



Log # 2025-0005266

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On October 20, 2025, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) received a telephone complaint² from [REDACTED] reporting alleged misconduct by members of the Chicago Police Department (CPD). [REDACTED] alleged that officers stopped and detained him for no reason and changed the description of who they were looking for during the stop. [REDACTED] also alleged that the officers threatened him with arrest and Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) before they handcuffed him and searched his person and vehicle.³ [REDACTED] also alleged that officers took his infant son and held him without wearing mask or gloves.⁴ Following its investigation, COPA reached sustained findings regarding the allegation of searching [REDACTED] vehicle without justification and searching [REDACTED] person without justification.⁵

II. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE⁶

On October 18, 2025, near 223 E. 74th Street, at approximately 10:50 AM, officers were searching the area for a male subject who had recently shot a woman and fled the scene with a child.⁷ The subject was described as a black male about 5'6" with small dreads wearing black, with a black and white jacket, carrying a small female child who was four to six years, old wearing a pink shirt and white pants.⁸ The suspect had walked southbound on S Calumet St. from the scene of the shooting, which had occurred near E 71st Street and S Calumet Ave.⁹ Officer Christopher Ward spotted [REDACTED] whose appearance matched, in similar description to the sought after

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 Attempts to interview [REDACTED] were met with negative results.

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 [REDACTED] alleged that officers held his infant son without wearing mask or gloves. These actions are not inherently misconduct. COPA did not serve any allegations regarding this matter.

⁵ Upon review of the evidence, COPA determined there was insufficient objective verifiable evidence that CPD members stopped [REDACTED] for no reason, changed the description of who they were looking for, threatened [REDACTED] with arrest and Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS).

⁶ 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, Investigatory Stop Reports, Officer of Emergency Management and Communications (OEMC) transmissions and officer testimony.

⁷ Att. 25.

⁸ Att. 41 from 6:34 to 6:48.

⁹ Att. 25.

suspect, about four city blocks from the shooting.¹⁰ ■■■ was a black male with short dreads wearing a gray sweater with black lettering, black and white basketball shorts, black and white shoes, carrying a small child wrapped in a blanket. Officer Ward saw ■■■ standing on the parkway between the building and a white sedan.¹¹

Officer Ward exited his vehicle and approached ■■■ who was now trying to enter the building. Officer Ward inquired if ■■■ resided here, if ■■■ had a gun on him, and whether ■■■ had a Concealed Carry License (CCL).¹² ■■■ said he was not being detained and refused to answer any of Officer Ward's questions.¹³ Officer Ward explained that someone had been shot nearby and that ■■■ was being detained. Officer Ward requested another car to the scene and continued to question ■■■ asking if ■■■ had a gun on him and where ■■■ was coming from.¹⁴ ■■■ removed his cellphone from his pocket and began recording the encounter, asking Officer Ward why he was being detained when he had his son with him.¹⁵ Officer Ward attempted to answer ■■■ but ■■■ continued to speak over Officer Ward.¹⁶ Additional officers arrived on scene and explained the situation, but ■■■ did not believe someone would shoot another person with a small child. Officers took the child from ■■■ and placed ■■■ in handcuffs.¹⁷ ■■■ became upset and began to yell at the officers. Officers escorted ■■■ to a squad car where a pat down was conducted. Officer Ward performed a custodial search of ■■■ prior to placing him in the back of the squad car, while waiting for information on the offender's name. Officer Ward retrieved marijuana and cash from ■■■ front left trouser pocket.¹⁸

As Officer Ward was speaking with ■■■ responding Officer Marquise Freeman arrived. ■■■ child was handed to Officer Freeman as the officers continued attempts to talk with ■■■ while simultaneously escorting ■■■ to a squad car. During these attempts to talk to ■■■ Officer Ward motioned towards a white sedan, parked nearby as the vehicle belonging to ■■■¹⁹ Officer Freeman subsequently handed ■■■ child to another officer and went to the white sedan where Officer Freeman began searching the vehicle. Officer Freeman opened the unlocked vehicle doors, moving objects around the rear seats with a pen and checked inside the glove box.²⁰

Upon completing the search of ■■■ vehicle, Officer Freeman attempted to calm ■■■ down and explain the situation. Officer Freeman explained that the officers stopped ■■■ because he matched the description of someone who had just shot their girlfriend and had a baby with them. She told ■■■ that his baby needed him and he needed to relax. Officers removed the handcuffs

¹⁰ Att. 25.

¹¹ Att. 54 Page 10, Lines 2-9.

¹² Att. 11 from 10:46:08 to 10:46:34.

¹³ Att. 11 from 10:46:08 to 10:46:52.

¹⁴ Att. 11 from 10:46:21 to 10:46:52.

¹⁵ Att. 11 from 10:46:52 to 10:47:16

¹⁶ Att. 11 from 10:46:10 to 10:47:12.

¹⁷ Att. 11 from 10:47:18 to 10:47:58.

¹⁸ Att. 12 from 10:47:58 to 10:49:44.

¹⁹ Att. 15 from 10:48:04 to 10:48:08.

²⁰ Att. 15 from 10:48:26 to 10:49:45.

from [REDACTED] and gave his child back to him. Officers provided him with an Investigatory Stop Report (ISR) receipt.²¹

III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer Marquise Freeman

1. Searched [REDACTED] vehicle without justification.
 - Sustained, violation of Rules 1, 2, 3, 6, 8 and 10.

Officer Christopher Ward

1. Searched [REDACTED] person without justification.
 - Sustained, violation of rules 1, 2, 3, 6 and 8.

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.

The officers involved provided statements to COPA. The officers viewed their BWC footage prior to providing statements. Elements of their account were contradicted by the evidence gathered during COPA's investigation.

Officer Freeman denied that she opened the glovebox of the vehicle. A review of her BWC suggests that the glovebox was in fact opened and subsequently closed. Whether this discrepancy is inconsequential, mis recollection or materially offered is unknown.²² Officer Ward claimed that during the pat down he felt suspect narcotics in [REDACTED] pocket and that [REDACTED] pocket flared open while conducting the pat down, revealing multicolored bags. BWC footage shows that as Officer Ward patted [REDACTED] front left pocket, he subsequently opened the pocket with his thumb, looking at the contents inside.²³

²¹ Att. 15 from 10:51:40 to 10:53:20.

²² Att. 15 from 10:49:34 to 10:49:40.

²³ Att. 11 at 10:48:56.

V. ANALYSIS²⁴

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Freeman searched [REDACTED] vehicle without justification is **Sustained**. Police may perform a warrantless vehicle search incident to a recent occupant's arrest under two sets of circumstances: (1) "when the arrestee is unsecured and within reaching distance of the passenger compartment at the time of the search," or (2) when it is "reasonable to believe evidence relevant to the crime of arrest might be found in the vehicle."²⁵

OEMC radio transmission informed officers that the subject they were looking for was walking southbound on S Calumet Street from the scene of the shooting.²⁶ When [REDACTED] was first spotted by Officer Ward approximately four city blocks from the shooting, Officer Ward said he saw him standing on the parkway between a white sedan and the apartment building. [REDACTED] said to Officer Ward, "You just seen me get out the fucking car." Officer Ward responded, "No I didn't."²⁷ This was an investigatory street stop, not a traffic stop. Therefore, the automobile exception does not apply to this situation.

[REDACTED] was being detained by officers due to reasonable articulable suspicion that [REDACTED] matched the description of the shooting suspect. He was detained until officers were able to properly identify him. Upon establishing that officers did not have the correct person detained, [REDACTED] was released. He was never placed under arrest. Therefore, the warrantless vehicle search did not apply in this situation.

Officers escorted [REDACTED] in handcuffs, to a parked squad car. While [REDACTED] was detained and in handcuffs, seated on the edge of the squad car's rear driver side seat, with the rear driver's side door open, his legs outside the squad car with his feet on the ground, Officer Freeman went to [REDACTED] vehicle and conducted a search of the vehicle to look for weapons²⁸. She opened the rear driver's side door of the vehicle and used a pen to move items in the back seat around. She then opened the front driver's side door and conducted a visual search. She opened the rear passenger side door and moved more items around with her pen and finally opened the front passenger side door and may have opened the glovebox.²⁹ (COPA purposely used the term "may" in describing Officer Freeman's interaction with the glovebox. Freeman's BWC showed the glove box to be closed at the time Freeman opened the front passenger door. As Freeman bent down outside the vehicle with the front passenger door open, the position of her BWC camera captured her feet on the ground and the vehicle's front passenger door sill. The BWC audio captured what appeared to

²⁴ For a definition of COPA's findings and standards of proof, *see* Appendix B.

²⁵ *People v. Bridgewater*, 235 Ill. 2d 85, 94 (2009) (quoting *Arizona v. Gant*, 556 U.S. 332, 343 (2009)) (internal quotation marks omitted). If neither set of circumstances pertains, "a search of an arrestee's vehicle will be unreasonable unless police obtain a warrant or show that another exception to the warrant requirement applies." *Arizona v. Gant*, 556 U.S. 332, 332 (2009).

²⁶ Att. 41 at 4:25 to 4:35.

²⁷ Att. 11 from 10:48:03 to 10:48:06.

²⁸ Att. 53 Page 15, lines 11-15.

²⁹ Att. 15 from 10:48:26 to 10:49:45.

be the sound of the opening and closing of the glovebox. There was no definitive capture of Officer Freeman searching inside the glovebox).

In Officer Freeman's statement to COPA, she stated that she did look inside the vehicle.³⁰ and described how she moved items around the back seat with her pen.³¹ This temporary detention did not meet the legal standard to justify Officer Freeman searching [REDACTED] vehicle. Therefore, COPA finds this allegation to be sustained.

COPA finds the allegation that Officer Ward searched [REDACTED] person without justification is **Sustained**, significantly based on Officer Ward's insistent misapplication and misconstruction of a custodial search coupled with Officer Ward's inconsequential omission of an intended act. CPD policy defines a protective pat down as a limited search during an investigatory stop in which the sworn member conducts a pat down of the outer clothing of a person for weapons for the protection of the sworn member or others in the area. If, during a protective pat down of the outer clothing, the sworn member touches an object which the sworn member reasonably believes is a weapon, the sworn member may reach into that area of the clothing and retrieve the object. A protective pat down is not a general exploratory search for evidence of criminal activity.³² The same special order further defines the Plain Touch Doctrine as when a sworn member is conducting a lawful protective pat down of a suspect's outer clothing for weapons and encounters an object that, based upon their training and experience, the sworn member believes that object is contraband, the sworn member may seize the item without a warrant. The object may not be manipulated in order to determine the identity of the object.³³ The United States Supreme Court has definitively held that there must be *immediate recognition* (*emphasis added*) of the item's identity as contraband or evidence must be "immediately apparent" to the officer through their sense of touch, without any further manipulation or probing.³⁴

Officer Ward's BWC showed him telling [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] was being detained.³⁵ Officer Ward subsequently conducted a pat down and a search of [REDACTED] person. Officer Ward felt the area around [REDACTED] waist. He then ostensibly and simultaneously felt and opened [REDACTED] left trouser pocket. He used his fingers to open the pocket further looking at the contents inside. After a brief conversation with [REDACTED] Officer Ward reached into [REDACTED] pocket and removed the contents.³⁶

In his statement, Officer Ward said during the pat down, he "observed brightly colored bags in his pocket, basically in plain view, which I believed to be suspect narcotics."³⁷ Officer Ward said, "I felt what I thought was narcotics, and he was going in the back of a police squad car.

³⁰ Att. 50 Page 10, Lines 2-3.

³¹ Att. 50 Page 13, Lines 20-24 and Page 14, Lines 1-17.

³² S04-13-09 (II)(B) Investigatory Stop System.

³³ S04-13-09 (II)(E) Investigatory Stop system.

³⁴ *Minnesota vs. Dickerson*, 508 U.S. 366 (1993)

³⁵ Att.11 from 10:46:20 to 10:46:26.

³⁶ Att. 11 at 10:49:39.

³⁷ Att. 54 Page 12, Lines 8-12.

So, to avoid any issue of him disposing of any illegal narcotics, I went into his pocket because I felt like he possibly had narcotics in his pocket and based on the packaging I couldn't ID what it was."³⁸ The objects he grabbed were bags of marijuana and cash. Later Officer Ward said, "I pat him down and I patted his front pocket. His front left pocket and in doing so, where my hand was, his pocket flared open."³⁹ By Supreme Court decision, Officer Ward was barred from searching [REDACTED] pockets at this point as Officer Ward stated he could not ID by feel what was in [REDACTED] pockets.

In the Investigatory Stop Report (ISR), Officer Ward wrote that he conducted a protective pat down and a custodial search with negative results of a weapon.⁴⁰ CPD policy defines a custodial search as "warrantless search of a person under arrest with or without probable cause to believe there is any contraband or evidence subject to seizure on the person."⁴¹

Officer Ward wrote in his ISR and stated in his COPA interview that he performed a custodial search of [REDACTED]. To conduct a custodial search a subject must be under arrest and in police custody. In this case, [REDACTED] was only being temporarily detained, during an investigatory stop. By CPD definition, directive Officer Ward did not conduct a custodial search. COPA finds this allegation to be **Sustained**.

VI. DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATION

a. Officer Marquise Freeman

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History⁴²

Officer Freeman has been employed by CPD since August 31, 2022. She has received a total of eight awards, including one Democratic Convention Service Award (2024) and seven Honorable Mention Certificates. Officer Freeman has had no Sustained Complainants and no Summary Punishment Action Request (SPAR).

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA has found that Officer Freeman violated Rules 1, 2, 3, 6, 8 and 10 when she searched [REDACTED] vehicle without justification. COPA found no substantive aggravating or mitigating circumstances to consider in this instance. Based on the above, COPA recommends **Reprimand and Re-Training**.

³⁸ Att. 54 Page 16, Lines 9-13.

³⁹ Att. 54 Page 21, Lines 9-12.

⁴⁰ Att. 25.

⁴¹ G06-01-02 (IV)(A) Restraining Arrestees.

⁴² Attachment ____.

b. Officer Christopher Ward

i. Complimentary and Disciplinary History⁴³

Officer Ward has been employed by CPD since August 27, 2018. He has received a total of 19 awards, including one Department Commendation, one Attendance Recognition Award, one Crime Reduction Award (2019), one Democratic Convention Service Award (2024), and thirteen Honorable Mention Certificates. Officer Ward has had no Sustained Complaints and no Summary Punishment Action Request (SPAR).

ii. Recommended Discipline

COPA found that Officer Ward violated Rules 1, 2, 3, 6 and 8 when he searched [REDACTED] person without justification. COPA recognizes the nuances in this particular situation. In mitigation, Officer Ward had articulable reasonable suspicion to stop, temporarily detain, handcuff, and perform a pat-down of [REDACTED]

Officer Ward did not, however, properly articulate his rationale for the actual search of [REDACTED]. While he maintained that the suspected cannabis was in “plain view,” the available BWC evidence suggests that it was only after Officer Ward had manipulated the contents and [REDACTED] pocket that these items became visible. In his statement to COPA, Officer Ward acknowledged he could not ID the contents in [REDACTED] pockets by touch, thus nullifying a plain touch doctrine argument for retrieving the items from [REDACTED] pocket.

Officer Ward may have been able to justify a more thorough search of [REDACTED] based on the fact that he was being placed in the rear of the squad car – but he failed to properly articulate that rationale. Instead, Officer Ward maintained that he conducted a “custodial search” of [REDACTED]. Officer Ward documented the “custodial search” in his report narrative, and he restated in his COPA interview that he conducted a “custodial search.” In all actuality, Officer Ward did not conduct a full custodial search.

Given the totality of circumstances, the effect and result of the pat down and subsequent search of [REDACTED] did not deprive Mr. [REDACTED] of any constitutional or civil administrative protections as Mr. [REDACTED] was not arrested, unjustly detained, nor was his property unreasonably and/or permanently seized. Based on the above, COPA recommends **Violation Noted**.

Approved:

[REDACTED]

27 July 2026

⁴³ Att. 55

Joshua Hunt
1st Deputy Chief Administrator

Date

Appendix A

Case Details

Date/Time/Location of Incident:	October 18, 2025 / 10:50 am / 223 E 74 th St.
Date/Time of COPA Notification:	October 20, 2025 / 12:51 pm
Involved Member #1:	Marquise Freeman, Star #3082, Employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: August 31, 2022, Unit: 003, Female, Black
Involved Member #2:	Christopher Ward, Star #19638, Employee ID# [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: August 27, 2018, Unit 003, Male, White
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED] Male, Black

Applicable Rules

- ☒ **Rule 1:** Violation of any law or ordinance.
- ☒ **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 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.

Applicable Policies and Laws

- *Horton v. California*, 496 U.S. 128, 136-37 (1990), (quoting *Coolidge v. New Hampshire*, 403 U.S. 443, 466 (1971)), *People v. Garcia*, 2012 IL App (1st) 1092940 *P5 (2012).
- *People v. Molnar*, 2021 IL App (2d) 190289, ¶ 12.
- *People v. Bridgewater*, 235 Ill. 2d 85, 94 (2009) (quoting *Arizona v. Gant*, 556 U.S. 332, 343 (2009)) (internal quotation marks omitted).
- *People v. James*, 163 Ill. 2d 302, 312 (1994) (citing *Carroll v. United States*, 267 U.S. 132 (1925)).
- *Arizona v. Gant*, 556 U.S. 332, 332 (2009).
- *Minnesota vs. Dickerson*, 508 U.S. 366 (1993)
- S04-13-09 Investigatory Stop System Effective date 10 July 2017 to 03 February 2026.

- G06-01-02 Restraining Arrestees (IV)(A) Effective date 08 December 2017 to current.

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.⁴⁴ 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.”⁴⁵

⁴⁴ 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).

⁴⁵ *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