



Log # 2025-0006095

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On December 11, 2025, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received a web complaint² from [REDACTED] reporting alleged misconduct by members of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). [REDACTED] alleged that on December 10, 2025, Sergeant (Sgt.) Julia Rodriguez, Officer Guiliano Buckner and Officer Androniki Velisaris failed to provide him with police service. Upon review of the evidence, COPA served additional allegations that Officers Velisaris and Buckner detained [REDACTED] without justification, failed to provide [REDACTED] with an Investigatory Stop Receipt, and that they were inattentive to duty by completing an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) that inaccurately stated [REDACTED] suffered from diabetes and/or was intoxicated.³ COPA also alleged that Sgt. Rodriguez failed to supervise Officers Velisaris and Buckner. Following its investigation, COPA reached sustained findings regarding all of the allegations against Officers Velisaris and Buckner.

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE⁴

On December 10, 2025, at approximately 2:20am, [REDACTED] called the Office of Emergency Management and Communications (OEMC) to report that the location where he was working security had trailer trucks that were blocking the street.⁵ [REDACTED] offered to meet responding CPD officers at a nearby location due to OEMC being unable to locate the address in their system.

Officers Velisaris and Buckner responded to [REDACTED] request for police assistance. When [REDACTED] observed their marked vehicle approach his location, he flagged them down. [REDACTED] identified himself as security and explained the reason for his call, but Officers Velisaris and Buckner suggested that handling the illegally parked trucks was [REDACTED] job.⁶ Officer Velisaris warned that if [REDACTED] did not stop being argumentative, she would call for a supervisor. [REDACTED] agreed that Officer Velisaris should call for a supervisor. The officer responded, “How much have

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.

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 BWC footage, police reports, civilian interviews, and officer interviews.

⁵ Att. 3.

⁶ Att. 6, at 2:00 to 4:20.

you been drinking tonight?”⁷ [REDACTED] replied, “I don’t drink, period.” [REDACTED] then said he would pull into a nearby parking lot to wait.⁸ Officer Velisaris told him not to drive anywhere, and both officers exited their vehicle to detain [REDACTED]

Officer Velisaris then asked if [REDACTED] was armed, and he replied that his firearm was in his glove compartment.⁹ Officer Velisaris radioed dispatch to confirm [REDACTED] Conceal Carry License (CCL) status, but the results showed he did not have a CCL.¹⁰ At that point, Sgt. Rodriguez arrived at the scene, and the officers asked [REDACTED] to exit his vehicle and handcuffed him. [REDACTED] explained that he was a retired CPD sergeant and had a PERC Card (Permanent Employee Registration Card), along with an IROCC (Illinois Retired Officer Concealed Carry).¹¹ Sgt. Rodriguez was able to verify that [REDACTED] had the proper identification to carry a firearm, and he was uncuffed after approximately 14 minutes.¹² Throughout the stop, Officer Velisaris made repeated comments that she believed [REDACTED] had been drinking or was diabetic, which [REDACTED] denied.

Sgt. Rodriguez then instructed Officers Buckner and Velisaris to go and locate the trucks that were blocking the street at the original call for service. Officers Buckner and Velisaris arrived at the location and observed the trailer trucks parked where [REDACTED] had originally stated they were. Officer Buckner knocked on the doors of the trailer trucks and instructed them to move.¹³ The officers did not issue any citations to the illegally parked truck drivers, nor did they provide [REDACTED] with an Investigatory Stop Receipt.

Following the incident, Officer Buckner completed an ISR documenting the stop. The report states that as the officers were investigating [REDACTED] complaint, he “began to get aggressive, appeared to slur his words as if he were intoxicated... R/Os performed an official traffic stop to investigate the caller sobriety state. During this investigation R/Os discovered that the caller suffered from diabetes. R/Os advised the caller to take his medicine as soon as possible.”¹⁴

III. ALLEGATIONS

Sergeant Julia Rodriguez:

1. Failing to properly supervise Officers Velisaris and Buckner
 - Sustained, Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, and 11

⁷ Att. 6 at 4:22.

⁸ Att. 6 at 5:07.

⁹ Att. 6 at 6:32.

¹⁰ Att. 6 at 7:37 to 8:00.

¹¹ Att. 6 at 8:53 to 9:05. A PERC (Permanent Employee Registration Card) is a mandatory credential in Illinois for security guards, detectives, and locksmiths to prove they have passed federal/state background checks and fingerprinting. *See* Att. 20. The IROCC card (Illinois Retired Officer Concealed Carry) is a yearly certification for qualified retired or separated law enforcement officers in Illinois to legally carry concealed firearms under the federal Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act (LEOSA/H.R. 218). *See* Atts. 33 and 34.

¹² Att. 5 at 21:15 to 22:17

¹³ Att. 5 at 25:49 to 27:49.

¹⁴ Att. 2, pg. 2.

2. Failing to provide service to [REDACTED]
 - Not Sustained

Officers Guiliano Buckner and Androniki Velisaris:

1. Was inattentive to duty by writing an inaccurate Investigatory Stop Report by stating that [REDACTED] suffered from diabetes and/or was intoxicated
 - Sustained, Rules 2, 3, 6, 10, and 11
2. Detaining [REDACTED] without justification
 - Sustained, Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 11
3. Failing to provide [REDACTED] with an Investigatory Stop Receipt
 - Sustained, Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10
4. Failing to provide service to [REDACTED]
 - Sustained, Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10

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 their ability to accurately perceive the event at the time of the incident and then accurately recall the event from memory.

In this case, Officer Buckner and Officer Velisaris were the initial responding officers. Although their interaction with [REDACTED] was brief, their accounts contain notable inconsistencies that raise concerns regarding the reliability of their recollections. Officer Buckner stated that [REDACTED] firearm remained in the glove compartment, whereas Officer Velisaris reported that she removed the firearm from the vehicle and secured it in a CPD vehicle. In situations involving a firearm, it is a fundamental safety expectation that all responding officers maintain awareness of the weapon's location. This discrepancy reflects a breakdown in shared situational awareness and undermines the reliability of their accounts.

Further credibility concerns arise from the inaccuracies contained in the ISR. Both officers were listed on the report, which included incorrect information regarding [REDACTED] health status. Although Officer Buckner completed the ISR, Officer Velisaris was the primary officer responsible for assessing [REDACTED] condition. Neither officer verified the accuracy of the report with one another prior to submission, resulting in documented misinformation. This lack of coordination and verification further calls into question the reliability of their reporting.

Sgt. Rodriguez's statement to COPA is partially corroborated by the obtained BWC footage. The footage shows Sgt. Rodriguez primarily engaging with Officer Velisaris and appearing to receive direction rather than exercise supervisory authority or lead the investigation. As a sergeant, Sgt. Rodriguez was responsible for independently gathering information from all

involved parties and making an informed, objective determination. However, the BWC shows that, at the outset, Sgt. Rodriguez made only a limited effort to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the situation. Notably, Sgt. Rodriguez's level of engagement appeared to increase only after learning that [REDACTED] was a retired CPD sergeant. This shift raises concerns regarding impartiality and consistency in supervisory conduct, as investigative diligence should not be contingent upon an individual's status or professional background.

[REDACTED] also provided a statement to COPA, which is corroborated by the obtained BWC footage and supporting documentation.¹⁵ The consistency between his account and the objective evidence enhances the reliability of his statement. Additionally, [REDACTED] experience as a former CPD sergeant lends further context to his account, as his training and professional background informed his perception of the events in question.

V. ANALYSIS¹⁶

a. Detaining [REDACTED] without justification

COPA finds Allegation #2, that Officers Buckner and Velisaris detained [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 investigatory stop intrusion."¹⁷ 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.¹⁸ Reasonable suspicion is an objective legal standard that is less than probable cause, but more than a hunch or general suspicion.¹⁹

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.²⁰

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

¹⁵ Att. 41

¹⁶ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, see Appendix B.

¹⁷ *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)).

¹⁸ Att. 29, 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)).

¹⁹ Att. 29, 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)).

²⁰ *People v. Thomas*, 198 Ill. 2d 103, 110 (2001).

an investigatory stop is for officers to confirm or dispel their reasonable articulable suspicion that a person is engaged in criminal activity.²¹ If officers do not develop probable cause to support an arrest, they must release the person.

In this case, ██████ requested police assistance with illegally parked trucks that were blocking the road. When Officers Buckner and Velisaris arrived at ██████ location, they suggested that handling the trucks was ██████ job.²² The officers quickly concluded that ██████ was being argumentative and decided to detain him. Initially, their decision appears to have arisen from Officer Velisaris's speculation that ██████ was intoxicated or experiencing a diabetic episode.²³ However, ██████ denied this, and he was not noticeably impaired on the BWC footage. Additionally, the officers failed to conduct any field sobriety tests of ██████²⁴ The officers may have had a hunch that something was off about ██████ behavior, but they did not have reasonable articulable suspicion that ██████ was committing a criminal offense.

Shortly after Officer Velisaris told ██████ he was not free to leave, the officers began to take the steps normally associated with a traffic stop. At that point, Officer Velisaris asked if ██████ was armed, and he replied that his firearm was in his glove compartment.²⁵ When the officers learned ██████ did not have a CCL, they asked him to exit his vehicle and placed him in handcuffs. ██████ immediately identified himself as a retired CPD sergeant and explained that he had an IROCC card. With certain limitations and conditions, this law exempts retired qualified law enforcement officers from state laws and local ordinances that prohibit the carrying of concealed firearms.²⁶ ██████ also informed the officers that he had a PERC card, which allows individuals to work as security guards, with their weapons. Despite having this information, the officers kept ██████ in handcuffs for approximately 14 minutes.²⁷

The evidence shows that ██████ freely and voluntarily told the officers that he was an armed security guard, and he complied with every verbal command they gave him. Additionally, ██████ did not make any furtive movements or exhibit any aggressive behavior toward either officer. In short, the officers lacked any basis to believe that ██████ was involved in criminal activity. He was the individual who called the police for assistance, not the subject of the call. Additionally, BWC footage captured Sgt. Rodriguez commenting, "This could have been handled," when she arrived at the scene where the trucks were parked.²⁸

For these reasons, COPA finds Allegation #2 against Officers Buckner and Velisaris is **Sustained** as a violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 8, and 11.

²¹ *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S., 1, 28 (1968); see also *People v. Cummings*, 2016 IL 115769, ¶ 18; Att. 14, S04-13-09 (II)(A).

²² Att. 6, at 2:00 to 4:20.

²³ Att. 6 at 4:25 to 5:30; Att. 2, pg. 2.

²⁴ Att. 6 at 18:00; Att. 31, pg. 10, ln. 22-24 & pg. 11, ln. 1-12.

²⁵ Att. 6 at 6:32.

²⁶ Atts. 33 and 34.

²⁷ Att. 7 at 4:00 to 18:00.

²⁸ Att. 7 at 22:49

b. Failing to provide service to [REDACTED]

COPA finds Allegation #4 against Officers Velisaris and Buckner, that they failed to provide service to [REDACTED] is Sustained. It is the policy of CPD to “respond as quickly and safely as possible when the assignment of a field unit is required, and to efficiently provide any needed police service.”²⁹ Additionally, CPD members will “conduct a thorough and accurate preliminary investigation,”³⁰ and “convey a sense of concern and general interest to all persons in need of police service, including allowing the victim the opportunity to voice their concerns.”³¹ The policy notes that “A Department member’s response to calls for service can directly impact a community member’s satisfaction, cooperation, and willingness to participate in any continuing investigation.”³²

In this case, [REDACTED] initiated the call for police assistance when he called emergency services regarding illegally parked trailer trucks.³³ When [REDACTED] observed the marked CPD vehicle, he flagged down Officers Buckner and Velisaris. [REDACTED] told the officers that he was working as a security guard and needed assistance in having trailer trucks moved from the road. As captured on BWC video, Officers Buckner and Velisaris failed to efficiently provide service or convey any sense of interest in [REDACTED] complaints. Instead, the officers almost immediately accused [REDACTED] of being intoxicated, without adequate facts to support this conclusion. [REDACTED] was handcuffed and detained for approximately 14 minutes, and he was not provided with the police service he had requested. It was only after Sgt. Rodriguez arrived at the scene and learned that [REDACTED] was a retired CPD sergeant that she instructed the officers to go the location where the trucks were parked to have them move.

For these reasons, COPA finds Allegation #4 is **Sustained** against Officers Buckner and Velisaris as a violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, and 11.

c. Inaccuracies in the Investigatory Stop Report

COPA finds Allegation #1 against Officer Velisaris and Buckner, that they were inattentive to duty when they completed an ISR that inaccurately stated that [REDACTED] suffered from diabetes and/or was intoxicated, is Sustained. Before February 2026, Special Order S04-13-09 listed requirements for investigatory stops and probable cause stops when no other documents captured the reason for the detention. Under that order, CPD members were required to submit an ISR following an investigatory stop, probable cause stop, or protective pat down or other search in a public place.³⁴ The order required CPD members to document “[a]ll of the factors that support Reasonable Articulate Suspicion in order to temporarily detain an individual for investigation.”³⁵

²⁹ Att. 42, G04-01 (II)(B), Preliminary Investigations (effective June 30, 2025 to present).

³⁰ Att. 42, G04-01 (III)(B)(1).

³¹ Att. 42, G04-01 (III)(B)(2).

³² Att. 42, G04-01 (III)(B)(2).

³³ Atts. 3 and 4

³⁴ Att. 29, S04-13-09 (VIII)(A)(1).

³⁵ Att. 29, S04-13-09 (VIII)(A)(1).

In this case, Officers Buckner and Velisaris submitted an ISR documenting the detention of ██████ which included an inaccurate narrative. The narrative stated that ██████ was a diabetic and that the officers advised him to take his medication. The BWC footage, however, refutes these statements entirely. During the incident, when ██████ was asked if he suffered from diabetes, he denied that he had any medical conditions.³⁶ Additionally, when asked if he had been drinking, ██████ explained that he had coffee and a tuna sandwich and did not drink alcohol.³⁷

In his statement to COPA, Officer Buckner stated that he had left some words out of the narrative and that it was his partner who told ██████ to get a medical evaluation.³⁸ In her statement to COPA, Officer Velisaris stated that although she did not author the ISR, she spoke with her partner and told him that she believed ██████ to be having a diabetic episode.³⁹ Officer Velisaris believed that ██████ was either intoxicated, having a diabetic episode, or even a stroke.⁴⁰ When asked about what professional or medical experience Officer Velisaris had to determine that ██████ had diabetes, particularly given his denials, she stated that her father in law was a diabetic and therefore she knew the symptoms.⁴¹ If Officer Velisaris truly believed that ██████ was suffering from a medical emergency, then this would have been supported by the officers calling for an ambulance, which they did not.⁴² Additionally, despite documenting their concerns about ██████ sobriety in the ISR, the officers did not conduct any field sobriety tests to rule out that ██████ was intoxicated.⁴³ BWC footage captured Officer Velisaris stating that she was a certified DUI officer, yet she failed to conduct any sobriety testing, even after Sgt. Rodriguez asked her about it.⁴⁴

Although the ISR narrative is not expected to be flawless, entering information that ██████ was a diabetic and was advised to take medication was wholly inaccurate, and therefore this allegation is sustained. However, the evidence in this case shows these inaccuracies were the result of negligent and sloppy report writing, as opposed to willfully false statements in violation of Rule 14. Officer Buckner told COPA that he completed the ISR based off his perception of what occurred.⁴⁵ He did not watch his BWC video before drafting the report, though CPD policy permitted him to do so. When pressed, Officer Buckner stated that he rarely watches his BWC before drafting reports, “because if we watched our cameras after every event, we won’t have the time to actually be on the streets.”⁴⁶ The evidence shows that Officer Buckner did not take basic steps to ensure that the ISR he wrote was accurate, reflecting an inattention to duty in his report-writing responsibilities. Additionally, although Officer Velisaris was listed as the second officer

³⁶ Att. 6

³⁷ Att. 5 at 19:37

³⁸ Att. 28, pg. 20, ln. 13-19.

³⁹ Att. 31, pg. 14, ln. 13-16.

⁴⁰ Att. 31, pg. 9, ln. 17-22.

⁴¹ Att. 31, pg. 11, ln. 4-12.

⁴² Att. 31, pg. 19, ln. 1-13.

⁴³ Att. 31, pg. 10, ln. 22-24 & pg. 11, ln. 1-12.

⁴⁴ Att. 6 at 18:00; Att. 7 at 13:15.

⁴⁵ Att. 28, pgs. 20 to 24.

⁴⁶ Att. 28, pg. 23, lns. 20 to 24.

on the ISR, she told COPA that she delegated the report writing to her partner, and she did not review the ISR before he submitted it.⁴⁷

For these reasons, COPA finds Allegation #1 against Officers Buckner and Velisaris is **Sustained** in violation of Rules 2, 3, 6, 10, and 11.

d. Failing to provide [REDACTED] with an Investigatory Stop Receipt

COPA finds Allegation #3, that Officers Buckner and Velisaris failed to provide [REDACTED] with an Investigatory Stop Receipt, is Sustained. Under Special Order S04-13-09, CPD members were required to provide the subject of an investigatory stop with a completed Investigatory Stop Receipt, if the stop involved a protective pat down or any other search.⁴⁸

The evidence shows that Officers Buckner and Velisaris temporarily detained [REDACTED] but did not conduct a protective pat down; however, they did remove [REDACTED] wallet and firearm from his vehicle. The ISR also documents that the officers conducted a search beyond a protective pat down of [REDACTED] effects.⁴⁹ Despite this, neither officer provided [REDACTED] with an Investigatory Stop Receipt. Officer Buckner's BWC captured him completing a receipt,⁵⁰ but he told COPA that he was unable to give the receipt to [REDACTED] because [REDACTED] drove away from the scene. In her statement to COPA, Officer Velisaris also stated that [REDACTED] was not there and therefore they were unable to provide him with the receipt. However, the evidence shows that Officers Buckner and Velisaris followed [REDACTED] to the area where the trucks were instructed to move,⁵¹ but neither officer made any additional attempts to deliver the Investigatory Stop Receipt.

For these reasons, COPA finds Allegation #3 is **Sustained** against Officers Buckner and Velisaris as a violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10.

e. Allegations against Sgt. Rodriguez

COPA finds Allegation #1 against Sgt. Rodriguez, that she failed to properly supervise Officers Velisaris and Buckner, is Sustained. CPD supervisors are accountable for the performance of subordinate members directly observed or under their direct command.⁵² Supervisors are expected to establish and encourage expectations, performance, and accountability. This includes ensuring that members under their command conduct their duties "safely and in a manner that complies with the law and Department policy," and "consistent with the established principles of procedural justice, sanctity of life, deescalation, impartial policing, and community policing."⁵³

⁴⁷ Att. 31, pgs. 14 to 15.

⁴⁸ Att. 29, S04-13-09 (VIII)(3). The ISR receipt included the event number, the reason for the stop, and the officer's name and star number.

⁴⁹ Att. 2, pg. 1.

⁵⁰ Att. 5 at 30:40 to 31:00.

⁵¹ Att. 7 at 20:44.

⁵² Att. 30, G01-09 Supervisory Responsibilities (III)(B) (effective June 30, 2025, to present).

⁵³ Att. 30, G01-09(II)(C)(5)(a)(b).

In this case, Sgt. Rodriguez arrived on scene and observed the officers handcuff ██████ despite having information that ██████ was working as a security guard and was a retired CPD sergeant.⁵⁴ Sgt. Rodriguez then allowed the officers to keep ██████ in handcuffs for approximately 14 minutes while Officer Velisaris made unsupported claims that ██████ was either intoxicated or had high blood sugar.⁵⁵ Although Sgt. Rodriguez told COPA that she did not believe ██████ was under the influence, she failed to take command of the scene and allowed Officer Velisaris to continue to hypothesize about ██████ blood sugar levels throughout the entirety of the stop.⁵⁶ At one point, Sgt. Rodriguez did ask Officer Velisaris if she wanted to test ██████ for a DUI, but the sergeant did not press the matter when Officer Velisaris did not give a straight answer.⁵⁷ In short, Sgt. Rodriguez showed far too much deference to a subordinate officer whose conduct was clearly inappropriate.

For these reasons COPA finds Allegation #1 against Sgt. Rodriguez is **Sustained** in violation of Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10 and 11.

However, COPA finds that Allegation #2 against Sgt. Rodriguez, that she failed to provide service to ██████ is Not Sustained. Unlike Officers Velisaris and Buckner, Sgt. Rodriguez conveyed a sense of concern and general interest in ██████ complaint. Additionally, once Sgt. Rodriguez verified that ██████ had the proper identification, she accompanied ██████ and the officers to the location of the trucks and ensured that the officers provided the requested service. However, this did not occur until after ██████ had been handcuffed and accused of being intoxicated when he had simply called for police assistance. Additionally, COPA notes that Sgt. Rodriguez's level of engagement appeared to increase only after learning that ██████ was a retired CPD sergeant. This shift raises concerns regarding impartiality and consistency in supervisory conduct, as investigative diligence should not be contingent upon an individual's status or professional background.

For these reasons COPA finds Allegation #2 against Sgt. Rodriguez is **Not Sustained**.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Sergeant Julia Rodriguez

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History⁵⁸

Sgt. Rodriguez has been employed by CPD since February 18, 2014, and she was promoted to the rank of sergeant effective November 1, 2024. She has received 19 various awards, including one Department Commendation, one Joint Operations Award, and one Problem Solving Award.

⁵⁴ Att. 6 at 8:08.

⁵⁵ Att. 7 at 4:00 to 18:00.

⁵⁶ Att. 23, pg. 6, ln. 21.

⁵⁷ Att. 7 at 13:15.

⁵⁸ Att. 36

In the past five years, Sgt. Rodriguez has not had any prior sustained complaints. However, she has received one recent SPAR, for failing to perform any duty in October 2025, which resulted in a reprimand. Notably, that incident was also related to the improper supervision of Officers Velisaris and Buckner. Following an unintentional firearm discharge by Officer Buckner, Sgt. Rodriguez failed to provide the officers with proper instructions for securing the scene and determining the scene was secure for BWC deactivation. BWC also captured Sgt. Rodriguez spontaneously stating, “I don’t know how to handle this,” and “I don’t know what to do.”⁵⁹ Although this was only a SPAR, Sgt. Rodriguez’s ability to supervise in a high stress or escalated incident requires further review.

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Sgt. Rodriguez violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, and 11 when she failed to properly supervise Officers Velisaris and Buckner. In mitigation, COPA notes that Sgt. Rodriguez made efforts to de-escalate a simple matter, as [REDACTED] was the individual who called the police for assistance, not a subject under investigation. In aggravation, Sgt. Rodriguez appeared to receive direction from Officer Velisaris rather than exercise supervisory authority or lead the investigation. As a sergeant, Rodriguez was responsible for independently gathering information from all involved parties and making her own informed, objective determination.

For these reasons, and considering Sgt. Rodriguez’s complimentary history and minimal disciplinary history, COPA recommends that Sgt. Rodriguez receive a **1-to-10-day suspension** and **retraining** on supervisory responsibilities (G01-09).

b. Police Officer Guiliano Buckner

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History⁶⁰

Officer Buckner has been employed by CPD since September 30, 2022. He has received 16 awards, including one Department Commendation. Officer Buckner has one prior sustained complaint, for unintentionally discharging his firearm and failing to complete an ISR. He received a 12-day suspension as a result of that incident. (Log 2025-5277). Additionally, Officer Buckner has received four recent SPARs: two court appearance violations (1 day-off and reprimand), one parking vehicles (reprimand), and one indebtedness to the city (no disciplinary action).

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officer Buckner violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, and 11 when he detained [REDACTED] without justification, failed to provide service to [REDACTED] failed to provide [REDACTED] with an Investigatory Stop Receipt, and included inaccurate information in the ISR documenting

⁵⁹ See Log 2025-5277, Att. 42.

⁶⁰ Att. 37

the stop of [REDACTED]. In mitigation, COPA notes that Officer Buckner had only been a police officer for three years at the time of the incident, and some of his misconduct may be attributed to inexperience and/or inadequate training. Additionally, Officer Buckner appeared to follow the lead of his more experienced partner throughout this incident, and he bears less culpability than Officer Velisaris for the maltreatment of [REDACTED].

In aggravation, Officer Buckner violated [REDACTED] constitutional right against unlawful seizure, undermining confidence in CPD's ability to treat members of the public fairly and to adhere to the requirements of the Fourth Amendment. Officer Buckner's delay in investigating [REDACTED] complaint also brought discredit to the Department, with the now civilian [REDACTED] who had previously served as a CPD sergeant. Finally, Officer Buckner displayed extremely poor judgment in his drafting of the ISR for this incident. The ISR included demonstrably false information, including that [REDACTED] suffered from diabetes and was advised to take his medicine. Officer Buckner failed to take basic steps to verify the accuracy of the narrative he wrote, such as reviewing his BWC footage or confirming the details with his partner. This reflects an inexcusably sloppy approach to drafting an official Department report. While COPA has found that Officer Buckner's actions were negligent as opposed to being intentionally deceptive, in the future, he should be mindful that all official reports are subject to Rule 14.

For these reasons, and consistent with the principles of progressive discipline, COPA recommends that Officer Buckner receive an **11-to-29-day suspension** and **retraining** on conducting preliminary investigations (G04-01), investigatory stops and related reporting requirements (formally S04-13-09, now G03-08 *et seq.*), and accurate report writing.

c. Police Officer Androniki Velisaris

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History⁶¹

Officer Velisaris has been employed by CPD since March 26, 2001. She has received 103 various awards, including ten Department Commendation Awards, one Honorable Mention Ribbon Award, two Life Saving Awards, two Problem Solving Awards, one Special Commendation Award, and one Superintendent's Honorable Menton Certificate.

Officer Velisaris has one prior sustained complaint, for failing to generate a case report after observing a domestic physical altercation, and for leaving a juvenile unattended after the altercation. She received a 2-day suspension as a result of that incident. (Log 2022-4096). Additionally, Officer Velisaris has received two recent SPARs, for failing to perform any duty in October 2025 (reprimand),⁶² and for a court appearance violation in November 2025 (1-day off).

⁶¹ Att. 35

⁶² This is the same incident involving Officer Buckner and Sgt. Rodriguez discussed above (Log 2025-5277). After Officer Buckner's unintentional firearm discharge, Officer Velisaris acted with apparent knowledge of what to do during a shooting incident, yet she deactivated her BWC without receiving supervisory approval.

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officer Velisaris violated Rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, and 11 when she detained [REDACTED] without justification, failed to provide service to [REDACTED] failed to provide [REDACTED] with an Investigatory Stop Receipt, and included inaccurate information in the ISR documenting the stop of [REDACTED]. In mitigation, COPA has considered Officer Velisaris's 25 years of service and considerable award history. Additionally, Officer Velisaris explained to COPA that she had a diabetic family member, and that informed her belief that [REDACTED] was either experiencing a health-related episode or was intoxicated.

In aggravation, Officer Velisaris's conduct during this incident was unprofessional, disrespectful, and unnecessarily escalated a simple request for police assistance from [REDACTED]. Officer Velisaris told COPA that she was both a DUI and CIT trained officer; however, she did not perform any sobriety testing of [REDACTED] or call for medical assistance. Her repeated accusations that [REDACTED] was intoxicated or had high blood sugar were unsupported by the evidence and potentially suggestive of bias. Additionally, Officer Velisaris violated [REDACTED] constitutional right against unlawful seizure, undermining confidence in CPD's ability to treat members of the public fairly and to adhere to the requirements of the Fourth Amendment.

COPA also notes that Officer Velisaris's actions set a poor example for her much less experienced partner, both in her interactions with [REDACTED] and the subsequent report writing. Officer Velisaris told COPA she did not assist Officer Buckner in drafting or reviewing the ISR, assuming he could handle it on his own. This was an unacceptable dereliction of duty, particularly given that Officer Velisaris was the officer who initiated [REDACTED] detention and took the lead in speaking with him. Further, Officer Velisaris failed to accept any responsibility for the ISR and deflected blame onto both Officer Buckner and Sgt. Rodriguez.

For these reasons, and consistent with the principles of progressive discipline, COPA recommends that Officer Velisaris receive an **11-to-29-day suspension** and **retraining** on conducting preliminary investigations (G04-01), investigatory stops and related reporting requirements (formally S04-13-09, now G03-08 *et seq.*), and accurate report writing.

Approved:

[REDACTED]

Steffany Hreno
Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator

6/3/2026

Date

Appendix A**Case Details**

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	December 10, 2025/ 2:20am/ 11040 S. Ellis Avenue, Chicago, IL 60629
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	December 11, 2025/ 7:52am
Involved Member #1:	Julia Rodriguez, Star #1986, Employee # [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: 02/18/2014, Unit of Assignment: 005, Female, White Hispanic
Involved Member #2:	Androniki Velisaris, Star # 6177, Employee # [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: 03/26/2001, Unit of Assignment: 005, Female, White
Involved Member #3:	Guliano Buckner, Star #13778, Employee # [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: 09/30/2022, Unit of Assignment: 005, Male, Black
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] Male, 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 10:** Inattention to duty.
- ☒ **Rule 11:** Incompetency or inefficiency in the performance of duty.

Applicable Policies and Laws

- Special Order S04-13-09 Investigatory Stop System (effective July 10, 2017 to February 2, 2026)
- General Order G04-01, Preliminary Investigations (effective June 30, 2025 to present)
- General Order G01-09 Supervisory Responsibilities (effective June 30, 2025, 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.⁶³ 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.”⁶⁴

⁶³ 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).

⁶⁴ *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