee in front of [REDACTED] who was seated.¹⁶ [REDACTED] then attempted to bite Officer Taylor's wrist.¹⁷ The officers grabbed both of [REDACTED] arms and [REDACTED] laid on her back and flailed her arms as the officers attempted to handcuff her. While on her back, [REDACTED] rolled over on her left side, and with her arms close to her body and face, grabbed Officer Taylor's ankle.¹⁸ [REDACTED] cried out that Officer Taylor stepped on her face. Officer Taylor stated that [REDACTED] had her pant leg in her mouth and when Officer Taylor tried to shake [REDACTED] off her leg, she accidentally stepped on [REDACTED] head.¹⁹ Officer Estrada stated that she saw [REDACTED] try to bite Officer Taylor's ankle.²⁰

[REDACTED] father told the sergeant who responded to the scene that the officers did not do anything "outrageous."²¹ He stated that [REDACTED] was resisting and that the officers used a little force and [REDACTED] tried to bite Officer Taylor.²²

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer LaShawn Taylor:

1. Stepping on the face of [REDACTED] without justification.
 - Exonerated

⁹ Att. 3 at 45:11 to 55:10.

¹⁰ Att. 3 at 55:10 to 55:12.

¹¹ Att. 3 at 56:10 to 56:15.

¹² Att. 3 at 58:00 to 58:13.

¹³ Att. 3 at 58:32 to 58:37.

¹⁴ Att. 3 at 58:30 to 59:00.

¹⁵ Att. 4, BWC of Officer LaShawn Taylor at 57:45 to 57:47.

¹⁶ Att. 3 at 58:48 to 58:52.

¹⁷ Att. 4 at 57:48.

¹⁸ Att. 3 at 59:08.

¹⁹ Att. 24, pg. 17, Ins. 15 to 23.

²⁰ Att. 20, pg. 17, Ins. 14 to 21.

²¹ Att. 4 at 1:09:20 to 1:09:22.

²² Att. 4 at 1:09:22 to 1:09:30.

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 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.

This investigation did not reveal any evidence that caused COPA to doubt the credibility of any of the individuals who provided statements. COPA found Officer Estrada's and Officer Taylor's statements to be credible and reliable. The officers' accounts were internally consistent, and the officers did not have difficulty remembering details of the incident.

V. ANALYSIS²³

A. There is clear and convincing evidence that Officer Taylor stepped on [REDACTED] face, but it was lawful and unavoidably proper.

Based on the evidence, it can be determined that Officer Taylor stepped on [REDACTED] face. CPD policy defines force as any physical contact by a CPD member to compel a person's compliance.²⁴ CPD members are required to only use force that is objectively reasonable, necessary and proportional under the totality of circumstances.²⁵ During all use of force incidents, when safe and feasible to do so, CPD members are required to use the principles of Force Mitigation, including continual communication, tactical positioning and time as a tactic.²⁶ A resister is any uncooperative person²⁷ and an active resister is a person who attempts to create distance between themselves and CPD members with the intent to avoid physical control.²⁸ An assailant is a person using or threatening to use force against themselves or others that is likely to cause injury.²⁹ Holding techniques are permissible to use against active resisters and assailants.³⁰ Failing to follow these directives is a violation of CPD Rule 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 11.

Officer Taylor and Officer Estrada used force on [REDACTED] when they used holding techniques to handcuff her. Because [REDACTED] was acting as a resister and increased her actions to become an assailant at the time force was used, the force was justified. Further the officers used Force Mitigation principles of communication and time prior to using force as demonstrated by the number of times they directed [REDACTED] to comply and the amount of time they provided her to comply

²³ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, *see* Appendix B.

²⁴ G03-02 (III)(A), De-escalation, Response to Resistance, and Uses of Force (effective June 28, 2023 to present).

²⁵ G03-02 (III)(B).

²⁶ G03-02-01 (III), Response to Resistance and Force Options (effective June 28, 2023 to present).

²⁷ G03-02-01(IV)(B).

²⁸ G03-02-01 (IV)(B)(2).

²⁹ G03-02-01 (IV)(C).

³⁰ G03-02-01(IV)(B)(2)(c); G03-02-01 (IV)(C)(1)(a).

with their orders. There is clear and convincing evidence to support that Officer Taylor stepped on [REDACTED] face. Although no video evidence captures Taylor stepping on [REDACTED] Officer Taylor's claim that the step occurred inadvertently when she was trying to shake her pants leg out of [REDACTED] mouth is supported by video that shows [REDACTED] grabbing Taylors's pants leg and holding it near her face. The claim is also supported by Officer Estrada's statement that she witnessed [REDACTED] attempt to bite Officer Taylor's ankle. Officer Taylor's action of stepping on [REDACTED] face was an accident. It was not physical contact made to compel [REDACTED] compliance and was therefore not a violative use of force under CPD directive G03-02. COPA finds that the allegation against **Officer Taylor** is **Exonerated**.

Approved:

[REDACTED]

Joshua T. Hunt
1st Deputy Chief Administrator

July 7, 2026
Date

Appendix A**Case Details**

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	June 27, 2025/ 2:35pm/ [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	June 27, 2025/ 5:03pm
Involved Member #1:	Leslie Estrada, Star No. 6516, Employee ID No. [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: October 16, 2017; Unit of Assignment: 007, female, Hispanic
Involved Member #2	LaShawn Taylor, Star No. 5523, Employee ID No. [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: April 16, 2010; Unit of Assignment: 007, female, Black
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.

Applicable Policies and Laws

- G03-02, De-escalation, Response to Resistance, and Uses of Force (effective June 28, 2023 to present).
- G03-02-01, Response to Resistance and Force Options (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.³¹ 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.”³²

³¹ 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).

³² *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